United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRSTSESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 16, 2005 No. 64

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC
May 16, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CATHY MCMORRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 2 minutes.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SAVES MONEY AND LIVES

Mr. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, today I had the pleasure of meeting with a group of bright students from Jeannette High School in Jeannette, Pennsylvania. In today's world, so many high school and college students make information technology a common part of their everyday lives. They have learned so much about technology that it is commonplace in America to use a card to access your bank machine. In fact, anywhere in the world one can do that. We even take it for granted that you can take your car to have an oil change, and the person who is doing that oil change will be able to tell you all about your car, when your last oil change was done, where, how much, et cetera.

But in America today if you try and access the same sort of information about your own health, your needs in a hospital, hospitals are often at a loss to gather that information. Even the best hospitals in America have that trouble. So today in America thousands of patients are having unnecessary tests, undergoing surgeries they do not need and taking harmful drugs due to our paper-based health care system, and the consequences are deadly and costly. Because of this, sadly, hundreds of patients will die today and thousands more will be put at risk. And all of this can be prevented. Simply put, paper kills.

To solve this problem, I have introduced, along with my colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) the 21st Century Health Care Information Act, to make it easier for doctors to take advantage of new technologies, including electronic medical records and electronic prescribing into their everyday practices. Electronic medical records and electronic prescribing centralizes patient information in a secure and confidential manner to improve patient safety and increase the quality, availability and accessibility of health care.

Congress can no longer ignore the over $100 billion in savings and the countless number of lives that can be saved by these new technologies. If you believe in saving lives and saving money, I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation to prevent further medical errors from taking the lives of those whom we hold dear.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues if they wish to learn more about the benefits of health information technology and this act to visit my website at murphy.house.gov.

CLOSURE OF CANNON AIR FORCE BASE AN ENORMOUS MISTAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, Friday the 13th unfortunately lived up to its ominous reputation when this administration and Secretary Donald Rumsfeld of the Department of Defense announced that they were closing Cannon Air Force Base in Eastern New Mexico. They announced that Cannon was closing and all 2,800 employees would be moved to other areas.

I can tell you one thing; our Congressional delegation, all the Democrats and all the Republicans, along with our Governor, Governor Richardson, are united to fight this, because we believe this is an ill-advised decision, an ill-considered decision and a wrongheaded move. I just want to talk today about a couple of the reasons why this is ill-considered.

First of all, there is the issue of encroachment. When you have an Air Force base, you do not want residential areas nor industrial areas nearby. Of the 56 Air Force bases in this country, this is one of the best in terms of the encroachment issue. The local communities have worked very closely and formed a committee to try to make sure that this Air Force base was not encroached upon. There has been a robust buffer around this base for years and years.

Secondly, there is the issue for our airmen and women of practicing and training in supersonic air space. We have initiated in New Mexico something called the New Mexico Training

Printed on recycled paper.

Range Initiative. It will be approved in October by the FAA and the Air Force. What that training initiative is going to do is make sure that as those pilots get off the ground, within a matter of minutes, they can train in supersonic air space. This is not true anyplace else in the country. For many, many pilots, they must fly 2 to 3 hours in order to get to a training area.

At Cannon Air Force Base, there are nearby bombing ranges, there is training, there is going to be this access to supersonic air space, which is enormously important, and they will be able to train immediately and not have to travel those long distances. That fact was not even considered by the Department of Defense because their cutoff date was December of 2004, so we are going to put that fact before the commission.

The third issue is what is called the military value and mission of this particular base. This is a top-notch base. It is an exceptional base. We have spent as a country $53 million over the last 6 or 7 years improving the towers, improving the runways, improving and enhancing the fire-fighting capability on the base and increasing base housing so that the base is in the kind of shape to make sure that our airmen and women that train there are ready to go into battle.

To close, this is a bad decision. Our Congressional delegation and Governor are united. We are going to persuade that base closing commission that this was not the right decision for the country.

Madam Speaker, Friday the 13th was a day that unfortunately lived up to its ominous reputation when the Department of Defense (DoD) released its Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) recommendations. In what I and the entire New Mexico Congressional Delegation believe is an enormous mistake, the Secretary of Defense included Cannon Air Force Base on its list of bases recommended for closure.

The BRAC process was established over a decade ago following the collapse of the Soviet Union as a means to realign or close military installations that are believed to be no longer needed for our Nation's defense. There have been BRAC rounds in 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995. This year's BRAC round, however, was expected to be one of the largest as Defense Secretary Don Rumsfeld pledged to shrink the number of military installations in the United States by as much as 25 percent. Although Secretary Rumsfeld recently acknowledged that the BRAC round would be less extensive than earlier thought, DoD still recommended closing 33 bases, including Cannon.

This is just the beginning of our fight to save Cannon. The list of recommendations submitted by the DoD to the BRAC Commission is only the first stage of a lengthy process. The next step is the Commission must submit its list of recommendations to President Bush on September 8th. The President will then either approve or disapprove the recommendations made by the BRAC Commission and submit to Congress. Congress will then have an up-or-down vote on the recommendations. Until September 8th, however, I will work with the entire Congressional Delegation, Governor Richardson, and the Clovis and Portales Communities to fight to get Cannon off the list of recommended closures.

A central argument we will make to the commissioners is the issue of "range encroachment." It is the process whereby a military base is progressively hemmed in by urban growth, competition for air space, and other factors. Such a development can detract from a base's desirability, and thus make it a target for future closure and realignment in the BRAC round. Cannon has two long runways, excellent airspace, and bombing ranges with no encroachment issues.

Additionally, the Department of Defense did not take into account the New Mexico Training Range Initiative as part of its analysis of Cannon's military value. Although the Initiative has yet to be fully approved, it is expected to be by October of this year. The Training Range Initiative will allow training at supersonic speeds, only further adding to the exceptional capabilities offered by Cannon Air Force Base. It is further evidence of the DoD's shortsightedness that they failed to take into account this valuable initiative.

Cannon Air Force Base is a critical component of our Nation's defense. It is also equally, if not more, important to the communities of Clovis and Portales and the entire State of New Mexico. There are several months to fight the DoD's recommendation and I plan to do so vigilantly side-by-side with you, the other members of the Congressional Delegation, and Governor Richardson to show the BRAC Commissioners just how valuable Cannon, Clovis, and Portales are to our Nation.

FEDERALIZING THE CRIME OF KILLING A POLICE OFFICER AND FLEEING THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I have taken this time today to announce the introduction of legislation. Today my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), has joined me in introducing legislation that calls for making it a Federal crime to kill a law enforcement officer and flee the country.

Just yesterday we saw the memorial held for the fallen peace officers, and we had here in Washington the Sheriff of Los Angeles County, Lee Baca, who is really the progenitor of this legislation, along with the Chief of Police of the City of La Verne, Ron Ingels, who was representing the California Police Chiefs Association and the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association.

We have had over the past 3 years a very tragic case in Southern California. Three years ago this last month we saw the tragic murder of Deputy Sheriff David March by a Mexican national, who chose to first shoot Deputy March and leave and then return and put the gun to Deputy Sheriff March's head and kill him, and then flee the country, knowing full well that he would face, if extradited, the death penalty, and that would prevent the Mexican government from extraditing him.

Well, over the past 3 years, in a bipartisan way, my colleagues the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), who represents the March family, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), whom I mentioned, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), and a wide range of Members, especially of the California delegation, have come together trying to deal with this issue.

While the introduction of today's legislation will not directly deal with the March case, it clearly is legislation that is designed to ensure that as we look at the prospect of someone killing a law enforcement officer and fleeing the country, we will have the full force of the Federal Government behind our quest for a resolution. This does not in any way preempt the opportunity for county and State jurisdictions to pursue with vigor a case such as this, but it does provide the option for the Federal Government to be involved, and also to deal with any kind of negotiating that might be necessary to ensure that someone can be extradited.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join as cosponsors of this legislation, which will federalize the crime of killing a law enforcement officer and fleeing the country. As I say, the bill is going to be introduced today, so I would encourage as many of my colleagues as possible to join on board in this bipartisan effort to help ensure that we bring the killers of law enforcement officials to justice.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY INAPPROPRIATELY AND IMPROPERLY PUTTING PRESSURE ON CADETS TO FOLLOW CERTAIN RELIGIOUS PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I was disturbed to read of reports that people at the Air Force Academy were inappropriately and improperly putting pressure on cadets to follow certain religious practices. In this particular case, cadets who did not follow a certain brand of Christianity were being ridiculed and being criticized, and the allegations were that they were even being pressured by officials of the Academy to follow this specific set of religious practices.

Obviously, we should create a situation in which people of any religious persuasion are free at the Academy to follow that. But for young men and women who were sent to the Academy to learn to lead our Air Force and defend our country in that important institution to be subjected to religious

pressures, religious ridicule and criticism because they do not particularly follow one or another religion is terrible public policy, and, of course, unconstitutional.

When I heard that, my reaction was to give the Air Force the benefit of the doubt. I wrote a letter to the Air Force Academy and the Secretary of the Air Force asking that the Air Force be looking into this, and I had read that in fact they were. So I thought, well, I hope we are talking with reasonable people. These allegations sounded to me like things that no reasonable person would allow to go forward. Let us see what happens. I decided I would wait to see what the Air Force did.

Well, I am not waiting anymore, because the Air Force has acted. They have made things worse. They have done some things that confirm the view that I and others have that there is something seriously wrong.

Captain Melinda Morton, an Air Force chaplain, number two in the chaplaincy there, was just transferred, well ahead of when she was supposed to be transferred, to Okinawa.

Now, I mean no disrespect to Okinawa. For the people that live there, it is home, and it is a wonderful home. It has a lot of advantages. But when you are the number two in the chaplaincy in Colorado and you are sent to Okinawa very suddenly, it is clearly meant to be a rebuke, and the reason that the number two in the chaplain's office was sent to Okinawa was because she was supporting the criticisms.

According to a New York Times article, which I will include for the record, she was told by the Chief Chaplain, Colonel Whittington, after a critical report on this subject from a team from the Yale Divinity School, she was asked to denounce the report and defend the Academy. But she said she could not do that because she agreed with the report. It was about 2 weeks later that she was transferred to Okinawa.

So we have here not just a refusal to deal with inappropriate abuse of people on religious grounds, but a punishment of a very brave officer, a woman of integrity, a chaplain, a member of the clergy, who in pursuance of her faith and her obligations and her understanding of the Constitution refused to say something that she thought untrue about a report.

When intelligent people say silly things, it generally means that they do not want to tell you the truth. The explanation the Air Force gives for sending her to Okinawa makes no sense at all. I do not believe we have put in charge of the Academy people incapable of making sense, so when they tell us things that are just silly, I think they are covering up.

They gave a convoluted argument about, well, the other guy is going to leave, so she is going to have to leave afterwards, and, therefore, they both have to leave together. It makes zero sense. If anything, you would probably say if a new person was coming in, it would be better to have her there to help train him.

Then we were also told by both the New York Times and the Associated Press that Colonel Whittington, the chaplain who apparently asked her to denounce the report, and when she disagreed with him and said she could not denounce the report she agreed with, and the report said there had been inappropriate religious pressure, he apparently was part of an effort to penalize her. We are told that he could not give an interview to the New York Times and the AP because he was being interviewed by the Air Force Special Study Panel.

Now, I doubt very much that the Air Force Special Study Panel is grilling him 18 hours a day, or even 10 hours a day. In other words, there is obviously no conflict between being interviewed by this panel and also talking to the press.

Why do they not let the chaplain talk to the press? Because they are afraid if he told the truth it would be embarrassing, is my inference. If there is a different argument, let them give it to us.

Madam Speaker, we should note that among those who brought these allegations to light originally is a proud Air Force Academy alumni, Michael Weinstein, who worked for the Reagan Administration, whose son is now there, who said he has spoken to 117 people at the Academy who validate the accusation that there is inappropriate pressure put on people and that people are subject to disadvantages if they do not follow a particular religious view.

The Air Force has got to reverse this pattern of religious oppression at the Academy, of religious abuse, ''oppression'' may be too strong; it has got to stop the transfer of a brave woman for speaking out; and they have got to take seriously a problem, rather than make it worse.

Madam Speaker, I include for the record the May 15, 2005, New York Times article entitled ''Air Force Chaplain Says She Was Removed for Being Critical.''

[From the New York Times, May 25, 2005]

AIR FORCE CHAPLAIN SAYS SHE WAS REMOVED FOR BEING CRITICAL

(By Laurie Goodstein)

A chaplain at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs who has accused her superiors of using their positions to promote evangelical Christianity among the cadets says she was fired from an administrative job because of her outspokenness and was given orders to ship out to Japan.

An Air Force task force, meanwhile, has finished an investigation at the academy into charges by the chaplain and others that officers there were inappropriately proselytizing the cadets.

The academy chaplain, Capt. MeLinda Morton, said she had disagreed with her boss, the academy's chief chaplain, Col. Michael Whittington, after a critical report by a team from the Yale Divinity School was released to the news media in April. The report, dated July 2004 and which she helped write, found that some academy chaplains were insensitive to the religious diversity of the cadets.

Captain Morton said her boss asked her to denounce the report and defend the academy, but she told him she agreed with it. She said that about two weeks later, on May 4, she received an e-mail message from Colonel Whittington dismissing her from her position as his administrative assistant, or ''executive officer.'' However, she remains a chaplain, retains her rank and earns the same salary.

''That is pretty plainly, in my mind, retribution,'' Captain Morton said. ''That makes a big point on a staff. The point is, 'We don't regard Mel as trustworthy and we humiliate her by firing her.' However, in the whole scope of things, that's pretty minor to what's going on in the academy.''

She also said that in March she received orders to transfer to Okinawa, and from there could be deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan. Captain Morton said she was surprised because in December she was told by Colonel Whittington that she would be staying at the academy through summer 2006 to see several projects through. At the time, Captain Morton was developing a sensitivity training program for the academy and was involved in pastoral care for cadets who were victims in a sexual abuse scandal that swept the academy in 2003.

An academy spokesman, Lt. Col. Laurent Fox, said in an interview that Captain Morton's dismissal as executive officer and her reassignment to Okinawa were entirely routine, and not retribution. He said that Captain Morton was removed from her position in order to make way for a new executive officer because Colonel Whittington was leaving the academy in June and Captain Morton is leaving in July.

''We don't see this as a dismissal,'' Colonel Fox said. ''This kind of a transition is a normal process that happens in squadrons across the Air Force.''

Colonel Fox said he knew nothing about a meeting that led to a quarrel over the Yale Divinity School report. A request to interview Colonel Whittington was denied because he was being interviewed by the task force investigating the religious climate at the academy. The task force is expected to release a preliminary report on May 23.

Complaints about the religious climate at the academy first surfaced after fliers were passed out in the dining hall advertising a showing of the movie ''The Passion of the Christ.'' An alumnus of the academy, Mikey Weinstein, grew concerned after he visited his son at the school last year and learned that he had been subject to repeated religious slurs because he is Jewish.

Mr. Weinstein, who served in the Reagan administration, said yesterday that he became enraged and set out to see if others had similar experiences. He said he has now spoken with 117 academy cadets, staff members and faculty members who complained about religious intimidation and proselytizing at the academy. Of the 117 people, 8 are Jewish, one is an atheist, about 10 are Catholic and the rest are nonevangelical Protestants.

His son was interviewed by the task force this week, Mr. Weinstein said. He said he was not interviewed by the task force, even though ''I have a boatload of information,'' he said.

''I can't reveal people's names, but I thought it might be useful,'' he said.

[From Associated Press, May 13, 2005]

CHAPLAIN SAYS SHE WAS OUSTED

(By Robert Weller and Jon Sarche)

DENVER.—A top Air Force Academy chaplain said Thursday she was fired for speaking

up about anti-Semitism and other reports of religious intolerance among cadets and staff, including allegations that evangelical Christians wield too much influence.

Capt. Melinda Morton said she was fired last week by her boss, Col. Michael Whittington. Morton said she was pressured to deny a report by Yale Divinity School Professor Kristen Leslie that a chaplain told 600 cadets during basic training last year ''to go back to their tents and tell their fellow cadets that those who are not born again will burn in the fires of hell.''

''I was told by Chaplain Whittington that if someone was going to be loyal to the chaplaincy and the Air Force, then someone would take a certain view of the Yale report and view Dr. Leslie as disloyal,'' Morton said.

Both chaplains had been scheduled to leave the school this year, with Whittington, the academy's chief chaplain, retiring and Morton, his executive officer, scheduled for an overseas assignment. She called that an excuse to get rid of her.

The Air Force's chief chaplain, Maj. Gen. Charles Baldwin, said Morton was not fired.

Her duties have changed, however, because Whittington will retire in June rather than in July as originally planned. Morton has been scheduled for reassignment to an Air Force base in Japan for some time, Baldwin said.

The academy said Whittington was unavailable because he was being interviewed for a Pentagon investigation into more than 50 complaints of religious intolerance in the past several years.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, Ruler of heaven and Earth, You created us to glorify You both in prayer and by our daily labor.

Look with favor upon us as we begin a new week in Your presence. Let us be fellow workers with You in building an earthly Nation that will reflect the attributes of Your heavenly Kingdom.

Grant to us, O Lord, joy and peace that we may bring these gifts to all we meet, for we desire to live, move, and have our being in You, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

CONGRATULATING BASCOMB UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and enthusiasm that I congratulate Bascomb United Methodist Church as they join together for their 175th Homecoming Celebration on June 5, 2005, a church with a rich heritage which continues to serve the Cherokee County community and beyond.

The church began in a mill in 1830 when W.K. McCanless organized a group of Christians which came to be known as Bascomb Church, named for antebellum orator and bishop Henry Bascomb. The church predates the founding of Cherokee County; and as the congregation grew, they moved to a log cabin which also served as a school.

In 1883, after negotiation for land, the framed and painted church was completed with cornerstones bearing the names of the trustees. Modern renovations include additions for classrooms and fellowship and stained glass windows. The chancel cross in the chapel is made from timbers from the 1883 frame building.

With pride I recognize Bascomb United Methodist Church for its 175 years of offering a place of loving care and joyous worship to the people of Woodstock, Georgia, and beyond. I ask all Members to join me in honoring and congratulating the congregation for their remarkable achievements.

NEWSWEEK ERROR

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are distressed by the anti-American images that surfaced this weekend in Afghanistan. United States flags are being burned, the American military is being harshly criticized, our good name is being stained. What is more, people are dying.

All of this because of the carelessness of one group of magazine editors at Newsweek magazine. This magazine recently reported that U.S. investigators had determined American guards at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base had desecrated the Quran by flushing the holy book down the toilet.

Now we have learned that Newsweek has acknowledged errors in its story. The source used by Newsweek's reporters was anonymous, and it is obvious that the magazine failed to fully investigate this ''source'' and his or her claims.

Newsweek decided to publish these accusations in haste, without regard for the great pain and suffering that they could, and ultimately would, cause.

Some in the media are simply fanatical about being first, and we as a country and as a culture must draw the line and demand more from our media.

Today, I call on Newsweek to fully retract its story and to apologize to the people of Afghanistan whose lives have been forever impacted by this carelessness and to the American people for damaging our good name.

TEXAS MLR

(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, some good news today from down in my home State of Texas. Recognizing that a unique turnaround is under way in the State of Texas in the arena of medical liability reform, the American Medical Association today announced that it was removing Texas from its list of States in crisis from the medical liability crisis.

The medical liability crisis in Texas was halted thanks to sweeping reforms that took place almost 2 years ago, in September, 2003, when voters in the State of Texas passed a constitutional amendment which placed an upper limit on noneconomic damages on pain and suffering.

Since those reforms were passed, signs of improvement are widespread in Texas. Access to care is increasing and claims are down; physician recruitment, physician retention is up, especially in high-risk specialties. New insurers are entering the Texas medical liability market, creating more choices for doctors. Subsequently, competition is increasing; and all five of the largest insurers in the Texas medical liability market have announced rate cuts. Rates are down. Doctors are coming back to the State of Texas. This is good news for the patients of Texas as access and affordability have increased.

This House should take up the bill that we passed 2 years ago and react similarly.

FILIBUSTER ARGUMENT A FRAUD

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, respected columnist Charles Krauthammer of the Washington Post correctly revealed the Senate Democratic filibuster of judicial nominees as a fraud.

He thoughtfully researched that one of the great traditions, customs, and unwritten rules of the Senate is that we do not filibuster judicial nominees. Only once in 200 years has a filibuster been successful, and it reflected uniquely a lack of votes for confirmation.

Senate Majority Leader FRIST is to be commended for maintaining the constitutional case for an up-or-down vote. Democrat obstructionism is a radical deviation from allowing Senators to vote on nominees who are highly qualified. Senator FRIST is courageously protecting the American people to take an unwritten 200-year-old rule to make it written.

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

CALLING ON ISIKOFF AND WHITAKER TO ISSUE FULL RETRACTION AND APOLOGY FOR NEWSWEEK STORY

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, today I stand as co-chair of the Afghan Caucus with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Newsweek reporter Michael Isikoff fabricated an incident at Guantanamo Bay where American soldiers allegedly desecrated a copy of the Quran. Yesterday, Newsweek editor Mark Whitaker announced that Newsweek may have ''inaccurately reported'' the incident; yet he refuses to run a retraction.

Isikoff inaccurately reported an incident that led to riots throughout the Muslim world. Isikoff inaccurately reported an incident that led to the death of 17 innocent people. Isikoff inaccurately reported an incident that resulted in the international condemnation of the American military.

Newsweek's behavior is not merely unfortunate. It is criminal. Journalists wield considerable power, and therefore, must exercise responsibility. Though Isikoff's actions resulted in the death of innocent people, he is evidently accountable to no one. His Newsweek editor, Mark Whitaker, even refuses to run a retraction.

Michael Isikoff and Mark Whitaker's fraud explains why the Gallup poll says that media credibility is at its lowest point in 30 years.

I call on Michael Isikoff and Mark Whitaker to take responsibility by issuing a full retraction of their fabricated story and an apology to the Nation and to the Afghanis. America's troops are in enough danger without self-righteous, yellow journalists like Michael Isikoff defaming them for a cheap headline.

NEWSWEEK MUST REWRITE OR RETRACT STORY

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a co-chair of the Afghan Caucus, let me acknowledge the fact that, although we have the first amendment, and we have a respected journalists and a respected publication, it is appropriate that we have an apology for the tragedy that has occurred in Afghanistan and in Pakistan.

Hundreds or tens of tens have lost their lives because of a report that soldiers at Guantanamo Bay flushed the Quran down the toilet, a report that has now been suggested by the person who reported it to be inaccurate.

I think in order to get ourselves back on track to create a more peaceful atmosphere in Afghanistan and to not undermine the peaceful track that the Afghani people are on with President Karsai, we must apologize, Newsweek must apologize, and it must, it must, rewrite the story or retract it if it is inaccurate or untrue.

It is important to note that everything that is said by Americans today can be characterized around the world to disturb the orderly peacefulness and the operations of new governments by countries where conflicts exist. It is appropriate that we recognize that the importance of our soldiers' safety rises above any potential thought that one cannot apologize.

So I hope that we will accept and recognize this need that the media and Newsweek will stand and apologize so that we can begin to rebuild and repair the schism that has now been created.

Telling the truth by media at all times, painful or not, is important, and an apology is owed; and I hope that this will occur very shortly.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2005.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 13 at 9:29 am:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 86.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 135.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 136.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. BART STUPAK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BART STUPAK, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2005.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony and documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BART STUPAK,
Member of Congress.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 USC 6431 note), amended by section 681(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 USC 2651 note), and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces that on May 14, 2005, the Speaker reappointed the following members on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom:

Ms. Nina Shea, Washington, D.C., for a 2-year term ending May 14, 2007, to succeed herself;

and upon the recommendation of the minority leader:

Ms. Felice Gaer, Paramus, New Jersey, for a 2-year term ending May 14, 2007, to succeed herself.

CBO COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 1817, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 2005, the Committee on Homeland Security filed its report on H.R. 1817, the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. At that time the committee had not yet received a Congressional Budget Office cost estimate, and it filed the report without the cost estimate required in clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Subsequently, the committee received the CBO cost estimate on H.R. 1817, and I am submitting it herewith for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the enclosed estimate be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the appropriate place.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

H.R. 1817—Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006

Summary: H.R. 1817 would authorize the appropriation of $34.2 billion for fiscal year 2006 to fund the major operations of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1817 would cost about $33 billion over the 2006–2010 period, assuming appropriations of the authorized amounts. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts.

H.R. 1817 contains an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) by exempting certain information related to critical infrastructure from state and local laws that provide public access to information. CBO estimates that the costs, if any, to state and local governments would be minimal and well below the annual threshold established in that act ($62 million in 2005, adjusted annually for inflation). H.R. 1817 contains no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 1817 is shown in the following table. For this estimate, CBO assumes that the authorized amounts will be appropriated near the beginning of fiscal year 2006 and that outlays will follow the historical spending rates for these activities. The costs of this legislation fall within budget functions 050 (national defense), 300 (natural resources and environment), 400 (transportation), 450 (community and regional development), 550 (health), 600 (income security), 750 (administration of justice), and 800 (general government).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Department of Homeland Security Spending Under Current Law:						
Estimated Budget Authority [1]	38,469	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	31,928	14,443	7,939	3,475	1,308	594
Proposed Changes:						
Authorization Level	0	34,152	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	17,418	7,513	5,123	2,391	683
Department of Homeland Security Spending Under H.R. 1817:						
Authorization Level [1]	38,469	34,152	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	31,928	31,861	15,452	8,598	3,699	1,277

[1] The estimated 2005 level is the amount of appropriations less offsetting collections for that year for operations of DHS.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 1817 contains an intergovernmental mandate as defined in UMRA by exempting certain information related to critical infrastructure from state and local laws that provide public access to information. CBO estimates that the costs, if any, to state and local governments would be minimal and well below the annual threshold established in that act ($62 million in 2005, adjusted annually for inflation). H.R. 1817 contains no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Section 306 would require the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to issue regulations for the security of maritime cargo moving within the intermodal transportation system. Those regulations would relate to the securing, recording, and verifying of seals on maritime cargo containers in the hauling of cargo from one mode of transportation to another. According to DHS, a notice of proposed rulemaking that incorporates the recommendations referred to in the bill has been drafted and is pending review. Based on information from DHS, CBO anticipates that the Secretary will issue those regulations. Thus, CBO expects that the provisions in this section would impose no additional mandates on public or private-sector entities.

State and local governments would benefit from programs to improve interoperable communications and to reimburse costs for having law enforcement officers trained to enforce immigration laws. Any costs incurred by those governments would be incurred voluntarily.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Mark Grabowicz; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Melissa Merrell; Impact on the Private Sector: Paige Piper/Bach.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

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.

LINDA WHITE-EPPS POST OFFICE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 627) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Putnam Avenue in Hamden, Connecticut, as the ''Linda White-Epps Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 627

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

SECTION 1. LINDA WHITE-EPPS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Putnam Avenue in Hamden, Connecticut, shall be known and designated as the ''Linda White-Epps Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Linda White-Epps Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 627 will designate this post office in Hamden, Connecticut, as the Linda White-Epps Post Office. Linda White-Epps lived a life that is very fitting for this high honor. Mrs. White-Epps was a breast cancer and women's health advocate in her community ever since she personally overcame a bout with breast cancer in 1990.

□ 1415

A result of her battle with the dreaded disease, she founded a group called ''Sisters' Journey,'' a nonprofit organization that provides support to survivors and anyone affected by this dreaded disease.

She was also a member of both the local NAACP executive board and the local Boys and Girls Club Board of Directors. In 2001, she was elected to the Hamden City Council. That same year, she was named a ''Point of Light'' for her work on behalf of women's health issues by the Points of Life Foundation, a national volunteer organization devoted to community service.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, though, Linda White-Epps' form of cancer relapsed more than a decade later and she passed away in 2003. Over the years I know she became very close with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and I want to commend my distinguished colleague for her work on this bill. This Post Office will help citizens of Hamden, Connecticut to remember their dear friend, Linda, as well as her contributions and her charitable life.

Linda White-Epps' grandfather was a letter carrier, making this honor of a Post Office all the more fitting and meaningful for her family. I strongly support this resolution and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), in consideration of H.R. 627,

legislation designating a postal facility in Hamden, Connecticut after the late Linda White-Epps.

This measure was introduced by my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), introduced on February 8, 2005 and unanimously reported by the Committee on Government Reform on May 5, 2005. It enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire Connecticut delegation.

By all accounts, Linda White-Epps was a very active member of her community. A member of the Hamden Legislative Council, Ms. White-Epps served on the executive board of the local NAACP and on the Board of Directors of the local Boys and Girls Club. Most importantly, she was a two-time presidential Point of Light recipient and a breast cancer activist.

Linda White-Epps will forever be remembered for founding ''Sisters' Journey,'' a nonprofit support organization for women of color who have survived breast cancer. The organization published a calendar featuring African American cancer survivors and their stories and their words of support. The calendar also serves as an important reminder to conduct breast self-exams and schedule mammograms.

Although Linda survived breast cancer in 1990, it eventually took her life in October of 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the legacy of Linda White-Epps and urge the swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) for their kind remarks about a wonderful, wonderful woman. I also want to say thank you to my colleagues in Connecticut for their support of this effort.

I rise in support of the legislation that would name the Whitneyville Branch Post Office in Hamden, Connecticut the ''Linda White-Epps Post Office,'' and this is in honor of her heroic work on behalf of women battling breast cancer.

To all who knew her Linda White-Epps was an inspiration, a true friend. An extraordinary young woman who did so much to improve the lives of those around her, she dedicated her life to her community. She served in the town government on Hamden's Legislative Council and on the boards of local nonprofits. As my colleagues have heard, she served as an executive board member of the NAACP and on the Board of Directors of the local Boys and Girls Club.

But it was her devotion to raising awareness about breast cancer in African American women that became her life's work. Linda herself had beaten breast cancer in 1990, but knew that the disease continued to affect minority communities disproportionately, with African American women facing only a 72 percent 5-year survival rate, 15 percent lower than the survival rate for white women.

That disparity inspired Linda to search for ways to bring survivors together. Knowing that many women often wait too long to be tested and are reluctant to talk about their problems, she wanted to ensure that all women, regardless of race, would be able to take advantage of the remarkable medical advances we have seen over these last several years. Whether it was early detection or increasing access to the best health care possible, she wanted to give every woman a fighting chance of beating this disease. She knew as a breast cancer survivor, as I do as an ovarian cancer survivor, that no one should have to depend on luck when it comes to fighting cancer.

So she created Sisters' Journey, a nonprofit organization which provides education and support to breast cancer survivors, their friends, and their families, and it was the first of its kind in Connecticut.

In 1999, Sisters' Journey published a calendar featuring the pictures of women who have beaten the disease. Each turn of a page provides a look at another month, more stories from ''sisters'' and words of encouragement to women, teaching women to conduct self-examinations and to get mammograms regularly. The unveiling of the calendar still occurs every October at a fund-raiser known as the ''Pink Tea,'' a tradition Linda started.

In addition to Sisters' Journey, she organized the first Relay for Life held in the Hamden community, raising nearly $50,000 for the American Cancer Society.

Sadly, Linda, a grandmother of two, finally succumbed to the disease in 2003, and we miss her to this day. For all her outspokenness on behalf of women too reserved to speak up for themselves, Linda faced her own breast cancer in such a quiet way that many of her neighbors and friends were not aware of the gravity of her illness.

Linda approached advocacy with the same humility, dignity, and grace, receiving numerous awards from the American Cancer Society for her efforts. She won the Greater New Haven NAACP Freedom Fund Award and the ''Daily Point of Light'' award by the Points of Life Foundation, which honors those who have made a commitment to bring people together through service to help meet critical needs in their communities. Indeed, she did. And today, Linda's legacy lives on in her mother, Phyllis White, who long joined Linda on her journey. Now she has taken up her cause as well, bringing new energy to that effort.

Mr. Speaker, Linda White-Epps lived a life of hope and of resilience, perseverance, and dedication to community. She did bring people together and for the greatest of causes. As the granddaughter of a postal carrier, renaming the Hamden Post Office in Linda's honor would be a most fitting tribute. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 627, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 627.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, SR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1760) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Madison, Wisconsin, as the ''Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1760

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

SECTION 1. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, SR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Madison, Wisconsin, shall be known and designated as the ''Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous

material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This important legislation, introduced by the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), names a Post Office in Madison, Wisconsin as the ''Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building.''

Robert La Follette, Sr. was a giant in Wisconsin and American politics around the turn of the 20th century. He served the people of the Badger State as a Congressman, a Senator, a Governor, and even ran and finished third in the 1924 presidential election, falling to incumbent President Calvin Coolidge. His passion and his rousing speaking style earned him the nickname ''Fighting Bob.''

As a member of this body, he was chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture in the 51st Congress, after which he lost a reelection bid in 1890. He returned home to a law career in Madison that began before his first stint in Congress.

Sixteen years after his defeat in 1906, he was elected to return to Washington, this time as a United States Senator. He was reelected three times before he died in office in 1925, shortly after his bid for the presidency ended the previous year.

His legacy was further enhanced when his son actually succeeded him as a Senator and went on to a significant political career of his own. Another son also held up the family name by becoming Governor of Wisconsin in 1931.

Mr. Speaker, all seven members of the Wisconsin delegation have joined Congresswoman BALDWIN as cosponsors of H.R. 1760 to prove the stature of Robert La Follette in Wisconsin political history. This Post Office in Madison will be an appropriate memorial to his legacy.

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

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

I rise in support of this bill, and I would first like to thank my colleagues from the Wisconsin delegation, Representatives OBEY, SENSENBRENNER, PETRI, MOORE, KIND, GREEN and RYAN, who have joined me as original cosponsors of this bipartisan resolution to designate the Post Office at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Madison, Wisconsin as the ''Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building.''

Mr. Speaker, Robert, otherwise known as ''Fighting Bob'' La Follette, is a true Wisconsin hero and a leader of the progressive movement. He was born on a farm in Primrose, Wisconsin on June 14, 1855. This would have been the 150th year of his birth. La Follette was elected to this body at the young age of 29 and served three terms as a Republican from 1885 to 1891. It is such a privilege to hold his congressional seat over 100 years later.

After losing his seat, La Follette returned to Wisconsin to practice law in Madison. It was at that point that La Follette reached a turning point in his political career, when he felt that a party stalwart was trying to bribe him to fix a court case. La Follette decided that it was time to challenge corruption in politics. He did so by taking his ideas directly to the people. La Follette went on speaking tours at county fairs and as a Chautauqua lecturer. He spoke about his commitment to eliminating the corruption in government and in corporations, the railroads, and banks.

He was elected Governor of Wisconsin in 1900, as a Republican, and during his tenure La Follette was able to pass and implement many progressive reforms and anti-corruption measures, including instituting the direct primary election in Wisconsin.

La Follette was elected by the Wisconsin State Legislature to the U.S. Senate in 1905, over 100 years ago, and he was elected while he was still serving as Governor of the State. He resigned as Governor in 1906 to once again return to Washington to represent the people of Wisconsin.

In the Senate, he fought against corruption and led the investigation into the infamous Teapot Dome scandal that revealed the oil lease scandals of the Harding administration. His principled work in the Senate was so highly regarded that a mural of La Follette was placed in the Senate Reception Room in 1959 as part of a collection of five outstanding Senators.

La Follette ran for President on the Progressive ticket in 1922. The Progressive Party championed a populist agenda, which included reforms to outlaw child labor, allow workers to organize, increase protection of civil liberties, and end discrimination on the basis of race, class, and creed. Just outside the House chamber doors, you can visit a statue of ''Fighting Bob'' La Follette. Wisconsin chose La Follette as one of two State heroes to be included in the U.S. Capitol's National Statuary Hall collection.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the privilege of addressing graduating students as a commencement speaker at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. In that speech, I spoke to the graduates about the obligation to carry one of Fighting Bob's legacies forward, the Wisconsin Idea.

The Wisconsin Idea is the notion that government should collaborate with the State's public universities to address serious social and economic problems. In simple terms, the Wisconsin Idea is often expressed by saying that the boundaries of the university are the boundaries of the State.

I would also like to share with you one other of my personal heroes, La Follette's wife, Belle Case La Follette, who La Follette regarded as an equal partner in life. Belle Case La Follette was the first woman to graduate from the University of Wisconsin law school. She was a woman before her time, supporting women's suffrage and advocating civil rights legislation for ethnic and racial minorities.

La Follette referred to her as my wisest and best counselor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with how appropriate the location of the Madison Capitol Station Post Office is in honoring La Follette. This post office is in the shadow of the Wisconsin State capitol, where La Follette developed many of his progressive ideas and support for farmers and the working person, opposition to monopolies and corruption in politics, and his belief that a strong democracy requires fair distribution of both wealth and power.

This summer, on June 14, Fighting Bob's greatest supporters will come to Madison for his 150th birthday celebration. And I am particularly grateful that this bill has been brought to the floor for a vote in time for this celebration.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to speak in support of H.R. 1760, a bill to designate a post office in Madison, Wisconsin, as the Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building.

Fighting Bob La Follette was a strong progressive Republican voice for the people in the late 19th and early 20th century. During his political career as a district attorney, and especially as a Congressman, Governor and Senator, Bob La Follette fought to improve the lot of farmers, workers, children and women, and battled against corruption in politics.

As Governor of Wisconsin, he proposed and implemented the Wisconsin Idea, a philosophy that public leadership, in combination with academic expertise, will improve the performance of government. This philosophy was the driving force in the progressive movement, and here in Washington led to the creation of, among other things, the Congressional Research Service.

Bob La Follette believed that the government should be more directly in the hands of the people. Therefore, he pursued policies, such as the establishment of direct primary nomination. Under his leadership, Wisconsin became one of the first States to adopt child labor laws and pass a women's suffrage amendment.

As a Congressman and Senator, he brought his progressive Republican politics to the national stage by playing a major role in bringing about the direct election of Senators and spearheading an investigation into the Teapot Dome scandal. And you can imagine how popular he was when elected to the United

States Senate and stood up and asked for a roll call vote over and over and over again, for the first time in a generation putting his colleagues on the record as to whether they were voting for or against railroad legislation and a variety of other things.

And the public record, combined with direct election of Senators, revolutionized the United States Senate and American politics from the Mississippi west in our country, in particular.

Bob La Follette was the kind of American that all of us, regardless of party, can be proud of. Accordingly, I urge support of H.R. 1760.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with such great pride and pleasure that I stand here in support of H.R. 1760, to name a post office after Fighting Bob La Follette.

You have heard from my other colleagues from Wisconsin about the institutions that this man has built and the impact that this one man has made on not only the institutions in Wisconsin, developing a civil service system, that has had an impact throughout our country, establishing the Congressional Research Service, which really put us on par with the K Street lobbyists in terms of having information and knowledge about the initiatives that take place here.

But Fighting Bob La Follette has put us on the map internationally, as Wisconsin has been a leader in the world, training people in democratic institutions. Fighting Bob La Follette is a hero to me. He was a powerful voice, a Lincoln Republican. He was a powerful voice with the underrepresented, outspoken for their issues no matter how unpopular or controversial.

He denounced any discrimination based on race, creed, class, during the era, for example, of the Ku Klux Klan resurgence. He called for investigations of World War I profiteers and defended antiwar activists that were sent to jail.

One of the favorite quotes of Bob La Follette that I think is apropos for where we are today was a quote that he made arguing on the United States Senate floor, and I would like to end my remarks with that quote: ''We should not seek to inflame the mind of our people by half truths into the frenzy of war. The poor, who are always the ones called upon to rot in the trenches, at some time will be heard. There will come an awakening. They will have their day, and they will be heard.''

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1760, to designate the post office located at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Madison, Wisconsin, as the "Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building."

"Fighting Bob" La Follette was one of our great American leaders. He spearheaded political reform in both Wisconsin and the Nation, laying the framework for the progressive movement. As governor of Wisconsin, he gained the respect of local farmers, small business owners, and intellectuals with his pledge to break the power of the private monopoly system over the economic life of the American people.

La Follette consistently championed the rights of women, minorities, the working class, and the poor. He called for reform of a tax system that disproportionately burdened middle and lower income Americans, and he campaigned for agricultural reform to relieve the distress of farmers. La Follette's progressive party also called for government control of railroads, the outlawing of child labor, the right of workers to organize unions, and increased protection of civil liberties.

"Fighting Bob" La Follette was a man fierce in his convictions and steeped in the ideals of Lincoln and Jefferson. In 1957, the Senate voted him one of the five most outstanding Senators of all time.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support H.R. 1760 to rename a post office in Madison, Wisconsin in honor of this extraordinary American, Robert La Follette.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1760 to designate the postal facility at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Madison, Wisconsin, as the "Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building."

A man of the people, Bob La Follette captured the hearts and minds of Wisconsin's citizens and rose to a place of distinction in the history of my State and this Nation. His storied political career began as a Republican when he was elected District Attorney of Dane County in 1880.

"Fighting Bob," as he would become known, served right here in the House of Representatives from 1885 to 1891. Although he was defeated for re-election in 1890, Fighting Bob returned to his law practice and demonstrated the resilience for which he developed a sterling reputation.

After two failed attempts for the Governorship, La Follette was elected Wisconsin's twentieth Governor in 1990. During his three terms as Governor in the early 1900's, La Follette led the State out of debt and earned a reputation as a skilled orator and a champion of the people.

Fighting Bob returned to Washington in 1906 following his election to the U.S. Senate, where he served until his death in 1925 at 70 years of age. It is no accident that one of my State's two statues prominently displayed in Statuary Hall is dedicated to "Fighting Bob" La Follette. He served Wisconsin and the United States honorably. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Bob La Follette by supporting this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1760.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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 H. Res. 266.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 266) supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 266

Whereas the well-being of all people of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 870,000 law enforcement personnel, the highest amount ever in the United States, serve their fellow citizens as guardians of peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front line in preserving the right of the children of the United States to receive an education in a crime-free environment, a right that is all too often threatened by the insidious fear caused by violence in schools;

Whereas 153 peace officers across the Nation were killed in the line of duty during 2004, well below the decade-long average of 165 deaths annually, and a major drop from 2001 when 230 officers were killed, including 72 officers in the September 11th terrorist attacks;

Whereas every year, a law enforcement officer is killed somewhere in the United States every 53 hours, and there are also 56,000 assaults against our law officers each year, resulting in 17,000 injuries;

Whereas section 136 of title 36, United States Code, requests that the President issue each year a proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day in honor of Federal, State, and local officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

Whereas on May 13, 2005, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, D.C. to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 266 that supports the goals and the ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

This occasion is a day of remembrance of all Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials who were killed or disabled in the line of duty during the past year.

Peace Officers Memorial Day highlights National Police Week, which is observed with several events in Washington this week, from May 15 through May 21. More than 20,000 peace officers and their families are expected to congregate here in the Nation's Capital for National Police Week 2005.

Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed into law legislation that designates both May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the week containing May 15 as National Police Officers Week.

However, the first National Peace Officers Memorial Day service was not officially held until May 15, 1982, and since then May 15 has indeed been a solemn date on the law enforcement calendar.

In addition to the focus of the observance here in Washington, National Police Week is also recognized by police officers across the country. And since we all witnessed police officers' indescribable bravery on September 11, 2001, Americans have intensified their appreciation for the men and women of our Nation's law enforcement.

These courageous individuals are the essential parts of our entire homeland security effort. They deserve to be thanked by each and every one of us for the protection that they provide and for the freedom that they ensure.

Peace officers are true American heroes. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), a great friend of law enforcement, for sponsoring House Resolution 266.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that all of my colleagues will join the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and myself in supporting this resolution.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, each day peace officers nobly protect our families, friends, and neighbors from crime. Peace officers work to improve the quality of life for all of us. For that, they deserve our sincere appreciation and respect.

While it is impossible to suitably thank these brave Americans for the tremendous sacrifices they make, we pause this week to salute them for their courage, dedication and service, and to pay our respects for those who have fallen in the line of duty.

Currently, more than 850,000 men and women guard our communities, and do so at great risk. Each year in the United States, one in 15 officers is assaulted, one in 46 officers is injured, and one in every 5,255 officers is killed in the line of duty. In total, more than 17,500 men and women have made the ultimate sacrifice.

In 2004, 154 law enforcement officers died while serving in the line of duty, well below the decade-long average of 169 deaths annually, and well below the 2001 total of 237.

A number of factors have contributed to this reduction, including better equipment, increased use of bullet-resistant vests, improved training, and advanced emergency medical care.

But the work of peace officers continues to take the lives of too many men and women who work to ensure our safety. So far this year, 42 peace officers have been killed in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I support the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and I call upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 266.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a supporter of H. Res. 266, which supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day. I want to thank Mr. HEFLEY for introducing this necessary recognition of our peace officers and the sacrifice they make everyday for Americans. I hope everyone in this Nation will take the time to observe Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty.

Today, more than 870,000 law enforcement personnel, the highest amount ever in the United States, serve their fellow citizens as guardians of peace. Unfortunately, while these brave men and women seek to keep the peace they are too often taken by the violence they are working to prevent. Every year, a law enforcement officer is killed somewhere in the United States every 53 hours, and there are also 56,000 assaults against our law officers each year, resulting in 17,000 injuries. I want to take a moment to honor the law enforcement officers from the City of Houston who day in and day out work to keep my constituents safe. Last Friday on May 13, 2005, more than 20,000 peace officers gathered here in Washington, DC to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them. I wish to join them in this recognition of the brave and honorable law enforcement officers who served this Nation despite the danger.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives will overwhelmingly support H. Res. 266, a resolution that pays tribute to Peace Officers Memorial Day, which took place yesterday. This is a special day to honor those law enforcement officers who have fallen or become disabled in the line of duty. As a former officer with the Michigan State Police and Escanaba City Police Department as well as founder and co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I am a proud cosponsor of this Resolution and want to thank my colleague Representative HEFLEY for introducing it once again this year.

The House will also overwhelmingly support H.R. 2107, a bill that requires the maintenance of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, DC and provides for the addition of the names of those in law enforcement who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Last Friday at the 17th Annual Candlelight Vigil, more than 20,000 family members, law enforcement officers, and friends of law enforcement gathered at this Memorial to respect, honor, and remember the 153 law enforcement heroes who in 2004 made the ultimate sacrifice.

Since September 11, 2001, many in this nation and this Congress have come to recognize the importance of the sacrifices made by our law enforcement officers. Every day these men and women protect and serve, often putting their own lives at risk.

Peace Officers Memorial Day brings us together to honor the sacrifice our nation's law enforcement and public safety officers make to our communities and our nation every day.

It is important as we discuss and pass both H. Res. 266 and H.R. 2107 that we must also resolve to provide our public safety officers the resources they need to meet the daily challenges of their jobs—especially at a time when we have placed greater demands on them to fight and prevent terrorist threats. We can do that by fully funding important grant programs such as COPS, Byrne, and Local Law Enforcement Block Grants.

These programs allow our local agencies to buy essential protective gear, hire the officers that they need, and obtain all the resources they must have to make themselves and our communities safe.

Congress can provide these resources through grants, especially the Community Oriented Policing Services or "COPS" program. This program was so successful that it helped to put 100,000 cops on the street under President Clinton. It is critical that Congress fully fund this program!

Unfortunately, the President's budget devastates the COPS program, requesting only $117.8 million for this important program. That is a $381.2 million cut below last year's level!

The President's budget also zeroes out the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance grant program that provides funding for 19 different programs for counter-drug initiatives in rural communities. These grants are used to administer vital programs such as multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement teams, anti-drug education programs, treatment programs and alternative sentencing initiatives.

If enacted, the President's budget cuts will have far reaching effects on our local communities. Local drug enforcement teams are crucial to keeping our communities drug free. If Byrne Grants are zeroed out they will be unable to hire the officers they need to sustain their drug enforcement teams.

And let me tell you—when it comes to drug abuse, no community—urban or rural—is immune to this problem. To highlight how important these local teams are to our rural districts, take a look at this article from a local paper in

my First Congressional District of Michigan. On April 13th the Huron Undercover Narcotics Team seized 3,000 Oxycontin tablets from a home in the rural county of Presque Isle. This is just one example of the critical work these Narcotics Teams do everyday to keep our communities safe.

This Country's Drug problems are not going away. In fact, with the emergence of prescription drugs used and dealt illegally like Oxycontin, some would argue the problems are getting worse. My question is why are we zeroing out the funding that enables programs like the Huron Undercover Narcotics Team to exist and combat this problem that is only growing more severe?

We also need to provide assistance to help regional law enforcement and first responders talk to each other in times of emergency. My bill, H.R. 1323 "The Public Safety Interoperability Implementation Act", would provide grants to local law enforcement agencies to modernize their communication systems and become interoperable. These are the kinds of resources and tools I'm talking about!! We need to do everything possible to ensure that our law enforcement officers are fully interoperable.

Currently, firefighters and law enforcement officials may not be able to communicate with each other even if they work in the same jurisdiction. The tragic events of September 11th illustrated why it is so important that our law enforcement officials are fully interoperable. 343 firefighters and 72 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the World Trade Center on September 11th. 121 of these brave firefighters lost their lives due to fact that they were unable to talk to each other.

When our first responders are confronted with an emergency situation, it is absolutely necessary that they are able to communicate with one another so they can fully assess the situation and how best to handle it. These are the kind of resources and tools our first responders need. We need to do everything possible to ensure that our law enforcement officers that play an integral role in our nations anti-terrorism efforts are fully interoperable.

We also need to ensure that programs like Thin Blue Line are fully funded. The Thin Blue Line is a non-profit, volunteer organization that assists and supports the families of injured or deceased officers of law enforcement agencies. Thin Blue Line began in Michigan and is now beginning to expand throughout the nation. Thin Blue Line volunteers assist families with applying for benefits, counseling, and answering their question during the most difficult of circumstances. These officers have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty and their families deserve to be honored, respected, and supported any way we can.

I am hopeful that we can continue to show our commitment to law enforcement by supporting their important funding needs as well as supporting these important pieces of legislation. It is the least we can do for those who put their lives on the line for us everyday.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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 gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 266.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENZI. 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 H.R. 1046.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONTRACT WITH CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYOMING, FOR WATER STORAGE IN KENDRICK PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1046) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming, for the storage of the city's water in the Kendrick Project, Wyoming.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1046

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

SECTION 1. WATER STORAGE CONTRACTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) CITY.—The term "city" means—

(A) the city of Cheyenne, Wyoming;

(B) the Board of Public Utilities of the city; and

(C) any agency, public utility, or enterprise of the city.

(2) KENDRICK PROJECT.—The term "Kendrick Project" means the Bureau of Reclamation project on the North Platte River that was authorized by a finding of feasibility approved by the President on August 30, 1935, and constructed for irrigation and electric power generation, the major features of which include—

(A) Seminoe Dam, Reservoir, and Powerplant; and

(B) Alcova Dam and Powerplant.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation.

(4) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Wyoming.

(b) CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into 1 or more contracts with the city for annual storage of the city's water for municipal and industrial use in Seminoe Dam and Reservoir of the Kendrick Project.

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) TERM; RENEWAL.—A contract under paragraph (1) shall—

(i) have a term of not more than 40 years; and

(ii) may be renewed on terms agreeable to the Secretary and the city, for successive terms of not more than 40 years per term.

(B) REVENUES.—Notwithstanding the Act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 322, chapter 187; 43 U.S.C. 392a)—

(i) any operation and maintenance charges received under a contract executed under paragraph (1) shall be credited against applicable operation and maintenance costs of the Kendrick Project; and

(ii) any other revenues received under a contract executed under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the Reclamation Fund as a credit to the construction costs of the Kendrick Project.

(C) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTORS.—A contract under paragraph (1) shall not adversely affect the Kendrick Project, any existing Kendrick Project contractor, or any existing Reclamation contractor on the North Platte River System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

□ 1445

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

H.R. 1046 provides long-term water supplies to the City of Cheyenne, Wyoming. This important bill authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to enter into a long-term water contract with Cheyenne. Due to uncertainty in the law, the Federal Government cannot enter into long-term, non-project water contracts with municipal entities without the express consent of Congress. This bill simply provides that authority.

I urge my colleagues to support this non-controversial bill that seeks to provide much needed long-term water use certainty.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Resources and the 108th Congress approved legislation identical to H.R. 1046. We have no objection to this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1046.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POTASH ROYALTY REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 485) to provide that the royalty rate on the output from Federal lands of potassium and potassium compounds from the mineral sylvite in the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be reduced to 1.0 percent, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 485

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

TITLE I—POTASH ROYALTY REDUCTION

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Potash Royalty Reduction Act of 2005''.

SEC. 102. POTASSIUM AND POTASSIUM COMPOUNDS FROM SYLVITE.

(a) ROYALTY RATE.—Notwithstanding section 102(a)(9) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(9)), section 2 of the Act of February 7, 1927 (30 U.S.C. 282) and the term of any lease issued under such section 2, the royalty rate on the quantity or gross value of the output from Federal lands of potassium and potassium compounds from the mineral sylvite at the point of shipment to market in the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be 1.0 percent.

(b) RECLAMATION FUND.—Fifty percentum of any royalties paid pursuant to this title during the 5-year period referred to in subsection (a), together with any interest earned from the date of payment, shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the payor of the royalties to be used solely for land reclamation purposes in accordance with a schedule to implement a reclamation plan for the lands for which the royalties are paid. No payment shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to this subsection until the Secretary of the Interior receives from the payor of the royalties, and approves, the reclamation plan and schedule, and submits the approved schedule to the Secretary of the Treasury. The share of royalties held by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to this subsection, and interest earned thereon, shall be available until paid pursuant to this subsection, without further appropriation; shall not be considered as money received under section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) for the purpose of revenue allocation; and shall not be reduced by any administrative or other costs incurred by the United States.

(c) STUDY AND REPORT.—After the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and before the end of the 5-year period beginning on that date, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress on the effects of the royalty reduction under this title, including a recommendation on whether the reduced royalty rate for potassium from sylvite should apply after the end of the 5-year period.

TITLE II—SODA ASH ROYALTY REDUCTION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Soda Ash Royalty Reduction Act of 2005''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The combination of global competitive pressures, flat domestic demand, and spiraling costs of production threaten the future of the United States soda ash industry.

(2) Despite booming world demand, growth in United States exports of soda ash since 1997 has been flat, with most of the world's largest markets for such growth, including Brazil, the People's Republic of China, India, the countries of eastern Europe, and the Republic of South Africa, have been closed by protectionist policies.

(3) The People's Republic of China is the prime competitor of the United States in soda ash production, and recently supplanted the United States as the largest producer of soda ash in the world.

(4) Over 700 jobs have been lost in the United States soda ash industry since the Department of the Interior increased the royalty rate on soda ash produced on Federal land, in 1996.

(5) Reduction of the royalty rate on soda ash produced on Federal land will provide needed relief to the United States soda ash industry and allow it to increase export growth and competitiveness in emerging world markets, and create new jobs in the United States.

SEC. 203. REDUCTION IN ROYALTY RATE ON SODA ASH.

Notwithstanding section 102(a)(9) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(9)), section 24 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 262), and the terms of any lease under that Act, the royalty rate on the quantity or gross value of the output of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market from Federal land in the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be 2 percent.

SEC. 204. STUDY.

After the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and before the end of the 5-year period beginning on that date, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress on the effects of the royalty reduction under this title, including—

(1) the amount of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market from Federal land during that 4-year period;

(2) the number of jobs that have been created or maintained during the royalty reduction period;

(3) the total amount of royalty paid to the United States on the quantity or gross value of the output of sodium compounds and related products at the point of shipment to market produced during that 4-year period, and the portion of such royalty paid to States; and

(4) a recommendation of whether the reduced royalty rate should apply after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENZI. 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 H.R. 485.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 485 is a bill that actually contains the language from bills introduced by two of my colleagues from the western United States.

Title I of this bill contains language by my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE). This language provides for a 5-year period the royalty rate on potash produced from Federal lands shall be 1 percent.

Potash is used primarily as an agriculture fertilizer because it is a source of soluble potassium, one of the three primary plant nutrients; the others are fixed nitrogen and soluble phosphorus. The 5-year reduction in royalty rates provides the industry the ability to employ new and more efficient production methods in potash mining, sustain and create new jobs, extend the life of existing deposits and make technological advances that will expand the availability of the Nation's potash resources.

Title II of this bill contains language introduced by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), which will reduce for 5 years the royalties paid on trona to help balance the unfair playing field in the world market that U.S. trona producers face from countries like China.

The U.S. soda ash industry, which until recently was the largest in the world, has operations in Wyoming, Colorado, and California, with the bulk of total production through four plants in the State of Wyoming. The total estimated value of the industry is around $800 million.

The current Federal royalty on soda ash produced in the United States ranges from 4 percent to 6 percent. Mines in the Rocky Mountain region, Colorado and Wyoming, pay 6 percent. Mines in California pay only 4 percent.

Until 2003, the United States was the world's largest exporter of soda ash. In 2003, China passed the United States as the world's number one exporter.

Producers in China manufacture a synthetic product while the United States exports natural soda ash. This bill will reduce the Federal royalty to the statutory minimum of 2 percent for a period of 5 years. This will make the U.S. soda ash more attractive to foreign purchases and provide a window of opportunity to tackle the global barriers that limit market access for U.S. soda ash.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 485 is supported by the majority and minority of the committee. I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the House passed similar royalty relief legislation in the 108th Congress. The bill before us contains provisions sponsored by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

We have no objection to this legislation.

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

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), who is the champion of American potash and the sodium industry here in America and I appreciate his advocacy.

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 Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 485, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS MEMORIAL MAINTENANCE FUND ACT OF 2005

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2107) to amend Public Law 104–329 to modify authorities for the use of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2107

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 ''National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MEMORIAL MAINTENANCE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of Public Law 104–329 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on and after the date of the enactment of the National Law Enforcement Memorial Maintenance Fund Act of 2005, the following applies, notwithstanding other provisions of this Act:

''(A) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Inc., a nonprofit corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, to carry out the purposes of the Fund as described in subsection (b).

''(B) In accordance with the terms of such agreement, the Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the Fund to the Corporation.

''(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'Corporation' means the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Inc; and

''(B) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.''.

(b) PURPOSES OF FUND.—Section 201(b) of Public Law 104–329 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by striking paragraphs (4), (6), and (7), and redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4); and

(3) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENZI. 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 H.R. 2107.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2107, introduced by my colleague on the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), would transfer funds of the 1996 sale of a commemorative coin from the National Park Service to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund for the purpose of maintaining the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. The Memorial Fund, a non-profit organization incorporated in Washington, DC, that raised the original $12 million to build the Memorial, wishes to have access to the $1.4 million raised from the coin sales to maintain the memorial in an effective and timely manner.

Today, more than 16,500 fallen law enforcement officers' names are inscribed on the Memorial, dating back to the first recorded police fatality in 1792.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2107 is supported by the majority and minority of the committee and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, we support passage of this measure.

Yesterday, May 15, was National Peace Officers Memorial Day and the first day of National Police Week, which are both intended to commemorate the service and sacrifice of those who keep our communities safe. While this legislation is technical in nature, it is an important way in which Members can show their respect for those honored by this memorial and for those who continue to serve as peace officers.

Mr. Speaker, there are today more than 17,000 names listed on the memorial here in our Nation's capital. Sadly, another 153 names will be added to the list for 2004, brave men and women who died in the line of duty protecting and serving others.

We all had a personal reminder last week of what that selfless service really means when many Capitol Police officers remained behind on the Capitol grounds to evacuate Members, staff, and visitors. Thankfully, that episode proved to be a nonthreatening incident; however, it clearly highlighted the potential dangers the women and men of the Capitol Police are trained and willing to confront.

We would encourage everyone to visit the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial and to let law enforcement officers know just how much we appreciate their service as they go about their duties this week.

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

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the author of this bill.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will transfer control of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund from the National Park Service to the nonprofit National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund to ensure the much needed maintenance and repairs to the memorial are made in an effective and timely manner.

In 1996, the United States Commemorative Coin Act of 1996 was signed into law. This law mandated the minting and sale of several commemorative coins, including the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Silver Dollar. Surcharges from the coin sale were to be placed in a special interest-bearing account established by the U.S. Treasury and to be maintained by the National Park Service. The revenues generated were then to be used to maintain the memorial and interest accrued was to be used towards establishing a scholarship fund for the children of officers who were killed in the line of duty.

Unfortunately, due to a series of unintentional oversights, the nearly $1.4 million generated from the sale of the coin was misplaced and until recently was never invested by the U.S. Treasury in an interest-bearing account, as required by law.

For the past 6 years, the Memorial Fund has tried, unsuccessfully, to gain access to the maintenance fund to make needed repairs to the memorial. During this time, the Memorial Fund has spent more than $250,000 of its own funds, despite the existence of the $1.4 million.

Therefore, to ensure the money of the maintenance fund is spent in accordance with the original intent of the law, I have worked with the National Park Service and the National

Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund to introduce legislation requiring the Park Service and the Officers Memorial Fund enter into a cooperative agreement outlining how the money in the maintenance fund will be spent. It is imperative that we correct this oversight and ensure the financial viability of the Officers Memorial Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2107, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund of 2005. The bill will transfer control of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund from the National Park Service to the non-profit National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund to ensure the much needed maintenance and repairs to the Memorial are made in a timely and effective manner.

In 1996, the United States Commemorative Coin Act of 1996 was signed into law. This law mandated the minting and sale of several commemorative coins, including a National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Silver Dollar. Surcharges from the coin sale were to be placed in a special interest-interest bearing account established by the U.S. Treasury and to be maintained by the National Park Service. The revenues generated were then to be used to maintain the Memorial, and interest accrued was to be used towards establishing a scholarship fund for the children of officers who were killed in the line of duty.

Unfortunately, due to a series of unintentional oversights, the nearly $1.4 million generated from the sale of the coin was misplaced, and until recently, was never invested by the U.S. Treasury in an interest-bearing account, as required by law.

For the past six years, the Memorial Fund has tried, unsuccessfully, to gain access to the maintenance Fund to make needed repairs to the memorial. During this time, the Memorial Fund has spent more than $250,000 of its own funds, despite the existence of $1.4 million they raised from the sale of the commemorative coin. These funds were intended for the purpose of making repairs to the memorial, as specifically outlined in federal legislation.

Therefore, to ensure the money in the maintenance fund is spent in accordance with the original intent of the law, I have worked with the National Park Service and the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund to introduce legislation requiring the Park Service and the Officers Memorial Fund enter into a cooperative agreement outlining how the money in the maintenance fund will be spent. It is imperative we correct this oversight, and secure the financial viability of the Officers Memorial Fund.

This past Friday, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial held their annual candlelight vigil, honoring the 153 brave men and women who lost their lives in defense of their communities in 2004. The Memorial hosted nearly 20,000 family members, law enforcement officers, and friends of law enforcement, who gathered to pay tribute to these fallen heroes. In addition to the pain and suffering of tragically losing a loved one, can you imagine the added stress had these families visited an unkempt site? Had the Officers Memorial Fund not used their own funds to provide routine maintenance and repair, grieving families would not have descended upon a memorial fit to honor the sacrifices made by their loved ones.

Ladies and gentlemen, in 1984, Congress honored those officers who worked devotedly and selflessly on behalf of the people of our Nation by authorizing a memorial built in their honor. Over a decade later, Congress again authorized support for our law enforcement community by issuing a coin sale to help cover the costs of maintaining their memorial. Which brings us to today, over 20 years later, we must continue to ensure these sacrifices made are memorialized in perpetuity.

This week, the Nation pays tribute to our law enforcement community by celebrating National Police Week. Enacted 43 years ago, this weeklong celebration commemorates law enforcement officers, past and present, who have, through their courageous and enduring commitment to maintaining the safety and security of all citizens, earned the respect and recognition of this grateful Nation.

Please join me in continuing to honor these brave men and women by supporting H.R. 2107.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON. H.R. 2107, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund Act of 2005 is a timely bill given that we are celebrating "National Police Week."

I am pleased that the 17th Annual Candlelight Vigil was held at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial last Friday. A reading of the 415 names newly engraved on the Memorial immediately followed the ceremony, and I send my condolences to the families of all of the fallen officers whose names were inscribed.

This important bill amends the United States Commemorative Coin Act of 1996 to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, to: (1) enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Inc., Corporation, to carry out the Fund's purposes, generally, maintaining and repairing the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, D.C., and periodically adding to it the names of law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty; and (2) transfer all amounts in the Fund to the Corporation, in accordance with the terms of such agreement.

Furthermore, H.R. 2107 revises the purposes of the Fund to repeal: (1) authority to provide educational scholarships to immediate family members of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty whose names appear on the Memorial; and (2) limitation of the Fund's use for its own administration to the lesser of ten percent of its annual income or $200,000 during any one-year period, including an emergency affecting the Memorial's operation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the city of Houston's law enforcement officers for the bravery that they exhibit in keeping the constituents of the 18th Congressional District safe. Lastly, I send condolences to the families and friends of Houston law enforcement officers who have fallen in the line of duty.

Mr. RENZI. 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 Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2107.

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. RENZI. 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.

NEWLANDS PROJECT HEADQUARTERS AND MAINTENANCE YARD FACILITY TRANSFER ACT

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 540) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 540

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

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Table of contents.

TITLE I—NEWLANDS PROJECT HEADQUARTERS AND MAINTENANCE YARD FACILITY TRANSFER

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Conveyance of Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility.

TITLE II—INLAND EMPIRE AND CUCAMONGA VALLEY RECYCLING PROJECTS

Sec. 201. Inland Empire and Cucamonga Valley recycling projects.

TITLE III—RIVERSIDE-CORONA FEEDER WATER PROJECT

Sec. 301. Planning, design, and construction of the Riverside-Corona Feeder.

Sec. 302. Project authorizations.

TITLE IV—AINSWORTH UNIT, SANDHILLS DIVISION, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM

Sec. 401. Ainsworth Unit, Sandhills Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program.

TITLE V—WICHITA PROJECT EQUUS BEDS DIVISION

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Equus Beds Division.

TITLE VI—LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Sec. 601. Short title.

Sec. 602. Authorization of additional projects and activities under the lower rio grande water conservation and improvement program.

Sec. 603. Reauthorization of appropriations for lower rio grande construction.

Sec. 604. Sunset provision.

TITLE VII—BROWNSVILLE PUBLIC UTILITY BOARD WATER RECYCLING AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT

Sec. 701. Brownsville Public Utility Board water recycling and desalinization project.

TITLE VIII—EL PASO, TEXAS, WATER RECLAMATION, REUSE, AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT

Sec. 801. El Paso, Texas, water reclamation, reuse, and desalinization project.

TITLE I—NEWLANDS PROJECT HEADQUARTERS AND MAINTENANCE YARD FACILITY TRANSFER

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility Transfer Act''.

SEC. 102. CONVEYANCE OF NEWLANDS PROJECT HEADQUARTERS AND MAINTENANCE YARD FACILITY.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, Nevada, as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act and in accordance with all applicable law and the terms of the memorandum of agreement between the District and the Secretary dated June 9, 2003 (Contract No. 3–LC–20–8052), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real property within the Newlands Projects, Nevada, known as 2666 Harrigan Road, Fallon, Nevada, and identified for disposition on the map entitled ''Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility''.

(b) TREATMENT OF PROCEEDS FROM FALLON FREIGHT YARD AS CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, amounts received by the United States for the lease and sale of Newlands Project lands comprising the Fallon Freight Yard shall, for purposes of this section, be treated as payment in full of consideration for the property conveyed under subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—If the Secretary has not completed such conveyance within 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress explaining the reasons the conveyance has not been completed and stating the date by which the conveyance will be completed.

(d) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW, REMEDIATION, AND REMOVAL.—The Secretary may not make any conveyance under this section until the completion with respect to the conveyance, in accordance with the memorandum of agreement referred to in subsection (a), of—

(1) compliance with requirements relating to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. et seq. 4321 et seq.) and cultural resources; and

(2) environmental site assessments, remediation, or removal.

(e) LIABILITY.—The United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act or omission by, or occurrence relating to, the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District or its employees, agents, or contractors relating to the property conveyed under this section and occurring prior to, on, or after the date of such conveyance.

TITLE II—INLAND EMPIRE AND CUCAMONGA VALLEY RECYCLING PROJECTS

SEC. 201. INLAND EMPIRE AND CUCAMONGA VALLEY RECYCLING PROJECTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102–575, Title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1637. INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Inland Empire regional water recycling project described in the report submitted under section 1606(c).

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000.

''(e) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

''SEC. 1638. CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Cucamonga Valley Water District, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Cucamonga Valley Water District satellite recycling plants in Rancho Cucamonga, California, to reclaim and recycle approximately 2 million gallons per day of domestic wastewater.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the capital cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $10,000,000.

''(e) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102–575 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1636 the following:

''1637. Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Program.

''1638. Cucamonga Valley Water Recycling Project.''.

TITLE III—RIVERSIDE-CORONA FEEDER WATER PROJECT

SEC. 301. PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE RIVERSIDE-CORONA FEEDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Western Municipal Water District, may participate in a project to plan, design, and construct a water supply project, the Riverside-Corona Feeder, which includes 20 groundwater wells and 28 miles of pipeline in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California.

(b) AGREEMENTS AND REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may enter into such agreements and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(c) FEDERAL COST SHARE.—

(1) PLANNING, DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION.—The Federal share of the cost to plan, design, and construct the project described in subsection (a) shall be the lesser of 35 percent of the total cost of the project or $50,000,000.

(2) STUDIES.—The Federal share of the cost to complete the necessary planning study associated with the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total study cost.

(d) IN-KIND SERVICES.—In-kind services performed by the Western Municipal Water District shall be considered a part of the local cost share to complete the project described in subsection (a).

(e) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary under this section shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

(f) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 302. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102–575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 163__. YUCAIPA VALLEY REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY RENEWAL PROJECT.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Yucaipa Valley Water District, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of projects to treat impaired surface water, reclaim and reuse impaired groundwater, and provide brine disposal within the Santa Ana Watershed described in the report submitted under section 1606.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation or maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000.

''(e) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

''SEC. 163__. CITY OF CORONA WATER UTILITY, CALIFORNIA, WATER RECYCLING AND REUSE PROJECT.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the City of Corona Water Utility, California, is authorized to participate in the design, planning, and construction of, and land acquisition for, a project to reclaim and reuse wastewater, including degraded groundwaters, within and outside of the service area of the City of Corona Water Utility, California.

''(b) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project authorized by this section shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funds for the operation and maintenance of the project authorized by this section.

''(d) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102–575 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 163__ the following:

''Sec. 163__. Yucaipa Valley Regional Water Supply Renewal Project.

''Sec. 163__. City of Corona Water Utility, California, water recycling and reuse project.''.

TITLE IV—AINSWORTH UNIT, SANDHILLS DIVISION, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM

SEC. 401. AINSWORTH UNIT, SANDHILLS DIVISION, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall extend for the period described in subsection (b) the water service contract for the Ainsworth Unit, Sandhills Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Nebraska, consisting of—

(1) the water service contract entered into by the Secretary of the Interior under—

(A) section 9(e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(e));

(B) section 9(c) of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665);

(C) the Act of August 21, 1954 (68 Stat. 757, chapter 781); and

(D) the Act of May 18, 1956 (70 Stat. 160, chapter 285); and

(2) the water service contract for the set project located in Cherry, Brown, and Rock Counties, Nebraska, for the use of a part of the waters of the Snake River, a tributary of the Niobrara River.

(b) PERIOD OF EXTENSION.—The water service contract described in subsection (a) shall be extended for 4 years after the date on which the contract expires under the water service contract and law in existence before the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—WICHITA PROJECT EQUUS BEDS DIVISION

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Wichita Project Equus Beds Division Authorization Act of 2005''.

SEC. 502. EQUUS BEDS DIVISION.

The Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes'' (Public Law 86–787; 74 Stat. 1026) is amended by adding the following new section:

''SEC. 10. EQUUS BEDS DIVISION.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Interior may assist in the funding and implementation of the Equus Beds Aquifer Recharge and Recovery Component which is a part of the 'Integrated Local Water Supply Plan, Wichita, Kansas' (referred to in this section as the 'Equus Beds Division'). Construction of the Equus Beds Division shall be in substantial accordance with the plans and designs.

''(b) OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPLACEMENT.—Operation, maintenance, and replacement of the Equus Beds Division, including funding for those purposes, shall be the sole responsibility of the City of Wichita, Kansas. The Equus Beds Division shall be operated in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

''(c) AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into, or agree to amendments of, cooperative agreements and other appropriate agreements to carry out this section.

''(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—From funds made available for this section, the Secretary of the Interior may charge an appropriate share related to administrative costs incurred.

''(e) PLANS AND ANALYSES CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL LAW.—Before obligating funds for design or construction under this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall work cooperatively with the City of Wichita, Kansas, to use, to the extent possible, plans, designs, and engineering and environmental analyses that have already been prepared by the City for the Equus Beds Division. The Secretary of the Interior shall assure that such information is used consistent with applicable Federal laws and regulations, including principles and guidelines used in preparing feasibility level project studies.

''(f) TITLE; RESPONSIBILITY; LIABILITY.—Nothing in this section or assistance provided under this section shall be construed to transfer title, responsibility, or liability related to the Equus Beds Division (including portions or features thereof) to the United States.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated as the Federal share of the total cost of the Equus Beds Division, an amount not to not exceed 25 percent of the total cost or $30,000,000 (January, 2003 prices), whichever is less, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved herein, whichever is less. Such sums shall be nonreimbursable.

''(h) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.''.

TITLE VI—LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2005''.

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES UNDER THE LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROJECTS.—Section 4(a) of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) In Cameron County, Texas, Bayview Irrigation District No. 11, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March 3, 2004, engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $1,425,219.

''(21) In the Cameron County, Texas, Brownsville Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the February 11, 2004, engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $722,100.

''(22) In the Cameron County, Texas Harlingen Irrigation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $4,173,950.

''(23) In the Cameron County, Texas, Cameron County Irrigation District No. 2, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the February 11, 2004, engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $8,269,576.

''(24) In the Cameron County, Texas, Cameron County Irrigation District No. 6, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report by Turner Collie Braden, Inc., at a cost of $5,607,300.

''(25) In the Cameron County, Texas, Adams Gardens Irrigation District No. 19, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $2,500,000.

''(26) In the Hidalgo and Cameron Counties, Texas, Hidalgo and Cameron Counties Irrigation District No. 9, water conservation and improvement projects as identified by the February 11 engineering report by NRS Consulting Engineers at a cost of $8,929,152.

''(27) In the Hidalgo and Willacy Counties, Texas, Delta Lake Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $8,000,000.

''(28) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 2, a water conservation and improvement project identified in the engineering reports attached to a letter dated February 11, 2004, from the district's general manager, at a cost of $5,312,475.

''(29) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004, by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $5,595,018.

''(30) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 6, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $3,450,000.

''(31) In the Hidalgo County, Texas Santa Cruz Irrigation District No. 15, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004, by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $4,609,000.

''(32) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Engelman Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March 5, 2004, by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,251,480.

''(33) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Valley Acres Water District, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in an engineering report dated March, 2004, by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $500,000.

''(34) In the Hudspeth County, Texas, Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $1,500,000.

''(35) In the El Paso County, Texas, El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, water conservation and improvement projects as identified in the March, 2004, engineering report by Axiom-Blair Engineering at a cost of $10,500,000.

''(36) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Donna Irrigation District, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 22, 2004, by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,500,000.

''(37) In the Hidalgo County, Texas, Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 16, water conservation and improvement projects identified in an engineering report dated March 22, 2004, by Melden and Hunt, Inc. at a cost of $2,800,000.

''(38) The United Irrigation District of Hidalgo County water conservation and improvement projects as identified in a March 2004, engineering report by Sigler Winston, Greenwood and Associates at a cost of $6,067,021.''.

(b) INCLUSION OF ACTIVITIES TO CONSERVE WATER OR IMPROVE SUPPLY; TRANSFERS AMONG PROJECTS.—Section 4 of such Act (Public Law 106–576; 114 Stat. 3067) is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INCLUSION OF ACTIVITIES TO CONSERVE WATER OR IMPROVE SUPPLY.—In addition to the activities identified in the engineering reports referred to in subsection (a), each project that the Secretary conducts or participates in under subsection (a) may include any of the following:

''(1) The replacement of irrigation canals and lateral canals with buried pipelines.

''(2) The impervious lining of irrigation canals and lateral canals.

''(3) Installation of water level, flow measurement, pump control, and telemetry systems.

''(4) The renovation and replacement of pumping plants.

''(5) Other activities that will result in the conservation of water or an improved supply of water.

''(d) TRANSFERS AMONG PROJECTS.—Of amounts made available for a project referred to in any of paragraphs (20) through (38) of subsection (a), the Secretary may transfer and use for another such project up to 10 percent.''.

SEC. 603. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR LOWER RIO GRANDE CONSTRUCTION.

Section 4(e) of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–576;

114 Stat. 3067), as redesignated by section 602(b) of this title, is further amended by inserting before the period the following: ''for projects referred to in paragraphs (1) through (19) of subsection (a), and $42,356,145 (2004 dollars) for projects referred to in paragraphs (20) through (38) of subsection (a)''.

SEC. 604. SUNSET PROVISION.

The authority of the Secretary to carry out the projects added by paragraphs (20) through (38) of the amendment made by section 602(a) of this title shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

TITLE VII—BROWNSVILLE PUBLIC UTILITY BOARD WATER RECYCLING AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT

SEC. 701. BROWNSVILLE PUBLIC UTILITY BOARD WATER RECYCLING AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102–575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 163__. BROWNSVILLE PUBLIC UTILITY BOARD WATER RECYCLING AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Brownsville Public Utility Board, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of facilities to reclaim, reuse, and treat impaired waters in the Brownsville, Texas, area.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102–575 is amended by inserting after the last item relating to title XVI the following:

''163__. Brownsville Public Utility Board water recycling and desalinization project.''.

TITLE VIII—EL PASO, TEXAS, WATER RECLAMATION, REUSE, AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT

SEC. 801. EL PASO, TEXAS, WATER RECLAMATION, REUSE, AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102–575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 16xx. EL PASO, TEXAS, WATER RECLAMATION, REUSE, AND DESALINIZATION PROJECT.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the State and local authorities, is authorized to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the El Paso Water Reclamation, Reuse, and Desalinization project to reclaim and reuse wastewater and to treat and reuse impaired and brackish groundwater in the service area of the El Paso Water Utilities Public Service Board, El Paso, Texas.

''(b) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the project authorized by this section shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not provide funds for the operation and maintenance of the project authorized by this section.

''(d) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in section 2 of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 16xx the following:

''Sec. 16xx. El Paso, Texas, water reclamation, reuse, and desalinization project.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENZI. 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 H.R. 540.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 540 directs the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 35 acres of the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District as soon as practicable. Before the transfer takes place, all environmental analyses will be completed in accordance with Federal, State and local laws.

As amended, this important bill also includes a number of other bipartisan water measures either favorably reported by the Committee on Resources in the waning days of the 108th Congress or those which were passed in the last Congress but were not considered by the Senate. Today's effort is an attempt to make it easier for Senate to pass these measures.

These bipartisan bills include H.R. 386, legislation offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and some of his lower Rio Grande, Texas colleagues, to help local irrigation districts and communities preserve their water supplies; H.R. 802, a bill authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), to authorize Federal assistance for a water recycling project in California's Inland Empire; H.R. 855, legislation introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), to provide Federal dollars to the City of Brownsville's desalinization project; H.R. 863, a bill sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), to provide Federal assistance to the City of El Paso's alternative water supply project; H.R. 1008, legislation authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), to allow Federal assistance for water projects in southern California; H.R. 1197, a bill sponsored by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), to extend irrigation contracts in Nebraska; and finally, H.R. 1327, legislation offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), to provide Federal assistance to the City of Wichita's aquifer recharge project.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, these are bipartisan bills and deserve unanimous support.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 540 and the measures included therewith.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, we support passage of H.R. 540 and the amendment to the bill which adds seven new titles. The amendment authorizes several important projects for water recycling, improvements to irrigation efficiency, conservation of groundwater and surface water, and desalination of water.

I particularly want to draw attention to titles VI, VII and VIII of this legislation. These titles incorporate the text of H.R. 386, H.R. 855 and H.R. 863, respectively.

These bills, introduced by the gentlemen from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. REYES), my colleagues, will help finance projects to stretch the limited water supplies in their districts. I commend my friends from Texas for their leadership in introducing these bills and for working hard to secure their passage.

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

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank my good friend and colleague from Arizona for allowing me the privilege to rise today in support of legislation I introduced, the Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility Transfer Act, H.R. 540.

This legislation passed the House under suspension of the rules last year, but was not considered in the Senate prior to the adjournment of the 108th Congress. I truly appreciate the opportunity to stand before my colleagues again in support of this legislation that is so important for the people of the Second District of the State of Nevada.

The purpose of this legislation is to transfer all right, title, and interest in the Newlands Project to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, otherwise known as TCID. This conveyance consists of approximately 35 acres and will allow TCID to make permanent improvements on this land for the continued operation of the Newlands Reclamation Project.

In 1996, the Bureau of Reclamation certified that TCID had repaid the original construction costs designated for repayment to the United States. The original construction costs included the cost of the land on which the initial headquarter facilities were located. In the late 1970s, however, TCID had outgrown the original facilities and moved to the current site, which is the area to be conveyed through this legislation.

TCID paid for the land where the original facilities were located; however, they were never compensated when they vacated these lots, despite the fact that a Federal post office now sits on the original tract of land that housed the project headquarters.

Critics will charge that this bill unfairly favors the TCID and that the land is a taxpayer asset and should be treated accordingly. Those assertions simply do not make sense.

The Bureau of Reclamation certified that the Newlands Project had been paid for and asking the TCID to pay for their land that their headquarters is currently located on would be in effect asking them to pay for it twice.

To say that H.R. 540 is a giveaway is simply incorrect and misrepresents the intent of this important legislation. This bill is a fair solution to an unfair situation.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator JOHN ENSIGN and Senator HARRY REID and Governor Kenny Guinn of Nevada and the local leaders of Churchill County and the city of Fallon, Nevada, in supporting this legislation.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), my good friend and colleague, once again for allowing me to speak on this bill. I appreciate the consideration of this legislation that is so very important to my constituents in Nevada.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from El Paso, Texas (Mr. REYES), and also recognize his crucial leadership on water issues in the border area.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation which will help several local communities around the country address their water management issues.

Like many communities in the West, one of the greatest challenges facing my congressional district of El Paso, Texas, has been providing an adequate water supply to our rapidly growing population.

Fortunately, our community is meeting this challenge successfully, in part through the construction of a major inland desalination plant that will treat the brackish water of the Hueco Bolson so it can be utilized by the people of El Paso and the surrounding region, as well as Fort Bliss military base. The project, which is a partnership of the El Paso Water Utilities and the Department of Defense, is set to begin construction and should be completed within the year.

I am proud to say that El Paso is leading the way when it comes to inland desalination, in addition to our ongoing conservation and reclamation initiatives. This bill will further our efforts by authorizing the city of El Paso to expand the soon-to-be constructed desalination plant or to construct an additional plant if and when additional capacity is required over the next 10 years.

Ensuring a reliable, long-term water source for El Paso and the El Paso region is essential for the community's future. Desalination, and therefore, this legislation, is an integral part of that effort.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water and Power, for their assistance in moving this important legislation forward.

I would also like to thank my two colleagues from Arizona and from New Mexico for granting me the opportunity to speak this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 540, a bill that will authorize a variety of water projects including several in my congressional district. I want to thank Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL for including my legislation, H.R. 386, in this bill.

I represent a region of the country that is subject to periodic droughts and yet is experiencing phenomenal population growth.

The 2000 Census showed that the population of Hidalgo County, in my district, increased by 48 percent. On the Mexican side of the border, millions have come to work in the maquiladoras and to take advantage of the economic boom that has come from NAFTA.

This growth has placed an enormous strain on water delivery systems along the Texas-Mexico border. Agriculture irrigation water often flows through open dirt ditches and studies show that much is lost to seepage and evaporation.

Municipalities rely on the water from the irrigation delivery systems to meet the water needs of growing communities.

H.R. 540 will authorize 19 projects that will allow border water districts to continue upgrading and modernizing our antiquated water delivery systems through the installation of water pipes and canal linings. Similar projects were authorized in the 106th and 107th Congresses.

We have already made a great deal of progress because this has been a collaborative effort. The irrigation districts have provided matching funds. The Texas Water Development Board and Texas A&M University have paid for many of the engineering studies. Federal appropriators have provided more than $10 million. As a result, we are seeing water savings of almost 80 percent in the projects that have been completed.

Most importantly, Federal authorization has allowed us to tap into the resources of the North American Development Bank. To date, NADBank has approved almost $24 million for these projects and passage of H.R. 540 will make these new projects eligible for NADBank assistance.

These funds are being put to good use. Numerous projects are already underway and some are almost completed.

When the metering system is fully installed, irrigation districts will have a much clearer picture of water usage and water savings. This data will be vital to improving water management throughout the region.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank House Resources Chairman RICHARD POMBO and Subcommittee on Water and Power Chairman GEORGE RADANOVICH, for their hard work in moving H.R. 802 as a part of this larger resources package bill, H.R. 540 as amended, to the House floor.

I introduced this Inland Empire Water Recycling Initiative, H.R. 802, to authorize $30 million total for the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) and the Cucamonga Valley Water District (CVWD) to assist in constructing two water recycling projects which will nearly 100,000 acre-feet of new water annually to the area's water supply.

It is imperative that we continue to approve measures preventing water supply shortages in the Western United States. This recycling initiative will help meet the water needs of the Inland Empire and begin a strategic federal-local partnership to bring a significant amount of new water supply to the region.

I am pleased that this initiative has the support of all member agencies of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, as well as the water agencies downstream in Orange County. IEUA encompasses approximately 242 square miles and serves the cities of Chino, Chino Hills, Fontana, Ontario, Upland, Montclair, and Rancho Cucamonga.

IEUA and CVWD are replacing water-intensive applications like landscape and agricultural irrigation, construction, and industrial cooling with high-quality recycled water, fresh water can be conserved or used for drinking, thereby reducing the dependence on expensive imported water.

In addition, by recycling water which would otherwise be wasted and unavailable, these agencies provide that the water available goes through at least one more cycle of beneficial use before it is ultimately returned to the environment.

I want to reiterate my thanks to the House Resources Committee, as well as to my colleagues, KEN CALVERT, GRACE NAPOLITANO, GARY MILLER, and JOE BACA for cosponsoring H.R. 802.

And last but certainly not least, I appreciate the visionary leadership of Mr. Robert DeLoach, General Manager of the Cucamonga Valley Water District and Mr. Rich Atwater, CEO and General Manager of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, having no additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 540, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UPPER HOUSATONIC VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 938) to establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 938

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 ''Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The upper Housatonic Valley, encompassing 29 towns in the hilly terrain of western Massachusetts and northwestern Connecticut, is a singular geographical and cultural region that has made significant national contributions through its literary, artistic, musical, and architectural achievements, its iron, paper, and electrical equipment industries, and its scenic beautification and environmental conservation efforts.

(2) The upper Housatonic Valley has 139 properties and historic districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places, including—

(A) five National Historic Landmarks—

(i) Edith Wharton's home, The Mount, Lenox, Massachusetts;

(ii) Herman Melville's home, Arrowhead, Pittsfield, Massachusetts;

(iii) W.E.B. DuBois' Boyhood Homesite, Great Barrington, Massachusetts;

(iv) Mission House, Stockbridge, Massachusetts; and

(v) Crane and Company Old Stone Mill Rag Room, Dalton, Massachusetts; and

(B) four National Natural Landmarks—

(i) Bartholomew's Cobble, Sheffield, Massachusetts, and Salisbury, Connecticut;

(ii) Beckley Bog, Norfolk, Connecticut;

(iii) Bingham Bog, Salisbury, Connecticut; and

(iv) Cathedral Pines, Cornwall, Connecticut.

(3) Writers, artists, musicians, and vacationers have visited the region for more than 150 years to enjoy its scenic wonders, making it one of the country's leading cultural resorts.

(4) The upper Housatonic Valley has made significant national cultural contributions through such writers as Herman Melville, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Edith Wharton, and W.E.B. DuBois, artists Daniel Chester French and Norman Rockwell, and the performing arts centers of Tanglewood, Music Mountain, Norfolk (Connecticut) Chamber Music Festival, Jacob's Pillow, and Shakespeare & Company.

(5) The upper Housatonic Valley is noted for its pioneering achievements in the iron, paper, and electrical generation industries and has cultural resources to interpret those industries.

(6) The region became a national leader in scenic beautification and environmental conservation efforts following the era of industrialization and deforestation and maintains a fabric of significant conservation areas including the meandering Housatonic River.

(7) Important historical events related to the American Revolution, Shays' Rebellion, and early civil rights took place in the upper Housatonic Valley.

(8) The region had an American Indian presence going back 10,000 years and Mohicans had a formative role in contact with Europeans during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

(9) The Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area has been proposed in order to heighten appreciation of the region, preserve its natural and historical resources, and improve the quality of life and economy of the area.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

(2) To implement the national heritage area alternative as described in the document entitled ''Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Feasibility Study, 2003''.

(3) To provide a management framework to foster a close working relationship with all levels of government, the private sector, and the local communities in the upper Housatonic Valley region to conserve the region's heritage while continuing to pursue compatible economic opportunities.

(4) To assist communities, organizations, and citizens in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in identifying, preserving, interpreting, and developing the historical, cultural, scenic, and natural resources of the region for the educational and inspirational benefit of current and future generations.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HERITAGE AREA.—The term ''Heritage Area'' means the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, established in section 4.

(2) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The term ''Management Entity'' means the management entity for the Heritage Area designated by section 4(d).

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''Management Plan'' means the management plan for the Heritage Area specified in section 6.

(4) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Boundary Map Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area'', numbered P17/80,000, and dated February 2003.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

SEC. 4. UPPER HOUSATONIC VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The Heritage Area shall be comprised of—

(1) part of the Housatonic River's watershed, which extends 60 miles from Lanesboro, Massachusetts to Kent, Connecticut;

(2) the towns of Canaan, Colebrook, Cornwall, Kent, Norfolk, North Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, and Warren in Connecticut; and

(3) the towns of Alford, Becket, Dalton, Egremont, Great Barrington, Hancock, Hinsdale, Lanesboro, Lee, Lenox, Monterey, Mount Washington, New Marlboro, Pittsfield, Richmond, Sheffield, Stockbridge, Tyringham, Washington, and West Stockbridge in Massachusetts.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(d) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, Inc. shall be the management entity for the Heritage Area.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITIES, PROHIBITIONS, AND DUTIES OF THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.

(a) DUTIES OF THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—To further the purposes of the Heritage Area, the management entity shall—

(1) prepare and submit a management plan for the Heritage Area to the Secretary in accordance with section 6;

(2) assist units of local government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in implementing the approved management plan by—

(A) carrying out programs and projects that recognize, protect and enhance important resource values within the Heritage Area;

(B) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits and programs within the Heritage Area;

(C) developing recreational and educational opportunities in the Heritage Area;

(D) increasing public awareness of and appreciation for natural, historical, scenic, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(E) protecting and restoring historic sites and buildings in the Heritage Area that are consistent with heritage area themes;

(F) ensuring that signs identifying points of public access and sites of interest are posted throughout the Heritage Area; and

(G) promoting a wide range of partnerships among governments, organizations and individuals to further the purposes of the Heritage Area;

(3) consider the interests of diverse units of government, businesses, organizations and individuals in the Heritage Area in the preparation and implementation of the management plan;

(4) conduct meetings open to the public at least semi-annually regarding the development and implementation of the management plan;

(5) submit an annual report to the Secretary for any fiscal year in which the management entity receives Federal funds under this Act, setting forth its accomplishments, expenses, and income, including grants to any other entities during the year for which the report is made;

(6) make available for audit for any fiscal year in which it receives Federal funds under this Act, all information pertaining to the expenditure of such funds and any matching funds, and require in all agreements authorizing expenditures of Federal funds by other organizations, that the receiving organizations make available for such audit all records and other information pertaining to the expenditure of such funds; and

(7) encourage by appropriate means economic development that is consistent with the purposes of the Heritage Area.

(b) AUTHORITIES.—The management entity may, for the purposes of preparing and implementing the management plan for the Heritage Area, use Federal funds made available through this Act to—

(1) make grants to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations and other persons;

(2) enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of

Massachusetts, their subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties;

(3) hire and compensate staff, which shall include individuals with expertise in natural, cultural, and historical resources protection, and heritage programming;

(4) obtain money or services from any source including any that are provided under any other Federal law or program;

(5) contract for goods or services; and

(6) undertake to be a catalyst for any other activity that furthers the purposes of the Heritage Area and is consistent with the approved management plan.

(c) PROHIBITIONS ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property, but may use any other source of funding, including other Federal funding outside this authority, intended for the acquisition of real property.

SEC. 6. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The management plan for the Heritage Area shall—

(1) include comprehensive policies, strategies and recommendations for conservation, funding, management and development of the Heritage Area;

(2) take into consideration existing State, county, and local plans in the development of the management plan and its implementation;

(3) include a description of actions that governments, private organizations, and individuals have agreed to take to protect the natural, historical and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(4) specify the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the Heritage Area in the first 5 years of implementation;

(5) include an inventory of the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the Heritage Area related to the themes of the Heritage Area that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained;

(6) describe a program of implementation for the management plan including plans for resource protection, restoration, construction, and specific commitments for implementation that have been made by the management entity or any government, organization, or individual for the first 5 years of implementation; and

(7) include an interpretive plan for the Heritage Area.

(b) DEADLINE AND TERMINATION OF FUNDING.—

(1) DEADLINE.—The management entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary for approval within 3 years after funds are made available for this Act.

(2) TERMINATION OF FUNDING.—If the management plan is not submitted to the Secretary in accordance with this subsection, the management entity shall not qualify for Federal funding under this Act until such time as the management plan is submitted to the Secretary.

SEC. 7. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY.

(a) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may, upon the request of the management entity, provide technical assistance on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis and financial assistance to the Heritage Area to develop and implement the approved management plan. The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the management entity and other public or private entities for this purpose. In assisting the Heritage Area, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that in general assist in—

(1) conserving the significant natural, historical, cultural, and scenic resources of the Heritage Area; and

(2) providing educational, interpretive, and recreational opportunities consistent with the purposes of the Heritage Area.

(b) APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove the management plan not later than 90 days after receiving the management plan.

(2) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—In determining the approval of the management plan, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(A) the management entity is representative of the diverse interests of the Heritage Area, including governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, and recreational organizations;

(B) the management entity has afforded adequate opportunity, including public hearings, for public and governmental involvement in the preparation of the management plan;

(C) the resource protection and interpretation strategies contained in the management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect the natural, historical, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area; and

(D) the management plan is supported by the appropriate State and local officials whose cooperation is needed to ensure the effective implementation of the State and local aspects of the management plan.

(3) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves the management plan, the Secretary shall advise the management entity in writing of the reasons therefore and shall make recommendations for revisions to the management plan. The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision within 60 days after the date it is submitted.

(4) APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS.—Substantial amendments to the management plan shall be reviewed by the Secretary and approved in the same manner as provided for the original management plan. The management entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this Act to implement any amendments until the Secretary has approved the amendments.

SEC. 8. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Any Federal agency conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Heritage Area shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the management entity with respect to such activities;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the management entity in carrying out their duties under this Act and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and,

(3) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner which the management entity determines will not have an adverse effect on the Heritage Area.

SEC. 9. REQUIREMENTS FOR INCLUSION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

(a) NOTIFICATION AND CONSENT OF PROPERTY OWNERS REQUIRED.—No privately owned property shall be preserved, conserved, or promoted by the management plan for the Heritage Area until the owner of that private property has been notified in writing by the management entity and has given written consent for such preservation, conservation, or promotion to the management entity.

(b) LANDOWNER WITHDRAW.—Any owner of private property included within the boundary of the Heritage Area shall have their property immediately removed from the boundary by submitting a written request to the management entity.

SEC. 10. PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.

(a) ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) require any private property owner to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to such private property; or

(2) modify any provision of Federal, State, or local law with regard to public access to or use of private property.

(b) LIABILITY.—Designation of the Heritage Area shall not be considered to create any liability, or to have any effect on any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any persons injured on such private property.

(c) RECOGNITION OF AUTHORITY TO CONTROL LAND USE.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to modify the authority of Federal, State, or local governments to regulate land use.

(d) PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS IN HERITAGE AREA.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the owner of any private property located within the boundaries of the Heritage Area to participate in or be associated with the Heritage Area.

(e) EFFECT OF ESTABLISHMENT.—The boundaries designated for the Heritage Area represent the area within which Federal funds appropriated for the purpose of this Act may be expended. The establishment of the Heritage Area and its boundaries shall not be construed to provide any nonexisting regulatory authority on land use within the Heritage Area or its viewshed by the Secretary, the National Park Service, or the management entity.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act not more than $1,000,000 for any fiscal year. Not more than a total of $10,000,000 may be appropriated for the Heritage Area under this Act.

(b) MATCHING FUNDS.—Federal funding provided under this Act may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any assistance or grant provided or authorized under this Act.

SEC. 12. SUNSET.

The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this Act shall terminate on the day occurring 15 years after funds are first made available for this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENZI. 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 H.R. 938, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 938, introduced by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and amended by the Committee on Resources, contains four titles. However, all four titles passed this House in the 108th Congress.

Title I would establish the Upper Housatonic National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It would

preserve the area's contributions in literature, art, music, architecture, iron and paper, and its electrical equipment industries.

Title II amends the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Act in order to transition their management authority from a Federal commission to a nonprofit organization, which is in line with more recent Heritage Area management.

Title III would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a suitability and feasibility study of establishing the St. Croix National Heritage Area in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands.

Title IV would establish the Northern Rio Grande National Heritage Area across three counties within the State of New Mexico to commemorate the unique combination of cultures, languages, folk arts, customs, and architecture associated with the Spanish colonization of New Mexico, beginning as far back as 1598.

I urge adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 938. The majority has explained the pieces of this package. As the sponsor of the legislation comprising title IV, I would like to focus my remarks on the Northern Rio Grande National Heritage Area, which will be designated in the State of New Mexico.

I introduced this legislation earlier this year. A companion bill in the Senate, introduced by New Mexico's two Senators, currently awaits a vote on the floor of that body. In the 107th Congress, identical language passed the House unanimously. I am obviously pleased that today we, once again, have the opportunity to move closer to making this bill a law so New Mexicans can take additional steps to preserve and learn from our rich history.

The establishment of the Northern Rio Grande National Heritage Area is a citizen-driven effort to protect the remaining significant resources representative of the Spanish and Pueblo colonial era in north-central New Mexico. The bill identifies the northern New Mexico counties of Rio Arriba, Santa Fe and Taos as a National Heritage Area, an elite designation from Congress reserved for areas regarded as significant resources.

Northern New Mexico boasts many sites of historic and cultural significance. Our State is a blend of Pueblo and Hispanic cultures, making it a very unique and special place in our country. This legislation would identify many of the sites that tell northern New Mexico's story, help preserve them and, in the process, allow them to be more thoroughly enjoyed by New Mexicans and visitors to our State. Preservation would directly lead to economic development of this area through enhanced tourism.

Title IV creates a nonprofit corporation governed by a 25-member board of trustees charged with developing a management plan for the heritage area. The board will be comprised of representatives from the State, affected counties, tribes, cities, and others. The corporation's plan would include recommendations for identifying, conserving and preserving cultural, historical and natural resources within the heritage area, along with strategies to promote tourism of the region's natural and cultural assets.

The city of Espanola, the city of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Rio Arriba County, Taos County, La Jicarita Enterprise Community, the Chimayo Cultural Preservation Association, and the Eight Northern Pueblos support the Northern Rio Grande Heritage Area.

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

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 938, but I will confine my remarks to title I of the bill which would establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

Let me start by thanking the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for her persistence, her diligence, and her hard work on this legislation. It has been a pleasure working with her.

During the 106th Congress, H.R. 4312 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study of the Upper Housatonic as a potential national heritage area. The study establishes that the Upper Housatonic Valley meets the Interior Department's criteria for such a designation.

The Park Service recognizes the valley as distinctive for having a landscape that includes a blend of industrial innovations, environmental conservation initiatives, and cultural achievements of national significance.

The Upper Housatonic Valley includes 29 communities in western Massachusetts and northwestern Connecticut. I would like to highlight a few of the many contributions this region of New England brings to our national heritage.

Herman Melville, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Edith Wharton, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Norman Rockwell, Suzy Frelinghuesen are just a few of the prominent artists and writers who have made the Housatonic Valley their home and the subject of their work. Today, visitors can see these artists' work on display in local museums before taking in a classical music concert at Tanglewood or visiting the magnificently restored Shaker Village in Hancock. The Upper Housatonic has a rich cultural heritage and thriving artistic community to this day.

Elizabeth Mumbet Freeman is a person my colleagues may not be familiar with today, but her role in our national history is rightfully recognized in the newly reopened National Archives exhibit, Charters of Freedom.

□ 1515

A slave from Sheffield, Massachusetts, Mumbet sued in Massachusetts court for her freedom, leading to the abolition of slavery in Massachusetts in 1793. Many years later, the great civil rights leader, W.E.B. Dubois, made his home in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. His papers are archived and open to the public today in the University of Massachusetts in Amherst.

As I hoped to highlight for you today, the Upper Housatonic Valley is an area rich in culture, history, and innovation against the backdrop of scenic landscapes. Its designation as a National Heritage Area will help preserve this treasure for years to come. I urge an ''aye'' vote in support of this legislation.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 938, a bill to establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Act. The Upper Housatonic Valley, encompassing 29 towns in the hilly terrain of western Massachusetts and northwestern Connecticut, is a singular geographical and cultural region that has made significant national contributions through its literacy, artistic, musical, and architectural achievements, its iron, paper, and electrical equipment industries and its scenic beautification and environmental conservation efforts.

I would like to thank Chairman POMBO and the Resources Committee for bringing this legislation forward and for recognizing that through this broad, flexible and locally led initiative, the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts will be able to make real progress in protecting the river and its heritage. The heritage area has broad support throughout the region, from historic and civic organizations, local businesses and governments, and our State governments have expressed strong support for the establishment of a National Heritage Area and are enthusiastic about the potential for celebration and preservation of the heritage. It also has inspired the development of a local organization that has already begun hosting hiking events and historic visits.

Congress established criteria in our 2000 legislation that clarifies that designation requires a cultural, natural and historical heritage of national significance, must have broad public support and a qualified entity to manage the Area. The Park Service agreed that the Upper Housatonic Valley meets the Department's ten interim criteria for designation of a national heritage area and cite us as the best example of how to go about becoming a National Heritage Area.

The Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area would extend from Lanesboro, Massachusetts, 60 miles South to Kent, Connecticut. This region of New England was

home to the Nation's first industrial iron sites from the 1730s to the 1920s. The first blast furnace was built in 1762 by Ethan Allen and supplied the iron for the cannons that helped George Washington's army to make other weapons for soldiers of the Revolutionary army. While most of the furnaces, mine sites and charcoal pits have been lost to development and time, the few that remain are in need of refurbishment. The Beckley Furnace in Canaan, Connecticut, was designated an official project by the Millennium Committee to Save America's Treasures and now has been well restored.

The Valley's history as a cultural retreat from the Boston and New York areas provides both past and current riches for the country. Since the 1930s visitors from all over have come to hear the music at Tanglewood, Music Mountain and Norfolk, see the paintings at the Norman Rockwell Museum, watch serious theater at Stockbridge and musical treats at Sharon. Today's local authors draw on a long tradition going back to the 19th century, when Herman Melville, Nathaniel Hawthorne and Edith Wharton lived and wrote here.

The Housatonic Valley is also rich with environmental and recreational treasures. The Housatonic River, just below Falls Village, Connecticut, is one of the prized fly-fishing centers in the Northeast and is enjoyed by fisherman from not only Connecticut and Massachusetts but the entire eastern seaboard. Olympic rowers have trained in this river as children have learned to swim, boat and fish and value its ecosystem. The Upper Housatonic Area, with its remoteness from, but ties to large cities, occupy a special niche in our national culture and I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 938, to establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in Connecticut and Massachusetts. I am particularly pleased that Title 2 of the bill includes legislation I sponsored in the last Congress and again in this Congress to provide for a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing my home island of St. Croix as a National Heritage Area was also included in this package.

I want to begin by thanking Chairman RICHARD POMBO and Ranking Member NICK RAHALL for their support in including my bill in H.R. 938.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more fitting place that should be studied for possible designation as a national Heritage Area than my home island of St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands. The island of St. Croix has a long, distinguished, and varied history, including being the site where Christopher Columbus first stepped onto what is now American soil. There is significant interest in preserving and enhancing the natural, historical and cultural resources of the island on a cooperative basis and such a study would provide guidance on how we can best achieve those purposes.

Even though each one of the four major islands of the U.S. Islands Virgin Islands can make a good case for designation as a National Heritage Area, the island of St. Croix with its two historic towns—Christiansted built in 1734 and Frederiksted built in 1752—is richly blessed with all of the attributes that would justify this designation.

The towns historic architecture matured over a 100-year period. The town of Christiansted is one of the finest examples of Danish architectural designs in this hemisphere. Its history can be traced back some 4,000 years to 2500 B.C. It is also the place where one of our founding fathers and first Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, lived and worked during his formative years.

In 1493, Columbus arrived at what is now the Salt River National Historic Park and Ecological Preserve, making it the only site under the American flag where his men went ashore, as well as the first recorded hostile encounter between Europeans and Native Americans.

Frederiksted has the distinction of having been the first jurisdiction to have raised its flag in salute of the new Republic of the U.S.A., and indeed the first designed flag was done by a resident of that Island.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on about the many unique and significant features of the island of St. Croix, but in the interest of time I would say that this is the third time that we would have passed this bill in the House and sent it to the other body and I hope that the third time will be the charm. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 938.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 938. Among its provisions, H.R. 938 incorporates bill language from H.R. 1820 which reauthorizes the Illinois and Michigan, I & M, Canal National Heritage Corridor to receive appropriations and transfers management entity status from the now defunct federal, I & M Commission to the nonprofit Canal Corridor Association. I would like to commend Chairman POMBO and the House Committee on Resources for their hard work on this important piece of legislation.

The I & M Canal changed the Nation in 1848 when it opened the first shipping route between New York and New Orleans, designating Chicago as the Nation's greatest inland port. While the canal eventually fell into disuse due to new transportation methods and routes, in 1982 business and industry leaders founded the Canal Corridor Association to help revitalize the I & M Canal region, and in doing so, created a national model for regional partnership, conservation and renewal. I am proud to say that the I & M Canal National Heritage Corridor was America's charter National Heritage area, being created by an act of Congress in 1984. For 20 years, the Federal I & M Commission has worked to carry out the mission of the I & M Canal National Heritage Corridor. Its efforts have been particularly successful during the past 5 years that Phyllis Ellin has provided strong leadership as the Executive Director of the Commission.

Since 1984, the I & M Canal National Heritage Corridor has increasingly become an engine of economic growth in communities up and down the length of the Corridor; primarily through an increase in tourism but also in the use of the Corridor for recreational purposes. After consulting with local officials and those most interested and involved in the I & M Canal, it seems that the private sector approach offers more advantages to handle the increased work load brought on by the recent success of the canal and interest in heritage tourism.

As a result, H.R. 938 designates the Canal Corridor Association, CCA, as the new management entity of the I & M Canal National Heritage Corridor. The CCA seeks to enhance economic vitality by raising awareness of and expanding the parks, trails, landscapes, and historic sites that make the I & M Canal region a special place. They have also successfully implemented education programs and improved the cultural, environmental, historic and tourism resources that the canal offers.

Under the leadership of Ana Koval I am firmly convinced that the CCA, through their governance of the I & M Canal, will continue to successfully educated citizens of the nationally historical importance of the I & M Canal and to play a pivotal role in the continued economic redevelopment of the region.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, having no additional requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 938, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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.R. 627, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 266, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 2107, 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.

LINDA WHITE-EPPS POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 627.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 627, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
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)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
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)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—43

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Carson
Clay
Costa
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doyle
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Graves
Gutierrez
Holden
Istook
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Manzullo
Marshall
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Pryce (OH)
Ros-Lehtinen
Smith (WA)
Souder
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wicker
Young (FL)

□ 1854

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 171, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 266.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 266, 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 391, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—391

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
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)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)

Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
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)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Carson
Clay
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doyle
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Graves
Gutierrez
Holden
Istook
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Manzullo
Marshall
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Pryce (OH)
Ros-Lehtinen
Souder
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wicker
Young (FL)

□ 1903

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.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS MEMORIAL MAINTENANCE FUND ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2107.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2107, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
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)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
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)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—41

Ackerman
Barrett (SC)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Capps
Carson
Clay
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doyle
Ford
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Graves
Gutierrez
Holden
Istook
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Manzullo
Marshall
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Pryce (OH)
Ros-Lehtinen
Souder
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wicker
Young (FL)

□ 1921

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 171, 172 and 173.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably delyead in my return to Washington, DC and therefore unable to be on the House floor for rollcall votes 171, 172, and 173. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" for rollcall vote 171, "yea" for rollcall vote 172, and "yea" for rollcall vote 173.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, personal business in my district prevents me from being present for legislative business

scheduled for today, Monday, May 16, 2005. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 627, designating the "Linda White-Epps" Post Office in Hamden, CT (rollcall No. 171); "yea" on H. Res. 266, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day (rollcall No. 172); and "yea" on H.R. 2107, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial and Maintenance Fund Act of 2005 (rollcall No. 173).

UPPER HOUSATONIC VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), chairman of the Committee on Resources, for bringing out today and through this House H.R. 938, legislation that establishes the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area and designates a number of other National Heritage Areas as well.

This program of National Heritage Areas is really a wonderful program. The 29 towns that encompass the Upper Housatonic Valley have worked together, their first selectmen, their historic societies, and a very large group of volunteers to inventory the historic, the economic, and the environmental assets of this area. And truly, in my district as in the others, they are unique areas, uniquely important historically and uniquely endowed environmentally.

By having a structure within which they could work together with the technical experts from the Federal level, they have developed a knowledge that enables them to plan and will enable them to strengthen the economy through thoughtful tourism programs. Truly this is a partnership between the Federal Government and very small local governments that will bless every life in the Upper Housatonic Valley and the other Heritage Areas throughout the country.

IMPORTANT ISSUES NOT BEING ADDRESSED

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, how disappointing that instead of using the first months of this new Congress to address the important issues facing our Nation, we have spent most of our time on issues that cater to special interests.

Instead of helping retirees by strengthening our pension system, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are seeking to dismantle Social Security. They want to take away the safety net, a safety net that seniors depend on, in favor of giving even more money to Wall Street.

Instead of developing a meaningful energy policy to lessen our dependence on foreign oil, we spend time on the House floor passing an energy bill that will do nothing to relieve rising gas prices, but instead give tax incentives to big oil and gas companies.

The Republican leadership must stop abusing this body and the people we represent. They are doing it for their own self-interests, and it is time the people take this House back. It is the people's House.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). 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.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES AND THE COST OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, for those Members who are going home and having town hall meetings and meeting with constituents, the one issue that comes up with almost every small business, big business, medium-sized businesses, and it comes up with families and school boards, as well as coming up with representatives of State legislatures, it is the cost of health care.

One of the issues we talk a lot about in Minnesota, because we are so close to the Canadian border, is the difference between what we pay for prescription drugs and what people on the other side of the Canadian border pay for the same drugs.

I have in my hands two boxes of Celebrex. We had a hearing last week in the Committee on Government Reform and I held these up and asked: Can anyone tell me which one of these drugs came from another country and which one came from the United States? Well, the answer is you cannot tell because they are exactly the same. Another question, though, about the Celebrex, is which one is safe? Well, according to the FDA, and now according to the company itself, depending upon the condition you may have with your heart and blood, neither one of them may actually be safe.

What I want to talk a little bit about tonight is the differences between what we pay here in the United States and what they pay in Germany for the same drugs. I have a list here, and we have some pharmacies now around the world who, on a regular basis, will send us via e-mail what the pricing is right then for anyone who walks in off the street to buy the drugs.

Here are a few examples. I am going to talk later about the drug Nexium. You can buy that at the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany, for $60.25. That same drug, same potency, same everything, made in the same plant, sells at a local pharmacy in Rochester, Minnesota, for $145.33.

Look at Prevacid. In Germany, it is $35.22, American. In the United States it is $146.47. Zocor. This is an interesting drug. You can walk in off the street with a prescription and you can buy it in Germany, 30 tablets, 10 milligrams, for $23.83. That same drug in Rochester, Minnesota, will be $85.

□ 1930

But what I want to talk about is the Germans. Even if we add up 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs, in Germany you can buy all of those for $455.57. Those same drugs in the United States would be more than double that at $1,040.04.

That is bad enough, but what makes it even worse is the Germans are looking at cutting the cost that they paid for prescription drugs. Recently, the German health care system announced that they would not pay for Lipitor. Why not? Well, the ministry decided last year it could no longer cover the high prices of some of the branded drugs because they were deemed to have the same medical efficacy as available generics.

The point is even though they are buying Lipitor considerably cheaper than we buy it here in the United States, they still think it is too much and the manufacturers cannot justify the price.

The other story is from The Washington Post where even the Department of Defense is starting to get it right. They are saying they will not reimburse for Nexium except in rare circumstances. Nexium is the new purple pill, and it came out to replace Prilosec. That is why we have to pay so much for these drugs, because these are blockbuster drugs.

The truth of the matter is by their only filings with the FDA, Nexium is not much more effective than Prilosec. As the Department of Defense says in the article, Nexium is not worth the money. It goes on to say it is pretty dubious to pay $4 a pill for Nexium when over-the-counter Prilosec is 67 cents.

Mr. Speaker, I think Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs. I think we ought to pay our fair share. I think we ought to be willing to subsidize the starving people in sub-Saharan Africa, but I do not think Americans should have to subsidize the starving Swiss. I do not think Americans ought to be forced to pay the world's highest prices for these drugs. No one can tell the difference. These are the same drugs. They come from the same plants; and yet as Members can see, we are paying many times 50, 60, 70 percent more for the same drugs.

I am asking Members to join in this effort by cosponsoring my Pharmaceutical Market Access bill. We have been working on this for several years. It has passed the House a couple of

times. This time I think we can get it past the Senate as well.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND REACHING OUT TO THE MUSLIM WORLD

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration has done a woefully inadequate job of reaching out to the Muslim world. To quote an oft-used phrase, ''They never seem to miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity.''

I believe that fundamentally they fail to understand that most Muslims do not want to blow up Western sites and buildings; they want to live in a free society, one which allows them to worship the God of their choosing and raise their children in safety, much like every American.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration because of this lack of understanding has twisted the September 11 attacks in order to achieve a veritable clash of societies. The President uses phrases like ''us versus them'' and ''you are either with us or against us.'' Quotes like these cause many nonviolent Muslims to oppose the United States as they see a U.S. engaged in a war not against terrorism but against Muslims. They see the United States as a colonial occupier, not as a liberating government.

This has encouraged radical Muslim groups to step up their recruiting and their tactics. The net result is 3½ years after September 11, Americans are much less safe, not safer than they were. Instead of responding by reaching out to the Muslim world to address the root causes of terrorism, deprivation, resource scarcity and lack of educational opportunities, this administration invaded Iraq, a country that was not previously a haven for terrorists and had no relationship whatsoever to the events of September 11.

Regardless, in April 2003, the United States invaded Iraq with the support of a weak coalition of nations. Most countries, even those that fought in the first Gulf War in 1991, chose not to enter the second war in Iraq. They could not legitimize a war based on such faulty and wavering premises as the ones we heard in late 2002 and early 2003.

The war has been a disaster from nearly the beginning. Since April 2003, more than 1,600 American soldiers and at least 24,000 Iraqi civilians have paid for this arrogant foreign policy with their lives. At least another 12,000 Americans soldiers have been seriously wounded and of course the U.S. has incurred a tremendous financial burden, so far a $200 billion IOU.

Instead of addressing the threat of future terrorism by engaging the Muslim world through smart national security policies, the Bush administration took the fight to a country that became a terrorist enclave only after the U.S. invaded. It is quite clear that the war in Iraq was the worst possible response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Instead of stopping terrorism, the war has actually hindered our efforts, including any effort to capture Osama bin Laden.

But fortunately, there is another way. Over the last 2 years, I have developed and refined a national security platform called SMART Security. SMART is Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century. Unlike our current policies, it will achieve real results. SMART Security will ensure America's security by reaching out and engaging the Muslim world. Instead of rushing off to war for the wrong reasons, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues.

There is a demonstrated link between debt relief and lack of support for terrorism, which is why the SMART platform will encourage wealthy nations to provide debt relief and developmental aid for the world's poorest countries.

Not every international problem has a military answer; and that is why SMART Security will prevent terrorism, by addressing the very conditions which give rise to terrorism in the first place.

SMART Security also encourages democracy building, human rights education, conflict resolution through nonmilitary means, educational opportunities for women and girls, and strengthening civil society programs in the developing world.

Programs like these are the best way to encourage democracy in countries like Iraq, not through wars that cause thousands of deaths, cost billions of dollars. The SMART approach is a way to reach out to the Muslim world. It is time we stop putting all of our eggs in the military basket and start getting smart about our national security.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CHARGES DROPPED

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, my intent tonight was to come to the floor and talk about my opposition to CAFTA, which I think is a bad policy for the future of America.

But tonight I am glad to come to the floor after 4 weeks of coming and talking about Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who was charged with murder for actions he took as a Marine officer in Iraq over a year ago. I have been on the floor for 4 weeks saying this man should never have been charged. He did his job as a Marine officer. But because of circumstances of a sergeant who did not like the gentleman, he filed charges 2½ months later.

I am pleased to say this past Friday I was notified by the attorney for Lieutenant Pantano that the hearing officer, Major Wynn at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, in my district, has decided that he will recommend these charges be dropped: two charges of premeditated murder that should never have happened. But Major Wynn will now send his recommendations to General Huck who is in Iraq, and it is my hope and prayer that General Huck will agree with the hearing officer and drop these charges.

Mr. Speaker, what has been said about this is Lieutenant Pantano loves America. He had been a soldier during Desert Storm, came back, went back to his home State of New York, went to college and graduated in 3 years. He went into the stock market selling energy stocks making six figures. But shortly after September 11, he felt a passion because he had his brother and sister killed in the Twin Towers by terrorism, so he went back into the Marine Corps and was made an officer.

Shortly after the shooting in Iraq, he was actually recommended for promotion by the officer in charge, that he was competent and a real leader and the type of person that they needed to promote in the Marine Corps. But 2½ months later, a sergeant who was demoted by Lieutenant Pantano weeks before is the one who made the charges 2½ months later. But the good news tonight is that the hearing officer has made a recommendation that the charges of murder be dropped against Lieutenant Pantano.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I had the pleasure to speak with Mary Pantano who stood by her son for months, and I had the pleasure to talk with her. I was convinced, even before I met her son, who is a wonderful man, I would love to have as a son or son-in-law, and she convinced me her son could not have done anything more than what he should have done as a Marine officer.

So tonight, as I begin to close, I thank God Almighty that he has helped the Pantano family, both the mother; wife, Jill; and the two cute boys who are his sons; and also Lieutenant Pantano.

Mr. Speaker, I close tonight by asking God, I think about our men and women in uniform in Iraq and Afghanistan, how difficult it must be for them

to do their job. But yet they are there and they are willing to do their job, and they are proud to be American soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, bless their families, bless the job that they are doing for this world to bring peace. I ask God for the families that have lost loved ones, that they be remembered with our blessings and prayers.

With that I ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

FAILED TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago, President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a one-sided plan to benefit multinational corporations at the expense of the United States and Central American workers, small farmers, and small business people. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration has been ratified by Congress within 60 days of its signing.

But CAFTA has languished in Congress for nearly 1 year. Why? Because this wrong-headed trade agreement offends both Republicans and Democrats. Just look at what has happened with our trade policy. In 1992, the year I first ran for Congress, was elected later that year, that year our trade deficit, meaning the amount of dollars we imported versus exported, our trade deficit was $38 billion in 1992. Last year in 2004, it was $618 billion. It is hard to argue our trade policy is working when the deficit goes from $38 billion to $618 billion in just 12 years.

Opponents to the Central American Free Trade Agreement know it is an extension of NAFTA, which clearly did not work for our country. It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement, the President says it will mean more jobs for Americans, more manufacturing done in the United States, it will mean more economic prosperity and profits for U.S. companies. It will mean a rising standard of living in the developing world; it will mean more involvement, a higher standard of living in the developing world, and more workers working.

□ 1945

But it never works that way. So now they are trying this year because our trade policy clearly is not working, those promises every year, every trade agreement, never pan out.

This year the administration is tying the Central American Free Trade Agreement, saying it is not just going to ensure growth, it is going to help democracy in the developing world. Both Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld have said CAFTA will help in the war on terror, but 10 years of the North American Free Trade Agreement has done nothing to improve border security between Mexico and the United States, so that argument simply does not sell.

So they tried something else. Last week the U.S. Chamber of Commerce flew six Central American presidents around our country hoping they might be able to sell CAFTA. They went to Albuquerque, they went to Los Angeles, they went to Cincinnati, Ohio, in my State, trying to convince the media, trying to convince the public, trying to convince Members of Congress that CAFTA was a good idea.

Again they failed. The Costa Rican president after the trip announced his country would not ratify CAFTA unless an independent commission could determine the agreement will not hurt the working poor in his country.

The most powerful Republican in the House, Majority Leader TOM DELAY, even promised a vote on CAFTA by Memorial Day to try to drum up support in Congress. As you can see by this calendar, we are barely a week away from that deadline, the deadline to vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, set by Majority Leader Tom DeLay, the most powerful Republican in this Chamber. Echoed by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, BILL THOMAS, they said there would be a vote by the end of this month. That is the 1-year anniversary of CAFTA. Remember, every other trade agreement was voted on within 2 months. This one has been a year. As you can see by the calendar, it has simply not happened. That is again because of the failures of NAFTA.

Last month, two dozen Democrats and Republicans in Congress joined more than 150 business groups and labor organizations saying vote ''no'' on the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Last week, more than 400 union workers and Members of Congress gathered in front of the U.S. Capitol delivered the same message, vote ''no'' on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, because Republicans and Democrats, labor and business, know what the administration refuses to admit, that CAFTA is about one thing. It is not about more manufacturing in the United States. It is not about creating jobs in the United States. It is one thing only. It is access to cheap Central American labor.

That is why CAFTA, like NAFTA, is not a trade agreement, it is an outsourcing agreement. It will move more American jobs offshore. It will mean more profits for large businesses and more hurt for small businesses, more hurt for small farmers. Congress must throw out this dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA and negotiate a trade agreement that will lift up workers in Central America.

When students such as those I met with today at Longfellow Elementary School in Lorain, Ohio, are guaranteed good-paying jobs when they graduate from high school, then we will know finally our trade policy is working.

JUDICIAL NOMINEES

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time in the life of America. Our colleagues in the United States Senate are imminently approaching a crossroads that will forever impact the future of this Republic. They will choose the road that will restore the constitutional balance of power that our Founding Fathers so carefully constructed, or they will travel down that path that rewards a shameless behavior that has deliberately injured this delicate balance by transferring the executive power of judicial appointment to the legislative minority.

The Constitution's advice and consent has been twisted into mockery by the Senate minority. Men and women of outstanding character have come forth as judicial nominees to be undeservedly maligned, smeared, ridiculed and then left in nominations limbo indefinitely by this unprecedented, unconstitutional and outrageous judicial filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, this is a show of disregard and contempt for the world's flagship of freedom and toward her people and toward the time-honored principles of the United States Senate. We will recapture the civility that once presided over judicial appointments or we will forever surrender what Abraham Lincoln called ''the angels of our better nature'' to this bitterly partisan tactic that threatens the constitutional prerogative of the President of the United States to appoint good, decent and honorable men and women to the Federal judiciary.

Advice and consent is clearly written in the United States Constitution. This judicial filibuster to prevent a fair up-or-down vote is neither advice nor consent and, Mr. Speaker, it is not in the United States Constitution. Never before 2003, in 214 years of U.S. Senate deliberations, has any judicial nomination supported by the majority of the Senate been denied a fair up-or-down vote. Yet the minority would have the public believe that the majority is the one trying to change the rules here, calling it the nuclear option. It is the Senate minority, Mr. Speaker, that has launched this unprecedented, quote, nuclear option by devastating the constitutionally required just consideration of judicial nominees duly appointed by the President of the United States.

What the majority seeks is the constitutional option that is totally in keeping with 214 years of the rules, traditions and dignity of the United States Senate. Senate Democrats have strongly and arrogantly and openly

threatened to shut down the operations of the government if Republicans insist on the constitutional option. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is far better to let the Democrats shut down this government temporarily than it is to allow them to shut down this Republic permanently.

In this critical struggle for the future of this Republic, one of two things will occur. Either the time-honored and tested provision of advice and consent, written in the Constitution, will prevail or unprecedented judicial filibuster and obstructionism will take its place and become the tragic legacy of these days.

Mr. Speaker, I should not have to remind my Republican colleagues that the people who have entrusted us with this majority have spoken with resounding voice on the issue of judicial nominations. They hear it and I hear it everywhere I go. The people of America have a profound sense of fair play and they are tired of some of their United States Senators cowering behind a distorted version of the true and impeccable auspices of the United States Senate. The people want their Senators to have the courage to take a stand on judicial nominations. The people want a fair up-or-down vote on judges, Mr. Speaker, and they will remember those who have the courage to do so and, sir, they will remember those who did not.

The people understand how important this really is. They understand that it is truly about the Constitution itself, and they innately embrace the core message of those magnificent words by Daniel Webster when he said, ''Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution, and to the Republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world.''

Mr. Speaker, the stakes could not be higher and this Republic truly hangs in the balance. We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to pass this miracle of the American constitutional Republic on to future generations that are yet to be. We owe it to the American people, we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to those future generations and we owe it to that vision of human freedom that our forefathers risked their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to entrust to us.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail.

INNOVATION CRISIS IS A HOMELAND SECURITY ISSUE

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, this week we are considering legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security. These are necessary, important pieces of legislation, two bills we are taking up, that will help protect our homeland from terrorist threats and make the type of investments we need to make in areas of our airports, ports, roads, chemical facilities and nuclear facilities. Overall the homeland security bill funding will increase by 4 percent.

But while we are focused on defending ourselves from terrorists here in the United States and fighting terrorists in Iraq, one has to wonder whether we are not missing some other threats that are looming on the horizon that America must protect themselves. Friday in the New York Times, Tom Friedman mentioned that the University of Illinois recently tied for 17th place in the world finals of a major computer competition. That is the university that also helped develop the Internet.

Seventeenth was the best of any U.S. university and the worst we have done in 29 years of the competition. Who was number one? Shanghai, China. Second place and third place were won, respectively, by Moscow State University and St. Petersburg Institute of Fine Mechanics and Optics. The last time an American university won the competition was 1997. I do not think I have to remind anyone here that the modern computer and the field of computer science was invented here in the United States, and yet the best we can do is 17th. But it is not just in computers and the computer competition that America's place in the world has fallen.

Last year, the Chinese produced 160,000 more engineers than we did. Nearly 40 percent of all the U.S. jobs in a science or technology field that require a Ph.D. are filled by foreigners, up from 25 percent in just 15 years. We now rank below 13 other countries, including Japan, South Korea and Germany, in the percentage of 24-year-olds with a college degree in science and engineering. That is down from third place just 25 years ago.

And according to the National Science Teachers Association, just 26 percent of recent high school graduates scored high enough on their ACT science test to have a good chance of completing a first-year college science course.

I say all this because it is about the foundation and this competition and this area that is going to lay the groundwork for whether America keeps its economic and competitive edge with the rest of the world. What would you think if that was the type of threat that you saw coming to the United States? What type of preparation would you do? We know what we are doing on homeland security. We created a new department. We are increasing its funding. What do we do as it relates to this type of falling down and declining percentages of Americans leading in the area of science and technology?

The recent budget we passed here cuts basic research by 13 percent. It cuts applied research by 15 percent. Investments in research facilities and equipment are cut by 68 percent. We have to rely on Russians to service the International Space Station because we are cutting basic research funding at NASA by 7 percent. We are cutting the funding for the Department of Education. State grants for innovative education programs were cut by $100 million. Funding for the improvement of postsecondary education was gutted by $140 million.

These are not the type of priorities that understand the threat to the United States economic future and the type of global economy and global competition this country is facing. We are living on past times and on borrowed time in the area of science and technology, but that is not how the Chinese, Indians, Japanese, Germans and others across Europe are facing this competition.

America did well in 17th place. It can do better. The way it does better is it makes the type of investments in our universities. It allows the people in our high schools and in our colleges to understand the priorities. Unfortunately the budget we voted on did not reflect America's future and investment in its future. What it says is that as we deal with the terrorist threat of homeland security and increasing the funding by 4 percent, increasing our defense budget, making cuts in basic research and basic funding, and I did not add into that area, in the National Institutes of Health for the first time in over 15 years that budget was held without an increase, which basically means a cut.

These are not the type of investments of a major economy, the leader in the global economy, that builds and plans for the future. These are the cuts of an economy and an administration that does not see its vision for America's future as bright and as strong as the past and it is clearly not putting its money toward that investment. It is high time that we understand that as we take up these two pieces of legislation this week on homeland security, we understand there are other threats to the United States, ones that are looming on the horizon and coming to shore, and that is in the area of technology and competing against the Chinese and the Indians and we are not having a budget that reflects the types of investments we need to do.

CONGRATULATING WINFRED ORRELL

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor 30 years of service by Cobb County history teacher Winfred ''Windy'' Orrell, who is retiring from teaching this Friday, May 20. With admirable dedication, Mr. Orrell served his students not only in the classroom but also on the field as a coach for the football, baseball, track and cross-country teams at Campbell and Cobb County High Schools.

While some in Hollywood may know him as Julia Roberts' history teacher, Coach Orrell is most famous in Cobb County for his colorful history reenactments. His reenactment of the Battle of Vicksburg is legendary among his students as he crawls on his belly with imaginary rifle in hand, moving in and out of imaginary trenches. Mr. Orrell's desk has represented many ships, including the Alabama and the Bismarck. He knows how to get the very best out of every one of his students because he makes history enjoyable and memorable.

□ 2000

Mr. Orrell honed his skills at West Georgia College, where former Speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich, was his teacher. Mr. Orrell's gifts of teaching earned him two Campbell High School Teacher of the Year honors and five Star Teacher awards. He served as a social studies department head at Campbell High School for 15 years and at South Cobb High for 2.

He started teaching AP courses, advanced placement, in 1982 in the earliest days of the program and served as a successful example for the budding AP program across the State of Georgia.

As much as he loves teaching gifted students, Coach Orrell will be the first to tell us that the greatest moments of his teaching career have been helping those students in need, students that were disconnected from the school community and disillusioned with learning. He found great joy in restoring their hope and belief in the value of education. He let them know he believed in them and they had the capacity to learn and to achieve their goals.

Mr. Orrell has influenced his students and even other teachers. He leaves each school a better place to teach and learn than when he arrived. And his departure on Friday will be no different.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to join me in congratulating Coach Windy Orrell for his service to teaching, providing inspiration to future leaders, and helping make Cobb County a standard bearer for Georgia education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. HERSETH. 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 gentlewoman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

ELLSWORTH BRAC ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my profound disappointment and flat disagreement with the Department of Defense's recommendation to close Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota as a part of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. This recommendation is as misguided as they come.

While the BRAC process is necessary to ensure that our Armed Forces can efficiently and adequately serve our military needs at home and abroad into the 21st century, this decision does not accurately reflect the value of Ellsworth to that cause.

As Lead Wing for the Aerospace Expeditionary Force, the 28th Bomb Wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base played a decisive role in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. As they did in Kosovo and Afghanistan, the B–1 and her crews from Ellsworth Air Force Base performed superbly. During Operation Iraqi Freedom, B–1s played a vital role in helping liberate Iraq by dropping more than half the satellite-guided munitions. Ellsworth once again demonstrated that it is the backbone of America's bomber fleet and the base has fulfilled its missions admirably. This is a modern, well-equipped installation that has served our country for decades and is prepared to serve for decades to come. Ellsworth has substantially upgraded its infrastructure since the last round of base closures, which will allow Ellsworth to accept new missions and continue to grow. Rather than closing, Ellsworth is well situated to receive additional assignments.

In addition, Ellsworth's geographic and strategic strengths are many. Located in western South Dakota, Ellsworth is strategically positioned and is not threatened by urban encroachment or crowded air space, major factors that have not been given appropriate weight by the Department of Defense. In addition, the base is close to bomber training facilities in the region.

I am also concerned the Secretary of Defense did not adequately consider the benefits of locating military bases in rural regions. A disproportionate number of bases recommended for closure realignment resulting in a disproportionate number of lost jobs are in rural States such as Alaska, Maine, North Dakota, and South Dakota. This oversight is part and parcel of a continued disregard for not only the needs of rural America but the unique value and strengths rural America offers to our country as a whole.

Additionally, commencing a round of base closures during a time of war is questionable strategy and could be harmful to our national security. The current round of domestic base closures should wait until after the Department of Defense completes its plans to bring troops back to the United States from overseas bases. I am also concerned about the risks associated with consolidating all of our B–1 bombers in a single location.

Furthermore, I am concerned that we are making base closure decisions prior to the Quadrennial Defense Review for 2005. The Quadrennial Defense Review analyzes force structure, modernization plans, military infrastructure, and the defense budget to help establish a roadmap for defense programs. It cannot be ignored before assessing base realignments and closures.

Finally, the economic impact of closing Ellsworth Air Force Base on South Dakota would be dramatic. Our State would lose our second largest employer and an estimated $278 million a year. The loss of nearly 4,000 jobs would set South Dakota almost a year back in statewide job growth.

I have invited the chairman of the BRAC Commission, Anthony Principi, and other members of the commission to visit Ellsworth Air Force Base and hold one of their regional field hearings in Rapid City, home to Ellsworth. A visit to Ellsworth will allow the commission the opportunity to see what those of us from South Dakota already know: the B–1 bomber and Ellsworth Air Force Base are irreplaceable and crucial to our national security.

As the BRAC Commission moves forward and reviews the Department of Defense's recommendations, I am confident the BRAC Commission will realize the Department of Defense deviated substantially from their established base closure criteria when recommending Ellsworth for closure and will support removing it from the list.

THE FILIBUSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week the Senate has returned, and I believe America's eyes will focus on whether or not this Congress has the integrity and respect for the institution to be reminded of the principles of democracy, which is that where there is a majority and a minority, a democratic nation respects the power, or at least the rights, of the minority.

We have heard this discussion about nonnuclear and nuclear and filibuster center around some suggestion that those who are opposing the elimination of such would, frankly, be considered antireligious, antipatriotic, and antidemocratic, as I listened to my good friend on the other side of the aisle even cite the Constitution to suggest that the Constitution provides the right of an up-or-down vote on Presidential judicial nominees.

The Constitution is large and small. Small in words, but large in its power. And it does say that the Senate gives

the advice and consent on the Supreme Court judges. It does not extend it to what we call Article III judges; but by inference, we would imagine that the Senate gives the advice and consent to the President on nominations, which includes the Supreme Court and made by inference these nominations.

But this question of filibuster is not issue oriented. It is not about judges being confirmed or wars being fought. It is about protecting the minority.

I might suggest to my good friends that I wish that we had participated in a filibuster in the fall of 2002 when this administration came to this Congress and argued that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and that those weapons were pointed at the very heart and soul and minds of Americans and we were under immediate danger. It was a very difficult time. So many of us questioned the intelligence of the evidence, asked whether or not there were other alternatives or other options, asked the administration to go to the United Nations, and there was a lukewarm response.

Based upon the loss of life that we have experienced over the last 3 years, the amputees, the young men and women who have come home traumatized, needing mental health services, those who committed suicide, the families who buried their loved ones, I wish that the rights of the minority had been protected. But, more importantly, I wish that those who had the privilege of filibuster had stood on the floor of the House and filibustered this decision to go to war.

So there is value to that. There is value to the idea of protecting the rights of the minority. And that value, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a democracy. So I am saddened that the leader of the other body would even think that because they have not been able to get their way, the majority, that the rights of the minority should be extinguished or denied.

Let me say again this is not a question of a pointed rejection of the President's right to nominate. This is the sanctity and integrity of a procedure that allows the minority to be heard in opposition to the decisions being made by the majority.

I want to remind my colleagues that I stand here as an African American who lived for a very long time as a second class citizen in the United States of America. No, not me personally in terms of age, but the history of African Americans first came as two thirds of a person. The laws were against us. So in the early 1960s after Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, President Lyndon Baines Johnson brought to this Congress the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1965 Voter Rights Act. And, Mr. Speaker, what were called the Dixiecrats and others took to the floor of the Senate and filibustered those bills, and they talked and they talked and they talked and they talked. If there ever was a time for us to begin to look at why that procedure should be eliminated, that was the time.

But those of us, young as we might have been, our advocates, our lawyers, our organizations from SCLC to the Urban League to APRI to the NAACP, organizations that had marched with Martin Luther King, never for once stood up and said get rid of the filibuster which protects the rights of minorities. It is not time at this time to do that, Mr. Speaker. If the judges cannot pass muster, protect the rights of the minority, it is not an issue of the judges and an issue of the war. It is a right of the minority to be protected, and the filibuster does that. And I ask the Senate to step away from any nuclear option and respect the integrity of this place.

SOCIAL SECURITY, PRIVATE ACCOUNTS, AND PAY EQUITY

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 of this year, we observed Equal Pay Day, a day that indicates just how far into each year a woman must work to earn as much as a man earned in the previous year. Because women on average earn less than men, they must work longer for the same pay.

While many of my colleagues have addressed the impact of the pay gap on working women, I want to call attention today to how Social Security reduces this inequity for women in retirement in a way that private accounts will not.

It is no surprise that women are particularly wary of President Bush's proposed private accounts for Social Security. Women are more likely than men to depend on Social Security for their financial well-being, not only in retirement but throughout their lives, through survivorships and disability benefits.

The vast majority of Social Security recipients are women, representing almost 60 percent of all beneficiaries age 65 and over. And an even higher percentage of women that are seniors and are in older age groups are on Social Security. Unfortunately, women still make less money than men, about 76 cents on the dollar, and usually work fewer years than men. Social Security provides proportionately higher benefits for lower earners; so the progressive benefit structure counteracts the pay and pension gaps that women experience during their working years.

As this chart shows, women typically earn about 24 percent less than men. Since their lifetime earnings are lower than men's, they receive smaller Social Security benefits than men, but the gap is narrower. The typical woman's Social Security benefit is only 17 percent lower than the typical man's, narrowing the gap by almost one third. In contrast, private accounts would preserve the wage gap. The typical woman would accumulate 24 percent less in her private account than the typical man.

By taking time out of the workforce to raise children or care for ailing parents or spouses, women typically lose more than a decade of earnings.

□ 2015

This second chart shows the impact that time out of the workplace would have on private account accumulations. A man born today with average earnings throughout his career who diverted 4 percent of his earnings into a private account would accumulate about $204,000. A woman who earned 24 percent less each year would only accumulate about $155,000. If she took 10 years out of the workforce, her private account accumulation would drop to about $112,000, just over half what the typical man would accumulate. If she only took 5 years out of the workforce, her private account accumulation would drop to about $132,000, 35 percent less than what the typical man would accumulate.

Women are also more likely to work part-time, less likely to be covered by an employer-sponsored pension plan, and more likely to work in low-paying fields. As a result, they have lower lifetime earnings, making Social Security a larger portion of their retirement income.

Because women earn less, they would have less to invest in private accounts than men and more to lose from the substantial benefit cuts under the kind of privatization plan the President supports. The President's preferred plan requires cutting guaranteed benefits by more than 25 percent, even for middle class workers, and even for those who choose not to invest in private accounts. Meanwhile, those that do choose a private account also would be hit with a privatization tax of 70 percent or more of the value of their account, which would be deducted from their Social Security benefits upon retirement. Because Social Security helps level the playing field for women, cutting their benefits would make it even harder for women to achieve financial security in retirement.

Without Social Security, more than half of white and Hispanic senior women and almost two-thirds of African American senior women would live in poverty. Also, because women live longer, whatever they are able to save in private accounts would have to be stretched to cover more years in their senior years. Unlike private savings, you cannot outlive Social Security, and the benefits are not eroded over time by inflation.

The President is having a hard time convincing the American people, especially women, that private accounts would be better for American families than Social Security, and rightly so. It has touched so many of our lives. Social Security is an insurance program, not an investment plan, and private accounts would destroy much of the insurance value of the program.

The President's private accounts pose a serious threat to the future economic security of all Americans. Private accounts would cut Social Security's funding, weaken the program, and make its financial problems worse, not better. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan told Congress that private accounts would do absolutely nothing to improve Social Security's solvency. The government would have to borrow nearly $5 trillion over 20 years to fund private accounts. That would increase interest rates, harm our economy, and lead to large tax increases.

Democrats want to work with President Bush to strengthen Social Security for the long term, but we need to get it right. Clearly, women are disadvantaged when facing retirement. They are paid less and work fewer years than men, on average. Any reform that is enacted must keep the safety net intact. Our mothers, our daughters, and our granddaughters are counting on us.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2360, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–83) on the resolution (H. Res. 278) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE ON ENERGY

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise again to address a topic of immediate and great importance to our Nation. I will be joined this evening in this discussion by my fellow scientist, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT). He is in the life sciences primarily, although he has done work in the physical sciences. I am a physicist by training, a nuclear physicist to be more precise, and we hope to give a scientific perspective on the issue of energy.

There are a number of topics I wish to discuss relating to this, but let me first say that as scientists we have a unique perspective on energy, because we have had to deal with it in both a theoretical and a pragmatic way. As a result of this, and our scientific training and analysis, and graphing, we developed a perspective which I believe is accurate, but which is not widely held, except by a few far-seeing energy companies and energy analysts.

And I would also like to mention, if I may, that we covered much of this material last week, and I apologize to my colleagues for repeating it, but I have received a lot of questions and comments regarding the comments we made, and I felt in order to review it appropriately we would have to cover all of the material, but in a somewhat more cursory fashion. In addition, this evening we are going to add another dimension to the topic, and that is to discuss its relevance for national and economic security. So I hope that those who have listened to and seen the presentation last week will enjoy this one, again, because it will be somewhat modified.

The first point I would like to make about energy is that it is unique. Energy is unique, and unique means there is nothing else like it. That is very true about energy. Let me describe two, just two factors about energy that demonstrate this.

First of all, energy is our most basic natural resource. Why? Because without it, we cannot use our other natural resources. Just think about any natural resource you might wish to use, whether it is copper or iron or some other natural resource. Suppose you want to use some copper, you want to do some plumbing in your house or you want to run some copper wires through your house. Where do you get the copper? You have to dig copper ore out of the ground. It takes energy to do that. Once you get the copper out of the ground, you have to process it. You have to smelt it or use some similar process for that to purify the copper. That takes energy. Then you have to transport it to the fabrication plant. If you are going to use copper for plumbing, then you have to transport it to a plant that can convert it to tubing. It takes energy to transport it to the plant, and then it takes energy to manufacture the tubing from the copper. And when you finally finish, it takes energy to transport the copper to the store near your home, and it takes energy for you and your car to drive down and buy it and drive it back home, and finally, you install the copper. Every single step of the way of using that natural resource, that copper, involved the use of energy, and that is why I say energy is our most basic natural resource, because without it we cannot access and use our other natural resources.

The second unique aspect to energy as a resource is that it is a nonrecyclable resource. Once you use it, it is gone. Now, that is not true of copper. You use copper tubing, and eventually the house may be demolished, you can save the copper and recycle it and use it over and over. The same with iron. The same with many other natural resources. But with energy, it is different. The laws of thermodynamics are very explicit and the laws of thermodynamics are laws of physics that have been known for over a century, well over a century, and there have been no violations observed to those laws. These are laws of nature governing our creation.

One aspect of that energy is it is a nonrecyclable resource. Once you use it, it is gone. You put a tank full of gasoline into your car, you drive your car around, and a week later it is all gone. There is nothing left to recycle. It is energy that has been converted into kinetic energy of motion into friction, and eventually all of it gets converted into heat and radiates out into space.

Now, an important side effect of this, of our dependence on energy as being the most basic natural resource and something we cannot recycle, is that the price of energy affects our economy more than the price of almost any other resource. So when the price of gasoline goes up, it has a dramatic affect on us, but even more than that, and an even more dramatic affect, is the price of energy affects the cost of manufacturing something, the cost of digging it out of the ground. So when the price of energy goes up, the cost of living goes up because the price of almost everything goes up.

Let us take a look at something else about energy, another aspect. Energy appears to be intangible. You cannot really detect energy very well with your senses, and energy has many, many different forms. But you cannot touch it, see it, feel it, smell it, or taste it, except for light and heat; those are pretty obvious to our senses of seeing and the sense of feeling something hot. But energy is largely intangible. And, for most people, the only tangible aspect of energy is the price at the gas pump and the utility bill at the end of the month, and that is how you tell when you have used energy and how much you have used.

Now, it is different for scientists. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) and I recognize the nature of energy because we have worked with it so much. To us energy is very tangible and we can develop a sense of feeling for energy and when it is being used, but for most people it is not. That leads me to a comment that I made a number of times: I wish energy were purple. I really wish energy were purple, because if energy were purple we could see it, we could all see it. We could see when it is being used, when it is being wasted. And if in the middle of winter you drive up to your house and you look at your house and see purple oozing through the walls, you say, I better get better insulation in this house. Or you see rivulets of purple running from your windows and doors, you say, I have to tighten up those windows and doors. I cannot have all that money being wasted in energy. But we cannot see it, so we do not know it. If energy were purple, we would see how cars use it when they go by us on the freeway, we would see it around us in many different ways, and we would certainly treat it more carefully and certainly try to save more money by saving more energy.

Something else about energy I have pointed out before is how important it

is, that energy actually, as its very base, affects civilization. And by proof of that statement, I just offer two things. The reason it does affect civilization, by the way, is because energy represents the ability to do work. That is the actual definition in physics, and that relates to some of the ways that we use energy in everyday language. Have you ever gotten up in the morning and said, boy, I am full of energy today. I cannot wait to get out there and chop some wood. Or other mornings you wake up and you say, oh, I am so tired, I do not have any energy today; I do not think I can do anything. That is reflecting this statement.

Now, how does energy affect civilization? As I said, I give two examples. The first is use of nonhuman energy; in other words, the use of domesticated animals led to the agricultural revolution. People tried agriculture before the agricultural revolution took hold. It did not work. But once they developed a way to use nonhuman energy, they had animals pulling the plows, then it worked, because there was enough more energy added to the mix so that it actually helped advance the agricultural revolution and changed civilization.

Thousands of years later, we developed another use of energy, the first use of nonanimal energy. We turned away from domestic animals and we started developing engines, motors, tractors, things that could do work for us, and we ran those by using fossil fuels, first coal and then petroleum, oil, and natural gas. And that led to the industrial revolution, the second major revolution that historians talk about.

□ 2030

So energy has a dramatic effect on civilization. Now, how do we deal with energy use? And I have been amazed at the number of comments and telephone calls that I have received since we have put this on the board last week and talked about it, people who are intrigued by this as a very useful model.

And let me talk about this. Let us just look at the left-hand side first. We will talk about income savings and inheritance. Now, these terms are all familiar to everyone. Most of us try to get a job so that we have some income. This is the way we handle our money. We try to live within our means, within our income.

We also try to build up the savings account for special occasions, special events, saving money towards a car or a refrigerator, washing machine. And then some of us are fortunate enough to get an inheritance. So that is the way we handle our money.

Now, a model for responsible energy use is to look at energy in the same way. We have an income of energy on this planet. Where does it come from? Most of it comes from the sun. We have what is called solar energy which has many different forms. We receive it mostly as light from the sun. And it takes 8 minutes to get here from the sun.

But the sun produces vast amounts of energy. And so we have a lot of solar energy impinging on the Earth at all times. That energy, a lot of it, goes into growing plants. We refer to that as biomass. And we take these plants, and we can burn that to extract energy from it.

Solar energy through differential heating of the atmosphere creates wind. And we can tap into wind energy. That is another way of using solar energy. Hydropower. Building big dams and backing up the water behind them, and having them turn the turbines so we generate the electricity. That again is solar energy. The sun's energy evaporating the water from the oceans and the lakes gets into the atmosphere, it rains down on the Earth behind the dams, and the water shed, we get to collect it behind the dams. So that is another way of using solar energy.

Wave energy. Waves are generated by the winds, which are generated by the sun's energy. So another way to tap solar energy. And, finally, tidal energy, which comes from the tides, which are generated by the motion of the Moon.

Now, all of those are sources of income for our energy mix. And if we are wise, we will try to live within our energy income, just as we try to have our families live within our personal income. So that is the best use of energy, try to use our income energy.

What about the savings? What does that represent? Well, first of all, in wood, solar energy helps grow the trees. The trees become very large. There is a lot of energy there. We can burn the wood as the people in this planet did for many millennia. But also there are other savings accounts we have below the surface.

Coal, oil, natural gas, all of them are captured solar energy. Energy that grows plants, the plants died, they decayed. And in the process of decaying, they are transformed into other chemicals. But they still return energy from the sun. And so we have a savings account on the surface of the Earth; we have the wood.

Underneath the Earth, underneath the surface we have coal, oil, natural gas. And this is over-simplified. I can name other examples.

Finally, an inheritance. These came with the Earth. As the Earth was created, it was very hot. Hot body. And a lot of that heat is still there underneath the surface of the Earth. In fact, the center of the Earth is molten iron. So it has a lot of heat there. And we could tap that inheritance, if we wish.

Also nuclear energy. That was there from the beginning of the Earth, and through radioactive decay. It has changed over the years. Nevertheless there is still a lot of nuclear energy available to us if we mine appropriate ores and use it properly.

So income, savings, inheritance. We should live within our income. We should use our savings only for emergencies, and inheritance, tap into that when we need it; but if you have a good inheritance, you can tap into it for quite a while. The savings is where we are exceeding our quota; and my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) will talk about that a bit later, and particularly the fact that we have finite resources of coal and natural gas and we should be quite careful in how we use those resources because there are not that many.

I am not saying we should not use them; but the point is, if we use them, we should use them to help develop other energy sources so that our children and grandchildren will have energy available for use.

Now, let me add something else that is of extreme importance on this issue. And these are quotes that are taken from the document prepared by the Energy Future Coalition and contained in a letter addressed to President Bush from representatives of this Energy Future Coalition. I cannot list all of the names corresponding to this, but Frank Gaffney was a leader in this, and James Woolsey, former Director of the CIA, certainly someone who knows about security, C. Boyden Gray, Robert McFarlane, and many others signed this document, including a number of our military people.

And I bring this forward because too many people in America have this idea somehow that conserving energy, using energy carefully, living within your income is some fuzzy-headed liberal idea. I am only pointing out here it is a national security issue as well, and we have got some very conservative individuals and military people who are signing and saying, well, the policy we are pursuing is not a good one.

First quote: ''U.S. dependence on foreign petroleum poses a serious risk to our national and homeland security as well as our economic well-being.'' Why is that? Because if it is from foreign countries, first of all, we have to buy it. That contributes to an economic problem, namely, our deficit, a trade deficit.

But, secondly, much of the money is going to people who really are not that friendly to us, and, in fact, some are downright enemies. So dependence on foreign petroleum poses a serious risk to our national and homeland security.

Another quote from the document: ''Some foreign interests have used oil revenues to purchase destabilizing weapons or to support terrorism.'' Where do you think Osama bin Laden got the money that he used to attack New York, destroy the Twin Towers and kill 3,000 Americans? It was not his personal fortune, although that also came from oil; but it came from many, many of the dollars that we sent overseas to buy oil.

And it really irritates me. It burns me up that our Nation is sending money abroad to people who are using it to, in turn, attack us. I would also say the same, incidentally, about the

drug trade, because much of the drug money has been used also in the war on terror against us.

Two other quotes in the document from the Energy Future Coalition, and the letter addressed to the President: ''We must act now. Technologies exist today that can improve efficiency and produce clean domestic petroleum substitutes.'' There is no question about that. But they need some development money to really get going.

And some of these technologies are, for example, improved nuclear reactors. They will be safer and operate more efficiently. No green-house gases produced. We can do a much better job with that, but also with photovoltaics.

I have a report here which appeared in the American Physical Society News in April, about photovoltaics, so-called solar cells, which are now becoming very efficient and very soon will reach the point where they can be used, for example, as shingles on houses.

So on a house, you cannot only put shingles on your house to protect it from the rain, but also to generate electricity, to operate your appliances, your lights and everything inside the house.

Another important point from the Energy Future Coalition, and that is that the cost of action is far smaller than the risk of inaction. And there is no excuse for further delay. I totally agree with the comments in their letter; and I hope that we can, as a Nation, act on this, these ideas, and not only improve our energy future but also improve our national security.

Well, basically, I have been talking about energy because I hope this will help all of my colleagues and our Nation to appreciate energy. My hope is that a better understanding of energy will lead to a wiser use of it by our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I am pleased to turn it over to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT); and he will talk, as I said earlier, about petroleum reserves and what we are doing with our petroleum, and how we are using it so rapidly that the price is going up, as we know every time we go to the gas station, and it is going to get worse and worse until we take appropriate action.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the data that led these 30 people you mentioned, Jim Woolsey and Frank Gaffney, and there were about a dozen admirals and generals, and several retired heads of agencies in the government that signed that letter, these were really thought leaders in the country.

And the data that they quoted that led them to write that letter is what is on the board here. We have only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves. But we use 25 percent of the world's oil. And let me digress for just a moment. I have not been enthusiastic about drilling in ANWR, because if you have only 2 percent of the known reserves of oil in the world, and if ANWR is a part of that 2 percent, I am having some trouble understanding why it is a good idea to use that 2 percent up as quickly as possible.

Certainly we need oil, but we will need it in the future if our economy continues to grow even more than we need it now. So I think we need to reflect a bit on whether it is a good idea to exploit that resource now.

We import about two-thirds of the oil we use. And the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) said that is just going down hill from the direction we ought to be going, because during the Arab oil embargo, we imported only about a third of the oil that we used, and you may remember then the long lines at the service stations and a few fights over it, I think a death or two.

And you may remember that gas guzzling cars, you could hardly give them away. And now when we are importing two-thirds of our oil rather than a third of our oil, suddenly SUVs and pickup trucks represent more than half of the personal vehicles sold in the country.

So these 30 world and United States leaders who wrote this letter referred to this data. They said, Mr. President, this is an unacceptable national security risk. We cannot be using 25 percent of the world's oil, have only 2 percent of the reserves, and import two-thirds of what we use from other countries without having a big unacceptable national security risk.

And they noted, and the President agreed, because I have heard him say it more than once, that much of that oil we imported comes from countries that do not even like us very much.

This is indeed a big national security concern. Two other bullets on the chart point out some relevant factors that we need to be concerned with. First of all, the bullet here that says we are 5 percent, we are a bit less than that, actually about 1 percent out of 22 in the world, less than 5 percent of the world's population, and having only 2 percent of the known reserves, and using 25 percent of the world's oil, two-thirds of it coming to us from other countries, much of it from across the seas.

If those shipping lanes were interrupted or if there was some impediment to the flow of oil through some choke points in the world, we really could have an economy at risk.

One other thing that I wanted to denote, and that is from this little 2 percent of the reserves that we have, we are producing 8 percent of the world's oil. We are pretty good at pumping oil. That is both good news and bad news. It is good news in that we are importing only two-thirds of what we use. If we were not so good at sucking that oil out of the ground, we would be importing more than two-thirds of what we use.

The bad news is that it is going to be gone sooner doing that. And the more efficient we become at pumping these reserves the more quickly they will be exhausted.

□ 2045

The Chinese recognize that we are pretty good at this, and as the next chart shows here, they have been scouring the world for oil. And they were in our country a week or two ago and what they were doing is talking with our technical people, how do you could it? How do you get that oil out of the ground from these wells that were nearly exhausted?

This chart shows the world, and by the way, this green here for Russia should come around the other side because that is Russia there right next to Alaska. Russia spans 11 time zones. They are now a major oil exporter.

One of the few countries that probably has several years before they peak in their, they have peaked but that peak is being stretched out because of very poor performance when the Soviet Union was disintegrating. So they have a ways to go before they are on the steep down slope of a curve that we are going to talk about in a minute. But what this shows is all of the places in the world that they have gone to and secured contracts, and in some places bought assets to make sure that they have access to the world's oil.

They are in our backyard. They have contracts in Canada. They have contracts in Colombia, in Venezuela, in Brazil, in Argentina, in Africa, several in the Middle East. They are now meeting with Russia to build a very large pipeline from the Sakhalin Island region, the Russian far east to get oil down to China and perhaps on down to the Korean Peninsula.

China's economy is growing very rapidly, 10 percent last year, about the same the year before. They increased their oil imports last year about 25 percent. I have a set of exponential curves that we will show in a moment that show what those growth rates mean, but we are focusing on energy this evening with particular reference to national security. And China recognizes their dependence on oil, not only are they scouring the world for oil, they have noted that they are dependent on the shipping lanes to get their oil. And they are now aggressively building a blue water navy.

There is no other country other than the United States that has a blue water navy. By that I mean a Navy that patrols the seven seas, that controls access to those shipping lanes.

A couple of years ago, one of the senior members of the Pentagon sent some interrogators to China and India to ask people, men on the street, up and down, from the workers up to the leaders of the country, questions about oil and what they saw as China's future. And they were surprised that most of the people they talked to in China recognized the dependence that China had on oil and recognized how vulnerable they were to disruption of that and how essential it was for them to develop the

capability so that they would have some assurance that they would continue to have oil in the future.

India is also growing rapidly. The next chart I want to show you is the one that brought us here. It is knowledge that we have had for half a century now, actually just about half a century, and this is a chart that was developed by a scientist called M. King Hubbert who worked for the Shell Oil Company. And he was observing the production of oil from oil fields in the United States and he was observing the exhaustion of those oil fields, and he noted that they all follow a bell curve way was not too surprising.

There are many things that follow a bell curve. How tall we are, how long we live. Most things in our world, the most of the data, most of the individuals, most of the length, most of the heights fall in a fairly narrow range in the future, but there are some that were very much less and some that were very much more and we call this a bell curve.

M. King Hubbert rationalized that if he added up all the individual bell curves in the country that he could predict when we would reach that peak. And he noted that when we reach the peak in these individual fields that about half of the oil had been exhausted.

Now, it is reasonable that the first half of the oil is going to be easier to get than the last half and it takes more and more energy to get the last part of the oil and it comes with more difficulty and so you cannot pull it out of the ground as fast. After observing this for a number of years, he made a prediction in 1956 that the United States would peak in oil production in the early seventies. As a matter of fact, it was 1970 that we peaked in oil production, and this smooth green curve here is his prediction. The more ragged green curve, the actual data points show how close to the predicted curve the data points fell.

It did peak in 1970 and we are now sliding down Hubbert Peak. As a matter of fact, we now are producing only about half as much oil as we produced in 1970, when we were self-sufficient in oil. The red curve here shows a similar Hubbert's Peak curve for the Soviet Union, Russia. It was the Soviet Union early on. Now it is Russia. You see how poorly they performed and how they deviated from the projected curve with the collapse of the Soviet Union. They now are getting their act together and they will have a second little peak here. This is larger, the peak back here is higher than the second peak will be.

Most other countries have a single peak and several of them have already peaked in oil production. The little blue line here that does not show up very well on this chart shows what happened with ANWR. And the next chart that shows all of the places that we get oil from in our country. I am sorry. I said ANWR. I am thinking Alaska. This is Prudhoe Bay. Two places in Alaska, one we are getting oil from. That is Prudhoe Bay, and one we could get oil from if we drill there, which is ANWR.

This chart shows the contributions of Texas and the rest of the United States and this is liquids here. And notice what Prudhoe Bay did. We already reached our peak, and we are starting to slide down the peak, and there is a little blip as we slide down that peak from Prudhoe Bay. About a fourth of our oil production in our country comes from Prudhoe Bay. We are now reaching the end of the production from that field.

I am sure all of you can remember a little bit after that there was a lot of optimism because of what was supposed to be a major oil find in the Gulf of Mexico. That is this yellow. That is all it amounted to. We are still sliding down Hubbert's Peak. This did not stop the slide down Hubbert's Peak.

I would like to again mention ANWR. Mr. Speaker, you may be supportive of drilling in ANWR or you may not be supportive of drilling in ANWR, but the reality is that it will not make much difference whether we drill or not in ANWR. That will not come on line until maybe as much as 10 years, certainly not before 5 years. And when it comes on line, it is almost certainly going to be less than Prudhoe Bay was, and you see the fairly small contribution that Prudhoe Bay made.

Drilling in ANWR will not solve our oil problems, which is another concern about drilling there because if it gives people the illusion that we have solved our oil problem then we will have done a great disservice.

The next chart shows a generic curve and this is one that we really need to focus on. It shows a 2 percent rise. Let me show you this one next because this one shows some exponential curves and most people do not really understand the exponential function.

The story is told of the ancient kingdom in which one of its citizens invented the game of chess. It was very popular and the king was very pleased and he told his subject that I would like to reward you for what you have done. Anything which is reasonable I will give you for your contribution to our society.

And the inventor of the chess board said, I am a simple man with simple needs. And if you will simply take my chess board and put one grain of wheat on the first square and two grains of wheat on the second square and four grains of wheat on the third square and eight on the fourth square and just keep doubling the wheat until you have covered all the squares on my chess board, that will be adequate compensation for my contribution.

Well, the king was elated. How simple. All he wants is one grain of wheat and double it for each one after that. What he did not know was of course that there was no way that he could comply with that wish. My understanding is that that would represent more wheat than is grown in the last 4 years in all of the world.

This is the exponential function.

Albert Einstein was asked about the next great energy source in the world after nuclear. What will be next, Dr. Einstein? And he said the most powerful force of the universe is the force of compound interest.

So here we see some curves where you have compound growth. The lower curve here is a 2 percent growth. This 2 percent growth rate represents the rate about the rate at which we have been growing.

Now, some people think you can represent a 2 percent growth with a straight line. But if that is what you project, then each year you have a lesser percentage growth rate than the year before. All of us who have interest in the bank and it is compounded know that what you get at the end of the year is more than the simple interest rate because you get interest on interest if it is compounded. Sometimes it is compounded almost instantaneously by computers. Sometimes it is compounded every month.

But when it is compounded, instead of having this lower flat curve, the 2 percent growth rate follows the second curve. In just a moment we will show you a generic curve that shows how that relates to where we are now.

This next growth rate is 4 percent growth, and this first dotted line here is 5 percent growth. And what I really want to focus on is this steep line here, and that is 10 percent growth and that is the way China has been growing.

Now, at 10 percent growth it doubles in 7 years. That means it is four times bigger in 14 years. That means it is eight times bigger in 21 years. Now, I think that it is unlikely that China will continue this 10 percent growth rate for 21 years. But if they did, they would be using eight times the energy that they are using today.

Where will they find that energy?

I would like to look at a couple of recognitions in news weeklies and they are fairly recent. This one is U.S. News and World Report. It is May 16. This is the last one. And I have here Time Magazine and I think May 9, so these are very current.

I think it is significant that two of our major news weeklies are focusing on the energy problem, particularly the oil and gas part of the energy problem.

The article in U.S. News and World Report is about Exxon Mobil. This is really a giant. ''In the past year the corporate titan began pumping oil and natural gas from eight major new fields, including challenging projects in the deep water off Angola's coast, the icy depths of the North Sea, and the tough terrain of landlocked Chad.'' Yet Exxon's production continued to slip in spite of these new fields. Even these significant additions could not make up for the inexorable decline of the company's fast mature fields around the world.

Then the article goes on to note, ''The company's production eroded nearly 5 percent in the first quarter.''

By the way, in spite of this spectacular production of oil their stocks fell and they have enormous profits. Their stocks fell because they did not reach the expectations and that was because the company's production eroded nearly 5 percent in the first quarter, a rate that surprised analysts and caused Exxon to miss earning projections and therefore their stock fell.

It says here that Exxon has shown ''little concern about its reserves, even though by the government's accounting method it replaced only 83 percent of the reserves it depleted last year.''

They did pretty well because worldwide we are pumping about six barrels of every new barrel of oil that we find.

□ 2100

In a few moments, we will show you a chart which shows that the major oil discoveries from which we are pumping today occurred roughly 30, 40 years ago.

From a national security perspective, which is what we are focussing on relative to energy this evening, this phenomenal growth in China has to be a major concern. Where will they get that oil?

The next curve, the generic curve, shows what is probably the situation today or will shortly be in the near future. Notice that the past bell curves were pretty steep, and you can make them as high and steep as you want. You simply change the abscissas and the ordinate.

This is a 2 percent growth curve, and M.K. Hubbert predicted that the world would peak in its oil production about the turn of the millennium. That was delayed a little because he could not have known of the Arab oil embargo and the oil price hikes and the worldwide recession that occurred. Because of that, we reduced the consumption of oil, and there are now many people who believe that oil may be peaking in the world today.

As a matter of fact, yesterday there was what I think to be a fairly significant book that came out, written by the CEO of the largest energy investment bank in the world, Matt Simmons, and the title of the book is ''Twilight in the Desert.'' The content of the book addresses Saudi Arabia and production of oil there. He believes that Saudi Arabia has probably peaked in their oil production. My colleagues may have noticed that a couple of weeks ago when the Saudi oil prince was here that he did not promise the President that they would increase oil production. That may be the right verb. It may very well be that he could not promise the President that they would increase oil production because many people believe that they cannot increase oil production.

This is just that little leisurely 2 percent growth curve. China is growing very much more rapidly you will remember. By the way, when this doubles, which goes from about here to here, that represents 35 years. So you get some idea of the scale here because a 2 percent growth rate doubles in about 35 years.

So you see that the real problem begins not when you reach peak oil, but it begins when you are nearing the peak, and the increase in production shows that it cannot keep pace with the increasing growth of demand. There is some belief that the peak production may, as a matter of fact, be several years off in the future. The latest I have heard is 2037. Even if it was 2037, it is really quite past time that we should have been addressing this.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim the time for just a moment, I want to explain something that I discover often confuses individuals, and that is, when you reach the peak, they say, well, we have only used half of it, but the problem is that showed beautifully in that chart there, we are already in a habit of using so much oil, and it is going up yet. So even though we only used half, the demand is going to be so high, and as we go over the peak, production decreases, the oil becomes more expensive to retrieve because we may be tapping tar sands or shales at some point there. So you have double effect. It is going to be more expensive to find and produce, but at the same time, the demand keeps increasing. The demand versus supply gets worse, and so the price, of course, goes up and the wealthiest people can buy it.

To contrast that, we are talking a bit about solar energy. The best estimate we have at the moment is that the sun will probably continue for roughly 1 billion years, producing just as much energy as it is producing today. After that time, we have to start worrying. That is quite a contrast with the short-time scales here, and I find that much of the difficulty that we have is that most people have very short time horizons. If they have got enough for next week or next year, everything is fine.

This is a case where I think we have a particular responsibility, as the leaders of the Nation to recognize the long-time scale problems that are involved and change course so that we do not enter this catastrophic period where we are getting reduced production and increased demand. Prices are going to go skyrocketing. We will have at least a recession, probably a depression at that point, and so I think it is incumbent upon the Congress to recognize the situation we are in and take action now so to avoid disaster later.

With that, I will be happy to yield back to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me again and thank him for that clarification. He is right.

At the top of Hubbert's peak, still about half the oil remains, and the problem is that it is not that we are going to run out of oil. What we have run out of is high quality, readily available, cheap oil, and when the world's demand for oil keeps increasing along this curve, and the production of oil is the blue curve, then you see there is an ever increasing discrepancy between what we would like to burn and what there is to use.

The real question is: What will the world do; what will we do; what will China do; what will Russia do; what will the world do when it is recognized that, in fact, there will be no increased production of oil? The Third World is trying to industrialize. India and China are rapidly increasing their economies and using more and more energy, and by the way, not very efficiently.

One of the things that we might very well do to help ourselves in the end, and everybody, is to show them how to use energy more efficiently. Not only do we use 25 percent of the world's energy, we use it pretty efficiently. You might question, do we really need to use that much energy? We have a chart which we will show a little later that shows that people in California use only 60 percent of the energy of the rest of us in the country, and it would be hard to argue with California that they do not have a quality of life equivalent to ours. So you can use less energy.

I promised a slide, and the next one shows when we found this oil. It shows how long it is between when you find the oil and when you pump it. Of course, we might have pumped it a little sooner, because you are not going to pump oil that people are not demanding, and the world's economy grew. There were enough resources there in the oil in the ground that we could pump it out, but this shows when the peak occurred. This is worldwide. It shows that the peak occurred way back in the 1960s, well before 1970, and now we are peaking in production out here about 2000. So you see it is roughly 30, 40 years after the peak discoveries that we are peaking in the production of oil.

The next chart is a very interesting one, and it shows that drilling more will not necessarily get you more oil. By the way, even the oil companies now have fabulous profits, and ExxonMobil has billions of dollars in reserves. Their turnover is greater than most of the countries in the world. Why are they not out drilling for more oil? It is probably because they recognize what this little chart shows, and this shows what happens to oil drilling with the Reagan administration.

Remember, Hubbert's Peak peaked in 1970. By 1980, when Reagan came to office, we are already sliding down Hubbert's Peak, and that administration recognized that we were producing less oil. Their solution to that was to give the oil companies an incentive to go out and drill more. This yellow line here represents the number of wells drilled, and notice, there is a big spike

just after 1980 when they came in. They drilled a lot more wells but look what happened.

The green here represents the additional finds, as compared to the oil that we are pumping, and except for this one little brief green blip, there is just nothing but red after they started drilling for oil and kept on drilling for oil. Notice where it is now. It is way down. They recognize that there is not much return for aggressive drilling of oil, and so none of the major oil companies now are aggressively drilling for oil.

I mentioned the articles in these two magazines, and both of them reflect the reality that we really do have a national security implication here. This is the May 9 of this year Time magazine, and it has a good article that has questions and answers, and it makes it easy to read that way.

Is the world running out of oil? And the answer is, no, half the oil is left. That is not the problem. The problem is that you cannot get it out fast enough to meet the demands of our growing economies.

So cheap oil is now just part of history? And their answer is, yes, it is going to be expensive from now on.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the time that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) yielded me.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), and I am pleased to reclaim the time. I would like to make a few additional points and see if he has any additional comments.

One thing we have not discussed tonight, which I think is very, very important, is to ask what is the highest and best use of the energy resources we have. Take, for example, natural gas, which many in this country use to heat their homes.

I live in Michigan, the so-called ''Frozen North.'' We use natural gas to heat our homes, and it is wonderful. It is clean burning and so forth, but what has happened with natural gas, because it is clean burning, the power plants, which now have to meet strong environmental requirements if they are burning coal, say, well, let us burn natural gas, it is nice and clean, and we do not have these environmental requirements that we have with coal, and we will save money. So copious amounts of natural gas are being burned in electric power plants to produce electricity. At the same time, those of us who heat it with our homes, our heating bills double because there is just not that much natural gas available.

It is even more serious than that. I have often said that natural gas really is too valuable to burn. Why is that? Because natural gas is a beautiful feed stock for the petrochemical industry. We use a lot of fertilizer on our farms, and so do other countries and that is why we had the Green Revolution. We are able to feed far more people today than anyone anticipated because we are using a lot of chemical fertilizer. Much of it is made from natural gas or petroleum.

Now, if we run short on supplies of natural gas and petroleum, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) was showing us with his Hubbert curve, then you have a problem because where are we going to get the feed stocks for our petrochemical industry? Where will the plastic manufacturers get their materials, because that is all made from natural gas or petroleum? Where will the farmers get their agriculture because that is made from natural gas and oil? And so on and down the line. So we really as a Nation should be asking ourselves, what is the highest and best use of the energy resources we have.

We have huge amounts of coal available in this country. Russia, incidentally, has far more coal available than we do, but coal is dirty. But why do we not investigate ways that we can use that to provide for our electrical needs in a very clean way and reserve the natural gas in the oil for higher and better use?

There are other issues that arise from this, and again, recognizing the time spans available, we have not talked much about Europe tonight, but recognize that the reason we have not is because Europe basically has very little natural gas and oil left. They are importing virtually all of it. They still have some coal but not a huge amount of it. So we have not been talking about them, but they still use a lot of energy. Europe has a greater population than the U.S., and they use a great deal of energy.

Where are they getting it? They turned to nuclear energy. In the midst of all the discussion and upheaval in the United States about nuclear energy and the dangers and so forth, we produce only 20 percent of our electricity from nuclear energy. France, I believe, is at 80 percent now, and I believe India is even higher than that. These other Nations have turned to nuclear energy for two reasons.

First of all, they do not have supplies of fossil fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas.

□ 2115

Secondly, they have decided it is safer because it does not give off greenhouse gases. Maybe we have to learn a lesson from these other nations and say, look, oil and coal and natural gas are too valuable to just burn to produce electricity. Let us produce our electricity in other ways, perhaps nuclear fusion reactors, as France, India, and other nations are doing. Perhaps we should work more actively on fusion research so that we can build nuclear fusion reactors, which should be cleaner and safer by far. So there are a lot of different options to investigate.

Also, I mentioned earlier photo cells, or photovoltaics, and I mentioned this article from the American Physical Society News, excellent article, written by Dr. Alvin Compaan from the University of Toledo. I did not realize he had written it until I reached the end of the article when I was reading it, and I was delighted because he was a former student of mine some years ago at Calvin College. But he points out here, toward the end, that we have made so much progress in developing solar cells, or photovoltaics cells, that he envisions that by the year 2015 the electricity produced by photovoltaic cells, or solar cells, will cost only about 6 cents per kilowatt hour.

Well, that is more than competitive with the energy producing power plants today using coal, oil or natural gas, because they have transmission costs and transmission lines, whereas the photovoltaic cells can be in your back yard or on your roof.

He also says the current predictions are that half of all new U.S. electricity generation will be produced by photovoltaics by the year 2025. That will be an amazing growth, and it will be interesting to watch that and see if it happens, because that will definitely give us a heads-up and the opportunity to greatly improve our energy situation.

There are other ways, as I have outlined, of using solar energy, other ways of using our savings and our inheritance. But always keep in mind it is our responsibility to provide for our children and grandchildren the resources that they are going to need in this world to do their work, to grow plants, to produce products, to manufacture. And if we run away with all this coal, oil, and natural gas and do not leave our kids and grandkids any, and we do not do the research necessary now to provide alternatives, we are not helping our kids and grandkids. In fact, we are depriving them of things that they will need to go forward in life.

So I urge the Congress to adopt legislation that will help develop alternative energy sources that will make certain that our kids and grandkids have enough energy to use and can live a decent lifestyle, as we do today, and that we not waste our resources but shepherd them and use them wisely as a means of producing new energy resources that our children and grandchildren can use.

SENATE FILIBUSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to use all the time this evening, but I did want to take to the floor this evening on the first day of this week because of my concern of what may be happening in the Senate on the issue of the filibuster.

I know that the word filibuster to many may seem a little obscure. People ask what it is about, why it is significant, but I do want to say that in

my home State of New Jersey there have been many manifestations by New Jersey residents of all walks of life about their concern if the Senate Republicans were to go so far as to eliminate the filibuster.

About 2 or 3 weeks ago, at Princeton University in New Jersey, a group of students started their own filibuster to basically point out how important they thought the filibuster was, and they went on for 2 or 3 weeks, or as far as I know they may still be continuing, but all hours of the night, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week having different students and different people, including myself, I went one day on a Saturday with my kids to basically talk about the filibuster. My son read from one of his favorite Goosebumps novels.

The point that so many of these Princeton University students and New Jersey residents were trying to make was that the filibuster is a guarantee of minority rights. They see it, and I see it, and the Democrats here in the House of Representatives see the filibuster as a way of checking the absolute power, the absolute power of the majority, in this case the Republican majority.

And of course it is true that the Republicans are in the majority. They control the majority in the Senate, here in the House, the President is also Republican, but I would feel the same way regardless of which party was in power; that the filibuster is a way to guarantee that the Senate acts on a consensus basis, particularly with judicial nominees.

It was always envisioned by our Founding Fathers that the Senate would be different than the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives, because each of us represents a fairly equal number of constituents, is the representative body of the people. We act through majority rule. However, in the Senate, it was always envisioned there had to be more of a consensus; that there would not be the power of the absolute majority. Because, after all, in the Senate they are not necessarily representative in the same way as the House. So you could have, as we have, two Senators from California, and they represent over 50 million people, or millions of people, as opposed to a smaller State, like Delaware or Wyoming, where the numbers may be 500,000 approximately.

So it was always envisioned the Senate should act more on a consensus basis, and that is one of the reasons why the filibuster is in place, to provide a check on the power of the majority; to make sure that minority rights are represented.

Now, I want to talk a little tonight, a little extended debate, if you will, on this whole issue, and I think it is important, first, to start with what the filibuster is. I am actually referencing a statement from the Filibuster Action Center at the People for an American Way. They say, what is the filibuster? The filibuster is one of our democracy's oldest and most important checks on the power of the majority. It preserves two of our bedrock values: One, protecting the rights of the minority; and, two, promoting compromise. And it works like this. If at least 41 Senators strongly oppose a bill or a judicial nominee, they can vote to continue debate and block a final vote on the issue. A final vote can only be taken if and when the majority wins 60 Senators' votes.

In the context of a Supreme Court battle, the filibuster means that 60 Senate votes may be needed to confirm out of the mainstream judicial nominees rather than a simple majority of 51.

For two centuries, our leaders have supported the tradition of the filibuster in order to promote cooperation and compromise, and because they have recognized the dangers of one-party control and the importance of protecting the rights of the minority.

Now, there is a new word for what the Senate Republicans under Majority Leader FRIST are trying to do, and it is called the nuclear option. I think that is their own phrase. Proponents of the nuclear option seek to break Senate rules and eliminate the filibuster on judicial nominations. They basically argue, and their justification is, the false argument, that the Constitution requires an up-or-down vote in the full Senate on every judicial nomination.

This argument is very much refuted by more than 200 years of Senate history, during which literally thousands of judicial and executive branch nominees have been blocked in the Senate by filibusters, delays, and other tactics. Again, the idea being that it is necessary in the Senate, unlike the House, to have more of a consensus, hence the 60 votes.

Now, I would maintain, and I am continuing making reference to this document from the Filibuster Action Center, that the nuclear option proposed by the Senate Republicans is essentially a radical tactic that would prohibit Senators from using filibusters against extremist judicial nominees. Right-wing Senators and leaders are supporting this destructive action because they want to guarantee the Senate confirmation of far-right ideologues to our Federal courts, but especially our Supreme Court.

The nuclear option is actually a series of steps that right-wing Senators would take to eliminate the filibuster. The nuclear attack would likely begin with one party's Senators provoking a filibuster, most likely by trying to force the confirmation vote on an out-of-the-mainstream appeals court nominee. A Senator would then object, claiming that the filibuster could not be used on a judicial nomination. Vice President CHENEY or another Senator presiding over the Senate would rule in the radical right's favor and then that ruling would be appealed. At that point, a simple majority, with Vice President CHENEY as the tie-breaking vote, if necessary, would then uphold the ruling and the filibuster would be part of American history.

Now, this nuclear option earns its name essentially for two reasons, Mr. Speaker. First, it breaks the Senate rules in order to eliminate another rule, the filibuster. Under normal Senate procedures it takes 67 Senators, or two-thirds, to end debate on changing a Senate rule. So normally you would have to have 67 Senators, even more than 60, to change a Senate rule; but the nuclear option would violate Senate rules and require only 50 Senators, plus the Vice President's tie breaker.

Secondly, the atmosphere in the Senate after this attack would resemble a nuclear winter. That is one of the reasons why they call it the nuclear option. All bipartisan cooperation would vanish and the Senate's legislative business would grind to a halt, only adding to the price Americans would pay for the right's reckless abuse of power.

I wanted to make three points, again, this is from the People for the American Way from the Filibuster Action Center, three very important points that I think they make.

One is that filibusters are in fact constitutional. The U.S. Constitution gives Senators the vital responsibility and power to confirm or reject the President's nominees to our Federal courts. That is in the Constitution, Article II, section 2. The Constitution also gives Senators the authority to create rules for their own Senate proceedings. That is in the Constitution, Article I, section 5.

For over 200 years, almost since the very founding of this republic, the filibuster tradition has been maintained under this authority and used by Senators of both parties, including the GOP Senate majority leader Bill Frist, in an effort to prevent the confirmation of judicial and other nominees.

The second point. If filibusters reflect the democratic vision of our Founding Fathers, a primary goal of the filibuster is to force greater deliberation and compromise on controversial Senate matters by requiring that they receive 60 votes to proceed. More of consensus. Since it is legitimate to filibuster controversial legislation that future Congresses can revisit, it is even more appropriate to allow filibusters when considering lifetime appointments to powerful positions on the Federal Judiciary.

Remember, these Federal judicial appointments are for life. That is in the Constitution. Our Founding Fathers wanted America's courts to be an independent branch of government, free of partisanship. Because Federal judges serve lifetime terms it is important both parties help determine who is appointed to the Federal bench.

Lastly, on this point, Mr. Speaker, and again I think this is so important, that filibusters are really necessary to prevent one party from having absolute power, which is what the Republican Party wants right now in Washington.

The outgoing Republican chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senator ORRIN HATCH, has himself explained that the filibuster is, and I quote, ''one of the few tools that the minority has to protect itself and those the minority represents.''

For 200 years, the filibuster has been an essential part of our system of checks and balances and has appropriated cooperation and compromise. I would say consensus. Senators have retained the filibuster rules because they recognize the dangers of one-party control and the importance of protecting the rights of the minority.

I think America works best when no one party has absolute power.

I just wanted to now go, if I could, Mr. Speaker, into this myth that I think Senator FRIST and certainly the leadership on the Republican side in the Senate are trying to give out to the American people; that somehow the Constitution requires an up-or-down vote on a judicial nominee.

If you look at the true history of checks and balances and the advise and consent in the Senate, it is often the case that a nominee never has a vote because the nominee is simply too far, in this case, to the right ideologically to achieve a consensus, to achieve the 60 votes. And there is nothing in the Constitution that says there has to be an up-or-down vote on a judicial nominee if that person is not acceptable because they are too extreme, which is essentially what we have in some of these cases.

□ 2130

Again, I am making reference to the People for the American Way report on this and they say: ''To justify a truly unparalleled nuclear option parliamentary maneuver to end filibusters of judicial nominations by breaking the Senate's rules, Senate majority leader Bill Frist asserts that Democratic filibusters are unprecedented and that Senators have a constitutional duty to give Presidential nominations an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor. This assertion is squarely refuted by the history of the confirmation process in the Senate.''

To the contrary, as the examples that I am going to be giving illustrate, for over 200 years Members of the Senate have used delaying tactics, including the filibuster, to defeat Presidential nominations to both the Federal judiciary and the executive branch. On many occasions, they have been successful.

Furthermore, nuclear option proponents themselves, including Senator FRIST, have repeatedly used the filibuster themselves to delay nominations, including judicial nominations, and have been successful in defeating nominations through a filibuster and other delaying tactics, in which case the nomination never came to the floor for an up-or-down vote.

Under the Senate rules, there is a right of unlimited debate on any question that comes before the Senate, including a nomination. It takes 60 votes to invoke cloture, ending unlimited debate and bringing a nomination or other matter to a final vote. It takes two-thirds of the Senators present, as many as 67, to end debate or on a change to the Senate rules.

So the nuclear option is a proposed parliamentary maneuver which requires a simple majority to get around the Senate rules and amend the Senate rules that requires 60 Senators to end a filibuster. Nowhere in the Constitution, in the text of the Constitution, is there a requirement for a simple majority for a vote on nominations or for any vote at all. What the Constitution does expressly say is that the Senate holds the sole power to make its rules, which certainly must include the rules governing debate on the Senate floor. Again, this interpretation is validated by over 216 years of Senate consideration of nominations.

I want to give some examples because I do not want to just talk about this in the abstract. Until 1949 when Senate rule XXII was amended to allow the Senate to invoke cloture on any matter before the Senate, there was no way for the Senate to end extended debate or delaying tactics on a nomination. It simply kept going. In the last 32 years of the 20th century, the Senate leadership was forced to file cloture on at least 34 nominations to end a filibuster on the Senate floor.

Among those 34 were 13 judicial nominations, of which three people were nominated to be justices of the Supreme Court. So 26 of the 34 filibusters, including in these cases Federal judges, approximately three-quarters were led by Republican Senators.

So when they talk about how it is the Democrats are trying to do this, they should keep in mind that in three-quarters of the cases where filibusters were used in the last 30 or 40 years to stop a judicial nomination, it was the Republicans that were using the filibuster.

I will give some examples. Among these, Abe Fortas, nominated in 1968 to be a Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, was denied a final up-or-down vote by a Republican-led filibuster when the Senate failed to stop on a vote to invoke cloture by 45–43. In that case, while the vote indicates that a majority of the Senate supported a final vote because of primarily Republican obstructionism, a final up-or-down vote did not occur. Senator Howard Baker argued during debate in defense of the filibuster of Justice Fortas by a Senate minority: ''On any issue, the majority at any given moment is not always right.'' Basically invoking the argument about minority rights.

Similarly, the nomination of Henry Foster to be Surgeon General was killed by a successful Republican filibuster in 1995, as was the nomination of Sam Brown to be a U.S. ambassador in 1994. On both of these votes, a clear majority of the Senate supported the nominations. The exact same advice and consent clause in the Constitution applies to both judicial and executive branch nominations.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point in several cases the proponents of the nuclear option are supporting or have supported several of these filibusters. For example, Senator FRIST supported a filibuster against U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals nominee Richard Paez in 2000. Senate Republicans, including FRIST, LOTT and MCCONNELL, were so adamant to try to block a final vote on Paez that they forced the Senate to vote an extremely rare motion to postpone the nomination indefinitely after cloture had been invoked.

Some current nuclear option proponents have been among the most frequent Republican filibusterers of nominations. Senators LOTT, HATCH and MCCONNELL all voted against cloture to continue a filibuster on 11 nominations during the first 3 years of the Clinton administration, including on two occasions where filibusters defeated nominees with majority support in the Senate.

Former Senate majority leader TRENT LOTT on at least one occasion even prevented a cloture motion from being filed on a nomination. In 1998, President Clinton named James Hormel to be the U.S. ambassador to Luxembourg. Despite an overwhelming bipartisan vote of approval in committee, 16 to 2, LOTT simply refused to bring the nomination to the floor despite clear evidence that at least 60 Senators would have voted to confirm the nomination.

I could give many more examples, but I am not going to. I am trying to point out the hypocrisy, essentially, in the fact the Senate Republicans, including some who oppose the filibuster, have in the past used it in so many cases, including against judicial nominees.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has joined me, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I saw the gentleman speaking on the floor on this important issue, and I wanted to join the gentleman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The gentleman will suspend. The Chair must advise the gentleman from New Jersey that, under clause 1 of rule XVII, his allusions to hypocrisy are improper.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just come down here because it is a very important issue. It is often said in this House we sort of rush things through, and if it has 218 votes it passes; but the Senate is designed by our Founding Fathers to be more deliberate, more thoughtful, to take time and reason things out.

In order to do that, the minority party, whichever party it may be at the time, has certain rights that must be respected and honored. And what we have seen these last few years, that has not happened.

Unfortunately, when you have one party controlling the House, the Senate and the Presidency, at times they get caught up in their judicial power, their legislative power, their executive power; and they forget about the founding principles of this country, that is, that whether you are in the majority or minority party, there are certain things that should be respected and the right of the minority to be heard.

Whether it is a filibuster, or whether it is on the floor to have an amendment or a substitute bill, the minority should always have that right. In the last few years, I know I and other members of the minority party have felt we have been blocked from even having any thoughtful consideration of legislation. It is the main bill, no amendments are made in order, especially Democratic amendments, and they just ram things through.

Or with the Medicare reform bill, we have 15 minutes to vote; but it is left open for 3 hours and twist arms and have ethics investigations on the way those votes were obtained. Those are things when you do it at 3 in the morning and the vote closes at 6 in the morning like it did on the so-called Medicare reform bill, which is the prescription drug bill, and I am sure people will not be happy next year when they see it; but to hold a vote open from 3 to 6 in the morning, what is the majority afraid of?

One of the founding principles of any democracy, the credibility of your democracy, is how does that majority party treat the minority party. I never learned more about this than when I was dealing with a number of issues dealing with NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In order to be admitted to NATO, the dominant country, the majority population, has to treat that minority population with all due respect and courtesies in the legislature and in the executive and the way they are treated in their society.

Being of Slovakian descent, I was instrumental in trying to get Slovakia, and one of the reasons they were not admitted to NATO sooner, there was concern with how Slovakia treated the Hungarian minority in their country. And until reforms were made to show that the Hungarians had a voice in that country and an opportunity to make their views known, they were not going to be allowed into NATO.

So here we have the United States Senate, which says to bring anything before the floor, to have a thoughtful, deliberate consideration, you have to have 60 votes. It is 55–45. You have to have cooperation. The rules force you to cooperate.

Not like here where it is martial law: there is a rule, it passes, no amendments, no substitute bill, go with the majority bill and that is it, vote ''yes'' or ''no.''

But in the Senate, it is different. The rules force you to get along. It forces you to talk with each other and discuss the legislation. What do you object to, how do we do this.

So that is why you have this 60-person majority to bring anything to the floor under a unanimous consent agreement.

If we look at the judicial nominations that President Bush has enjoyed in his 4-plus years in office, there have been 250, and I think 208 have been approved. This is 96 or 97 percent have been approved. That is the best record of any modern-day President: more than President Carter, President Clinton, or the first President Bush.

Not everyone who is nominated who may be a Federal district court judge is automatically qualified to be elevated to the court of appeals or even the Supreme Court. You have a different set of facts. One is a trial judge; the other one is an appellate review judge. And the higher up, the broader your powers over a greater part of the Nation, especially the judicial circuits, all the way to the Supreme Court where one vote could determine the law of the land. So I think you need to have a certain judicial temperament to be elevated to each one of those steps. Those few who have been objected to have been based upon judicial temperament of the individual or the inexperience, whatever it may be; but that is for the Senate to decide.

To change the filibuster rules, if you will, change it for all of it, but they only want to change it for judicial and Presidential nominees. Why not change it for all legislation?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is just an excuse. I think they are using the judicial nominees and ultimately we will see it for everything else. There is no reason to make the distinction. I would argue there is a stronger case for judicial nominees because they are lifetime judges, and so it is an even stronger case why there should be a consensus and a filibuster should be used.

Mr. STUPAK. Absolutely. If a filibuster is so bad, it should go to 51 votes and not 60, and do it for everything. If you are going to do it for the judges, do it for everybody. Let us do it for the environmental laws, labor laws. Let us do it for trade agreements, defense; let us do it before we go to war, as we did in Iraq. That took 60 votes. But we only want to do it for the select few people.

So if you are really going to have a majority and minority party, if you are going to respect the spirit and the thought behind a minority party being respected by the majority party, if you are going to change the rules, apply them to all of the rules, not selective rulemaking. That is worse than the autocracy or dictatorship or whatever word you want to use where one party determines everything. That is where you have to be very careful.

In my home State of Michigan, we had a judge nominated by President Clinton, Judge White, who sat for over 7 years. Judge White never got a hearing, never did anything. The majority party, then the Republican Party, said we are not going to look at it. I am not saying that is the reason why they are blocking this handful of nominees by the President, because of Judge White; but the point being we have never seen the threat of nuclear option being used before. We saw Judge White sit there for 7 years and was certainly fit for the job. I am not saying tit for tat or anything like that, but what goes around comes around; and there will be a time, hopefully soon, when the Democratic Party will be back in the majority on the Senate side.

□ 2145

I would hate to see this where, well, you blocked us, we're going to block you, or you do this, we do that. That does not do anything for a democracy. The idea behind it that our Founding Fathers had for 217 years has been, there is a minority party which slows things down in the Senate. You may not like it but we have got to take our time and make sure that we do it properly. This President enjoys 96 or 97 percent of all his nominees being sent up and approved. But I guess they want 100 percent. I understand last week they even had an offer to approve a few more of these judges in good compromise, good spirit so we do not have any problems in the Senate. Because I really hate to see this nuclear option that you spoke so eloquently of become a reality in the U.S. Senate because that defeats the whole purpose of the Senate. We should have thoughtful deliberations, something we do not have a lot of time for here. And I understand the rules are different in the House because there are 435 of us. If we all got up to speak our mind, nothing would ever get done around here. But here is an opportunity to show the true principles of democracy and I think the true principles of democracy is again how the majority party treats the minority. They respect them. They give them an opportunity to be heard.

Do they have an opportunity to follow the rules and abide by them, those rules, when it applies to the minority when they are the majority or the majority when they are back to the minority? I would hope we would not get to this nuclear option. I would hope that reasonable minds would prevail. For 217 years it has served our country well. I just hope we do not change those rules on judicial nominees. As you indicated, it is a lifetime appointment, cannot be really recalled unless there is gross, gross, gross, improper behavior on the judicial bench which usually does not happen thankfully in this country.

We are a country of laws. We are a country of rules. No one party or no one person should prevail over them. This President has had, as I said, 96 or 97 percent, 208 of 215 nominees approved, some just in the last week or two. I do not think this nuclear option is viable. I would hope that we would

treat the Senate with all due respect. I would hope that the other body would take this decision carefully and not invoke a nuclear option. Because the only thing left then for the minority party on this side, being the Democratic Party on the Senate side, is to try to disrupt the proceedings of that Chamber.

If they are going to change the rules to suit them every time something they do not agree upon comes up, that is not really a democracy anymore and I think then the Senate minority party has to do what they feel is appropriate to bring attention to the mistreatment or maltreatment by the majority party. I hope it would not come to that because it does not speak well of our democracy. We are supposed to be an example for the rest of the world and how you treat a minority party by the majority certainly is one of the most critical factors that they look to.

We brag about how our country, that our President may ask us to declare war and if we do, the military listens to the civilian. That is a great respect that people always marvel at, how a popularly elected or electoral college-elected President can have control of the military, that the military does not see the President as a threat or the President does not see the military as a threat. That same principle should apply when we deal with one another in these great halls of Congress, whether it is the House or the Senate side.

Unfortunately we are not seeing that. If we don't get our own way, we'll just change the rules. After 217 years, that is not the way to run this country. For whatever reason why they have to have these last seven or eight judges approved to give the President 100 percent, no one gets 100 percent nowadays. Not even the schoolyard bully gets 100 percent. There are times when we have to stop and say, okay, step back a little bit. I would urge the majority party in the other body to step back and do not invoke this nuclear option.

Reading Congress Daily today, I guess the first signs of it are set for Wednesday. We hope it does not get to that. They are talking about staying in all weekend and debating this issue. Debates are fine. Let us respect the rules of the body, whether it is the House or the Senate.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on this issue and others as he is down here each night working hard for the democracy and for the right of everyone to speak out during their time and place here on this House floor or in the other body.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan and his willingness to come down here tonight. I know we both feel very strongly about this. Sometimes I think it is hard to explain because people's images of the filibuster are somebody standing up on the Senate floor reading the phone book, almost like ridiculing the process. But the bottom line is it is a very important part of our democracy.

As you mentioned and I really did not get into it much tonight but I will mention briefly that we have seen here in the House many abuses of power by the Republican majority. You mentioned some of them, where bills do not even come to committee anymore, or bills in committee do not have a hearing, or they skip the subcommittee mark, or they go to full committee and they do not allow Democrats to offer amendments, or bills come to the House floor with a totally closed rule, so there is no opportunity for amendment, or there is very little time for debate. In fact, one of the reasons that you and I are here tonight doing special orders is because oftentimes we do not get a chance to speak during the day when legislation is being discussed because the rules are very limiting.

We have just seen many examples where the Republican majority has limited in the House of Representatives the ability of the minority to speak or offer amendments or offer changes in policy. We do not want to see the Senate go down that route. Clearly, particularly on judicial nominations, the intent of the framers was that there had to be a consensus and the Senate was going to be a deliberative body that operated more, as I said, on a consensus basis.

I just wanted to say again, I was making reference to this document from the People for the American way where Senator FRIST is justifying this nuclear option or this parliamentary maneuver where he would simply have a majority vote on a rule change and that has never been done in the history of the United States Senate. For over 200 years, nearly as long as there has been a Senate, there have been documented examples of presidential nominations rejected by the Senate without even having an up-or-down vote, through delay, inaction, parliamentary tactics, including the filibuster. That history, I think, demonstrates conclusively that from the text of the Constitution there is no requirement for the Senate to vote on a presidential nomination. There is not a requirement that the Senate take any action at all on a nomination, which has often been the case. And the history of the confirmation process in the Senate illustrates another central fact, that Presidents have had the most success with their nominations when they have viewed the entire Senate as a partner in the nominations process, not an adversary. If you listen to Senator FRIST, it is as if the Democrats are an adversary. That is not the way it is supposed to be. The better way out of this current stalemate and the best way to preserve our independent judiciary is not the tyranny of the majority in the Senate but a genuine bipartisan cooperation and consultation with Senators on both the Democrat and the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, as I said and my colleague has said, we continue to see abuse of power by the congressional Republicans.

I will give you another example. Earlier this year here in the House, Republican leaders ignored protocol and weakened the House ethics rules without ever talking with Democrats about the proposed rules change. It was the first time the House ethics rules have been changed without both sides, Democrats and Republicans, sitting at the table and writing new rules together. Fortunately, both conservative and liberal newspapers around the country and the American people saw the weakened rules for the Ethics Committee for what they were, just a power grab and an attempt by the Republican leadership to protect one of their own. The Republican leaders were forced to backtrack and reinstate the rules a couple of weeks ago after Democrats refused to allow the Ethics Committee to meet until the rules were reinstated and the pressure from the public became too great.

But it appears that the Senate Republicans learned nothing from that experience in the House with the rules change that the House Republicans tried to make here. Instead, the Senate Republicans seem prepared to overreach this week, as my colleague said, we hear as early as Wednesday, in an attempt to blow up 200 years of tradition in the U.S. Senate. Majority Leader FRIST and Senate Republicans are on the cusp of waging an unprecedented political grab, abusing their power in order to force through a few judges who have been unable to earn a bipartisan consensus for their lifetime judicial appointments.

This power grab was initiated by the White House, which manufactured a judicial crisis. I think my colleague from Michigan mentioned that since President Bush has taken office the Senate confirmed 208 of his judicial nominations and turned back only 10, a 95 percent confirmation rate. That is the highest approval rating for any President in modern times, including Reagan, Bush and Clinton. Thanks to these confirmations, President Bush now presides over the lowest court vacancy rate since Ronald Reagan was President.

There is no judicial crisis here, Mr. Speaker. It is manufactured by the Republicans. Despite the fact that Democrats have helped confirm 95 percent of President Bush's judicial nominees, the President is choosing to pick fights and resubmit the names of nominees who have been rejected during his first term. There were 10 nominees that our Democratic colleagues in the Senate opposed because they had serious questions about their independence and fairness.

One wonders, why are the Republicans preparing to throw out all these constitutional checks and balances just for a couple of extreme judges? Some people say it is because of the Supreme Court, that President Bush wants this fight on the filibuster before a Supreme Court justice retires, which is something that could happen anytime. That

may be what is behind it, but it is still really not the way to proceed. To say that Supreme Court nominees would only need 51 votes instead of 60, again there would be no consensus on the very important selection of Supreme Court judges.

Again, I think it is just the right wing of the Republican Party that wants to appoint extreme conservatives to the highest court in the land and they simply know they cannot do it if they have to meet the 60-vote threshold. The White House does not want to nominate another David Souter or an Anthony Kennedy or a Sandra Day O'Connor or a Steven Breyer, all of whom were confirmed with nearly unanimous bipartisan support. Instead, it wants to divide the country by picking a right-wing Supreme Court nominee that it knows could not garner bipartisan support.

I just think that again although the motivation may be in terms of the Supreme Court, the bottom line is that we should not be sacrificing this very important safeguard of our democracy, the filibuster, just to appoint some conservative judges that the President wants to nominate.

The last thing I wanted to say, again there is a difference between the House and the Senate. The framers did not want the Senate and the House to be the same. They saw two different bodies. One of the things that would likely happen is if this nuclear option was presented and the filibuster was overturned is the Senate would basically become a second House of Representatives. That is not what the Founding Fathers envisioned when they created two distinct Chambers.

Again, I do not know what is going to happen, but I think we have to speak out and say that this is not just something that myself and my colleague from Michigan feel strongly about. I know and I have even seen polling that suggests that the American people feel very strongly about this. That is one of the reasons why we had this 2 or 3-week filibuster at Princeton University and why some of the Princeton students came down here last week and brought a bus, they called it the ''filibus,'' we were down on the Mall and we spoke to make the point of how important the filibuster is as a safeguard of democracy.

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the special orders of this evening, I think, have been a good example of a problem that faces families and businesses and countries and indeed is facing the world today and that is the tyranny of the urgent. So often, no matter whether it is your family or your business or your government, the urgent takes precedence over the important. It is really urgent that we are talking about confirmation of the judges in the Senate and the possibility of the nuclear option. This is just an example of how frequently the need to deal with the urgent diverts us from considering things which in the long run are going to be very much more important than that.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about here, and this is an article written by Matt Savinar. The introduction to it will really grab your attention if he is correct. This is what he says:

''Dear Reader:

''Civilization as we know it is coming to an end soon. This is not the wacky proclamation of a doomsday cult, apocalypse Bible prophecy sect or conspiracy theory society. Rather, it is the scientific conclusion of the best-paid, most widely respected geologists, physicists and investment bankers in the world. These are rational, professional, conservative individuals who are absolutely terrified by a phenomenon known as global peak oil.''

It is not just Matt Savinar that is concerned about this because he quotes several people in his article. One of them is an investment banker that he referenced. That is Matthew Simmons, with whom I had lunch last week.

□ 2200

Simmons and Company International is considered the most reputable and reliable energy investment bank in the world. Given Matthew Simmons' background, what he has to say about peak oil is truly terrifying. For instance, in August of 2003, in an independent interview with ''From the Wilderness'' publisher Michael Ruppert, Simmons was asked if it was time for peak oil to become a part of the public policy debate. He responded, ''It is past time. As I have said, the experts and politicians have no plan B to fall back on. If energy peaks,'' he might have said when energy peaks, ''it will be a tremendous jolt to our economic well-being and to our health, greater than anyone could ever imagine.''

When asked if there is a solution to the impending crisis, Simmons responded, ''I don't think there is one. The solution is to pray. Under the best of circumstances, if all prayers are answered, there will be no crisis for maybe 2 years. After that,'' he says, ''it's a certainty.''

Mr. Speaker, if we are talking about things that are important, if he is correct, and this evening we will explore the evidence so that the listener can make up their own mind, but if he is correct, this truly is something which is important.

Former industry insider Jan Lundberg recently pointed out: ''The scenario I foresee is that market-based panic will, within a few days, drive prices skyward.'' He is talking about a time when oil prices are peaking and that this is the response of the market. ''And as supplies can no longer slack daily world demand of over 80 million barrels a day,'' which it is now 84 million barrels a day, ''the market will become paralyzed at prices too high for the wheels of economy and even daily living in 'advanced' societies. There may be an event that appears to trigger this final energy crash, but the overall cause will be the huge consumption on a finite planet.''

In an earlier hour this evening, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) shared part of his Special Order hour with me, and he tells the story of when he was a little boy, he was told that there was about 250 years of oil remaining in the world. That was grossly over-optimistic; but even if it were true, his immediate response, he says was, gee, what will the world do when the oil is gone?

We may now be approaching peak oil. What will the world do?

''The trucks,'' he says, ''will no longer pull into Wal-Mart or Safeway or other food stores. The freighters bringing packaged techno-toys and whatnot from China will have no fuel. There will be fuel in many places, but hoarding and uncertainty will trigger outages, violence, and chaos. For only a short time will the police and military be able to maintain order, if at all.''

I am not sure that this has to be true. I really hope that it does not have to be true. And what we will be doing is talking about some of the things we need to keep it from being true. And I am sure all have heard of the Lundberg reports on gas prices.

Dr. Ted Trainer explains in a recent article on the thermodynamic limitations of biomass fuels, and this is his quote: ''This is why I do not believe consumer-capitalist society can save itself. Not even its 'intellectual' classes or green leadership give any sign that this society has the wit or the will to even think about the basic situation we are in. As the above figures make clear, the situation cannot be solved without huge reduction in the volume of consumption.''

Going on in a few moments we will have a chance to look at some curves that put that in context.

Dr. Smalley, in the February 2005, issue of Discover magazine gave the following prognosis as a result of the energy shortage brought on by peak oil and the fact that the world cannot produce oil as fast as the world's growing economies demand it: ''There will be inflation as billions of people compete for insufficient resources. There will be famine. There will be terrorism and war.'' I hope he is not correct.

I am just reading these quotes, Mr. Speaker, to point out that it is not just one person. It is many people who are concerned about this.

The chief economist of Morgan Stanley recently predicted that we have a 90 percent chance of facing ''economic Armageddon,'' while stating, ''I fear

modern-day central banking is on the brink of systematic failure.'' No wonder someone like Matt Simmons says that the only solution is to pray.

And it is not just the people quoted in this article, Mr. Speaker. Recently, there have been two articles in major news weeklies. Just this week in U.S. News and World Report, an article on ExxonMobil points out that this giant was not able to meet its projection production last year. They slipped 5 percent, as a matter of fact. Although they made enormous profits, their stocks still fell because they did not meet expectations. The other article is one in Time magazine, and that is last week's Time magazine: ''Why Gas Won't Get Cheaper,'' and they ask a number of interesting questions in the article and display a considerable understanding of the probability of peak oil. ''Is the world running out of oil?'' And the answer is ''No.'' The world is not running out of oil. What the world is running out of is its ability to produce high-quality cheap oil on demand.

How did we get here? The chart that we have on the easel here shows a prediction that was made in 1956, and I keep coming back in discussions to M. King Hubbert because it was his predictions that started this discussion, which has now been going on for half a century. In 1956, he predicted that the United States would peak in its oil production about 1970. As a matter of fact, it was exactly 1970. How could he do that? How could he watch what was happening in 1956 and conclude that we would peak in oil production in this country in 1970?

What he was doing was watching the exploitation and exhaustion of individual oil fields, and he noted that they all followed a very similar pattern. They followed a bell curve, lots of bell curves. If we measure people, how tall they are, we will see some are very short, most are bunched in the middle, and a few are very tall. If we weigh people to see how much they weigh, we will find a few are 60, 70, 80 pounds, very few at that weight. A few would be up at 600, 700, 800, very few there. But the big mass of people are bunched in the middle, and that is called a typical bell curve.

He found that the production of oil followed this curve that is well known to scientists and statisticians. When oil is plentiful in the ground, it is easily pumped and it reached a peak, and he found that when it had reached that peak production rate that about half of the oil had been pumped.

It is reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that the last part of the oil would be more difficult to get. As a matter of fact, I just heard today that the scavaging wells that we have in our country, the yield between three and 10 barrels of oil a day, much of it electrical energy in pumping, are requiring more energy to get the oil out than we will get out of the oil. But, never mind, we may have enough electrical energy, and one cannot put that in their car unless they have awfully big batteries and then it will not take them very far.

But we really do need the oil, and so they are producing the oil, which energy-wise is uneconomical to produce. So after we reached the peak production, we started falling down what is called Hubbert's Peak. This is a well-known phenomenon and M. King Hubbert became a celebrity among his peers because he predicted that the United States would peak in oil production in 1970. He looked at the world situation and made some guesses to how much more oil the world would find. And, by the way, most of it had been found during his lifetime. We are now pumping it some 30 or 40 years after it was found.

And he made a prediction of when oil production would peak in the world, and he said that that would be about the turn of the millennium. It was a little after that, obviously. He could not have known about the Arab oil embargo or the oil price hikes or the worldwide recession that reduced the demand for oil, and so we had a few years of grace. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that if M. King Hubbert was right about the United States and, using those same analysis techniques, he predicted that the world would peak in oil production at about the turn of the century, why should the world leaders not have been concerned that maybe, just maybe, he was right about world oil production peaking about the turn of the millennium? And if that was true, then we should have been embarking on an aggressive program to develop alternative energy sources.

Before leaving this, I would like to point out that the red is what happened in the Soviet Union and now Russia. There are going to have a second little peak here because they kind of came apart when the Soviet Union was dissolving, and we see the oil they pumped did not meet the expectations of the Hubbert's curve.

The next chart I want to show is kind of a schematic curve that shows the relationship between oil demand and oil use. During all of history until this time, there has been adequate oil in the ground and adequate capability to pump it that the oil supply has been equal to the demand for oil. But when we are reaching the peak of this curve and demand keeps on going up, there will be an increasing discrepancy between the amount of oil we would like to use and the amount of oil that is available to use.

This is a 2 percent growth curve. With 2 percent growth compounded, it doubles in 35 years; and so from this point to this point, it has doubled. So that is about 35 years. So it shows that rolling over this peak, and, by the way, sometimes this phenomenon is known as ''the great rollover.'' We have been referring to it as peak oil. It about 35 years from this point to the end of the yellow there. And this points out that the world problems with oil will occur considerably before the peak. In this schematic, it occurs about 17 years before the peak.

Have we peaked? It may very well be a few years in the future. But as production slows down as we reach that peak and demand keeps on going up, even before we reach the peak, there will be a discrepancy, a difference, between what we would like to use and what is available to use.

The next chart shows us something about the challenges that we face, and this is an interesting chart. The top graph here shows the history of the use of energy in the world, going clear back to the 1600s and bringing us up to the present. The brown curve here is wood; and for a very long time, that was the world's only energy source. And then the Industrial Revolution was almost floundering because we had decimated the forests in New England. There are now more forests in New Hampshire than there was at the time of the revolution because we had used the trees in very large numbers for producing coke, for producing charcoal, for producing iron.

And then we discovered coal, and notice how many more quadrillion BTUs we were able to produce with coal. That is for two reasons: one, because the energy density of coal is higher, and because it is more convenient to use.

□ 2215

And then, long before we ran out of coal, we transitioned to oil. And notice then what happened to energy use. That is because, again, these two qualities of oil, one is it is more convenient to use; you could have a coal cart following the engine and shovel coal as we did in trains for a long time and run the train on coal. That is very difficult to do with your car, but oil you can put in the tank of your car, and so we found lots more uses for energy, and the energy density of oil is greater than the energy density of coal. So we see a greatly increased production of BTUs with oil.

The challenge that we face as we roll over Hubbert's Peak, and the available oil does not meet the demands for oil in the world; the challenge we face is to find energy sources which can replace oil. Now, unless there is some sort of energy that we have not envisioned yet that is hidden out there, we just need to go find it, we are going to have to deal with the energy sources that are available to us.

The next chart shows us the energy density of a number of different substances, and it begins with something like domestic refuge which, by the way, can produce a lot of electricity if you burn it rather than putting it in a landfill; brown coal, which is a very poor quality coal, baled straw, this is the biomass that you may hear people talking about, dried dung, we burned buffalo chips when our forefathers went

west in this country, and they still burn dried dung in many parts of the world, and then that is just about the same as wood. Notice that coal is better than wood, higher energy density than wood. Then we go through coke and ethanol, and notice that ethanol does not have the same energy density, it is considerably less than crude oil and, of course, as you refine it, why you get the diesel and petrol, the automotive gasoline, naptha is still higher, aviation fuel is still higher, and natural gas, which contains relatively more hydrogen, still has a higher energy density.

Just a word about this energy density and what that really means. The energy density in these fossil fuels is just incredible, and we have kind of taken them for granted, and we have fashioned a society and economy which is just about totally dependent on them. The energy in one barrel of oil, that is 42 gallons of oil, which today at the pump will cost something like $100; it is about $50 to buy it and another $50 to refine it and transport it to the station. You are paying a little over $2 a gallon, so that is about $100 for that barrel of oil. That barrel of oil, Mr. Speaker, has the energy equivalent of about 25,000 man-hours of labor.

Now, in another life, I worked for IBM and we prepared a lot of responses to proposals, and we would price our manpower in man-years, and a man-year was 260 hours; that is the number of hours a person works in a year. So if I divide 260 hours into 25,000, I get roughly 12 man-years. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that with this barrel of oil that costs you $100, you have bought the work equivalent of 12 people working full-time for you for one year. What a cheap servant fossil fuels have been for us, and how addicted we have become to using them.

Another little example so that you can get perhaps a more personal appreciation of the energy density of these fossil fuels, imagine how far a gallon of gasoline, not very large, and still cheaper, by the way, than water in the grocery store, unless you buy it in a gallon jug in Wal-Mart or K-Mart or some place like that; but note how far that gallon of gas takes you in your car. And if you are going up a mountain, how long it would take you using some mechanical advantage to pull yourself up that mountain, and you can get some notion as to the energy density in these fossil fuels and the enormous challenge we have in finding alternatives, and alternatives we must find.

The next chart takes a look at some of the options that are available to us as we transition from our enormous dependence on oil and natural gas, which tend to go together, because natural gas is kind of a volatile from oil, it exists generally with oil; remember pictures of old oil derricks that are burning the natural gas off, we did not have pipelines, it was just a waste product and they burned it off. The gas is collected there, it is gas associated with oil; if not, it is vented through the millennia to the atmosphere. Of course, we have some fields of only gas and they generally are much deeper where there has been more heat and all of the oil has, in a sense, been vaporized and become natural gas.

Here we have a list of the alternatives that are available to us, and there are some finite resources that we can tap, and we will need to do that, but we need to recognize two things. One is that there is some economic and environmental penalties that we will need to pay for tapping some of these, and the second is that they are also not forever. So we must not conclude that if we are successful in developing some of these; well there is one of these that could be forever and that is nuclear fusion. I think the odds of getting there, Mr. Speaker, are relatively small; about the same odds as you and I planning on our economic future by winning the lottery. That would be nice, but unlikely, and I think that fusion would be very nice, but just about as unlikely.

We have some enormous deposits of tar sands in Canada, and they have invited us to come there this summer to look at those. They are being exploited, by the way, and China has bought the rights to purchase much of the oil that they are producing from the tar sands and the oil shales. There is a lot of potential oil there. But the problem is that it is very difficult to get. It takes a lot of energy to get, with a pretty high environmental penalty. In a few moments we will show a chart that looks at energy profit ratios and we will see where the tar sands and oil shales fall on this plot.

Then there is coal. I would like to digress for just a moment. We will come back to this chart, but let us look at coal, because I know some people say, gee, we have a lot of coal in this country and China has a lot of coal, we are the two biggest economies in the world now, and why worry, we will just burn coal. And your children may come home from school and tell you there is a 500-year supply of coal. That really is not true. The best estimates today that, at current use rates, with no growth, there is about a 250-year supply of coal. Well, gee, that sounds like a lot of coal. Well, that would tide us over.

But notice what happens when I assume just 1.1 percent growth rate. Remember those exponential curves we showed; with just 1 percent growth rate. Notice what happens with 2 percent growth rate, it drops down to about 100 years. But since there are not very many uses for coal directly, except maybe firing a furnace that produces steam that drives a turbine that produces electricity, we are going to have to convert coal into gas and into oil.

I remember as a little boy that all of the lamps that we burned were not kerosene lamps, they were called coal oil lamps, and that is because we learned that before we were refining oil to get kerosene, we had learned how to get oil from coal, so we can do that again. But notice what happens. When you recognize it, you are going to have to spend some of the energy in the coal to convert the coal to more usable forms. Now, our 250-year supply of coal, with no growth, now has shrunk to just about 50 years. When we have only a 2 percent growth and, by the way, last year the world economy grew 5 percent, we grew about 2 percent, the world economy grew 5 percent, and China's economy grew at about 10 percent last year, which, by the way, they doubled their economy in just 7 years.

We are going to have to depend more on coal clearly to tide us over, but it is a fantasy that it will carry us through to the indefinite future. We have to recognize that it is a resource that we have to use wisely.

Let us go back now to the original chart and look at the nuclear, this is a nuclear option, which is a little different than the other one, because we do have some nuclear options here. We produce 20 percent of our electricity with nuclear power plants in this country. France produces about 70, 80 percent of their electricity with nuclear power. There are three ways in which you can use nuclear power to produce electricity. One of those I mentioned already and that is fusion, and that is what the sun does. That is why we get so much energy from the sun. That is the hydrogen bomb, and you get a lot of energy from that over a very short time period, and it becomes difficult to effectively utilize that, but we are trying. We are trying to exploit fusion so that we can use it in a scale large enough to produce electricity economically. If we ever get there, we are kind of home free, Mr. Speaker, because this really could produce energy with which we could do wonderful things in the world. But the odds of getting there are pretty small, I think. You can use your own judgment, but I think that they are pretty small. So it is something that we need to keep pursuing, but let us not bank on it.

There are two other ways we can use nuclear power. One of them is in the lightwater reactors that uses fissionable uranium, which is probably in shorter supply in the world than either gas or oil. And so that is not a final solution. We really have to ramp up nuclear, and we really seriously need to look at nuclear power. I know there are some environmental concerns, and as long as oil was plentiful and natural gas burns cleanly, why worry about nuclear when you can burn these fossil fuels. But if, in fact, Mr. Speaker, we are at or will soon be at peak oil, then we need to reevaluate nuclear, and I know some of my friends are now taking a new look at nuclear who have been kind of stoutly opposed to nuclear in the past.

Well, since fission with fissionable uranium is limited because of a limited

supply in the world, the third way to produce electricity from nuclear is what is called the breeder reactor. We have none of those in this country. The only one we have here were producing nuclear weapons. France has a number of them. As the name implies, they produce more fuel than they use, and so this could be a big energy source. But it produces, the way we now use it, it produces by-products, Mr. Speaker, which have to be stored away for maybe as much as a quarter of a million years.

I have a feeling that anything which is so hot, that it has so much energy in it that you have to squirrel it away for a quarter of a million years ought to have enough energy in it that resourceful, creative, innovative people could find some use for it. And I think that that is a challenge that we need to address, because if we are going to have anything like a smooth transition and not have the dire predictions that I read in Savinar's article here, if we are going to have anything like a smooth transition to alternatives, we are going to have to use a whole lot more nuclear than we are using now to buy us time to move to these renewables.

Now, with nuclear, we are limited in the kind of energy we can produce. Heat, which can boil water and run turbines and produce electricity, that is the way we use nuclear energy now. Of course, there are limited things we can do with electricity, and so there are other types of energy that we need equivalent to the type of energy that we get from oil.

Now we look at some truly renewable sources, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) earlier this evening was talking about how this is our income, and we ought not to be dipping into our savings, and our savings are things like tar sands and oil shales and coal and so forth; we ought to be able to make due with our income and if you keep dipping into your savings, by and by you will be bankrupt. That is what we have pretty much done as a society is dip into these savings and, from an energy perspective, we are near bankruptcy.

So you look at all of these renewables now and by and by, with the exception of nuclear and how much of that you are willing to put up with in terms of environmental effects and so forth, we are going to have to have a society that runs on these renewables, because obviously, fossil fuels are not forever. Solar is one of them. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, most of the energy that we are using or will use came from or comes from the sun. It is no wonder the ancients, so many of them, worshipped the sun, because they intuitively recognized it as the source of life. It was the sun that made the plants grow, that produced the coal. As a little boy I remember we used to use what was called run-of-mine coal. You took it from the mine just as it came, some big lumps and some dust, and I grew up in western Pennsylvania, and some of the lumps were so big we could not put them in our furnace.

□ 2230

And so I would go to the basement, and with a sledgehammer I would break the lumps of coal to get them small enough to throw in the furnace. And I remember the feelings that I had, Mr. Speaker, when I broke open those big lumps of coal, and there was a fern leaf. And I recognized how many thousands of years ago that plant grew that was producing coal for us today.

And then, of course, it was the sun that made the little organisms grow in those ancient waters in a very much warmer Earth than we have today. It was warm at the poles because there is oil up at the poles. And these little organisms grew in the water. They would die and settle out to the bottom, and then in many places they would fall into deep crevices and the rains would wash sediment in over them. And time and pressure, the sediments were converted to rock, then with the movement of the tectonic plates in the Earth, they would sink down to where heat acting on this organic material trapped under the rocks would be converted to oil and gas.

And so all of the fossil fuels that we are burning came from the energy of the sun. Today, we can harness the energy of the sun in many ways. You build a house with windows that face south, and your house will be warmed by what we call passive solar heating. You can put a little mechanism on the top of your house that has a copper pipe painted black usually inside of it, under glass. You know what happens to your car in a parking lot, it gets really hot inside that glass, and you can heat your water with it.

We now have developed technologies where we can convert the photons into electricity. And the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) earlier mentioned the thin films that we have developed that you can incorporate in tiles for your floor or roof shingles for your house, or siding for your house, which can produce electricity.

That has been fairly expensive, like 26 cents a kilowatt hour. We pay about 7 now per hour now here in the East, but that is really coming down in price.

With oil at $50 a barrel, and Goldman Sachs says it is going up to $105, I do not how they picked that magic number, but since solar is coming down and the price of oil is going up, those curves will cross; and I hope we will see a whole lot more solar, because it is really clean. There are no byproducts, for at least 30 years. Those solar cells will sit there. Every time the sun shines or you have light, they will be producing electricity, less when there is no sun.

Then there is wind energy. Mr. Speaker, I have driven and seen some real forests of these wind machines, out in some of the passes in the West; and they are now producing electricity at 3½ cents a kilowatt hour. Some people do not like their looks. I think they look a whole lot nicer than those swaths that we cut through our forests to run these high tension lines; and if we had more of these wind machines closer by, we would have less susceptibility to terrorist attacks, because we would have a distributed energy production, and we would not need so many high tension lines, and you would not have a grid which is at such risk.

Of course, the wind blows because the sun shines, and the differential heating produced by the sun causes the wind to blow, so that really is solar energy. We get it through wind, but it is the sun shining that makes the wind blow. And then there is true geothermal.

Now, that term is used in an interesting way in heat pumps. The ordinary heat pump is not very brightly, wisely conceived, because what it does in the winter time to warm you in the house, it tries to make the outside air even colder; and the summer time, to cool you in the house, it tries to make the outside air warmer.

If you are working not against the outside temperature, which can be zero in the winter time and 100 in the summer time, if you are working against the Earth or groundwater, obviously you are working against something which is a whole lot warmer in the winter and a whole lot cooler in the summer.

And they sometimes call that geothermal. But real geothermal is when you are doing what Iceland does and that is tap the energy from the core of the Earth, which is molten iron, and some places it comes close enough to the surface, sometimes it actually boils the water, it, of course, comes out through a volcano, but some places you can drill down deep enough, if you tap that heat, that is a very large molten core.

So that is an energy source that we have some places in the West we can tap that, which would be an important source of energy, but only in certain places. And then there is ocean energy. Two kinds of energy in the ocean. One is the waves, and of course we have waves in the ocean because the wind blows, and the wind blows because of the sun, and we come back again to the sun as the source of energy.

The other source of energy from the ocean are the tides. And this is about one of the few energy sources that does not come from the sun, and that of course comes from the Moon, because as the Moon goes around the Earth, it has the gravitational pull, and it is pulling the water up about 2 feet. How much energy would it take to raise the whole ocean 2 feet?

There is a whole lot of energy there if we could tap it. And we have tried, but that is very difficult, because there is an old axiom that says that energy, to be effective, must be concentrated. And these tides are spread out over far too great a distance, and they are difficult to tap.

But as energy becomes more and more critical, we should become more and more creative in how we approach tapping that energy source, because there is a lot of potential energy there that could be made available.

And the next point here is agricultural resources. This is one I really am very enthusiastic about. A few cautions, however. Our agriculture in this country is in trouble economically. And there are lots of potential sources of energy from agriculture. The soy diesel and biodiesel are an obvious energy source, and there are now engines today that will run on soy diesel, soybean oil, indeed, as well as on diesel fuel.

So this is a potential source of energy, ethanol, which everybody has heard about. And I would like to digress for just a moment and come back to this chart. I have another chart here that looks at ethanol. This points out some very interesting challenges that we have.

On the right here, it shows how you go from petroleum, that is crude oil, how you go from crude oil to gasoline. And it shows all of the energy inputs at every step from recovering it, to transporting it, to refining it, to hauling it to the gas station.

And to get 1 million Btus out of it, you had to consume 1.23 million Btus of fossil energy. So it cost you about 25 percent of the energy to produce the energy. On the other side here, we look at ethanol. And, of course, we start out with energy from the sun, and corn, and this is the energy input of the fertilizers and so forth to plant the corn and transport the corn and make the ethanol and transport the ethanol.

And for the same one million, it will be more volume, by the way. Do you remember the energy density? Lower for ethanol, more volume, but the same. We are comparing apples to apples, because it is a million Btus. To get a million Btus of ethanol, we had to use .74 million Btus of fossil fuel, still a net gain but not a really big net gain. But still worth doing.

The bottom here shows something really interesting. It shows the energy which is used to produce a bushel of corn. And I want to note how much of this energy comes from fossil fuel. Nitrogen. All of that comes from fossil fuel. All of the nitrogen fertilizers we have today are made from natural gas.

Until we learned how to do that, the only source of fertilizers was barnyard manures and guano. Guano is the droppings of birds and bats over thousands of years accumulating in caves and on tropical islands. There was an industry, before we learned how to make nitrogen fertilizer from natural gas, there was an industry that mined guano. That is gone now; that is not a resource we can fall back on.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you have noticed or not in the summer time when you water your lawn, it is nowhere near as green as when you have a thunderstorm. You may have wondered why. We used to call a thunderstorm poor man's fertilizer, because what the lightning does in the thunderstorm is to combine nitrogen of the air, and about four-fifths of all of the air is nitrogen, combines it in a form that can be carried down by the rain, into the soil so your lawn does look greener after nature waters it, as compared to you watering it, and that is because of the nitrogen which has been converted to a form by the lightning, which can be carried down by the water.

What will we do for nitrogen when natural gas is gone? Now we can produce it with other energy sources. But we are looking at enormous investments of energy. Because, look, nearly half of all of the energy that went into producing that bushel of corn is just the natural gas and the nitrogen fertilizer.

But let us go on. Here is the seed. Some energy went into growing that. Input hauling, that is fossil fuels. Purchased water. That was probably pumped using some fossil fuels. Chemicals, a whole bunch of those chemicals are made from fossil fuels, which, by the way, we have not mentioned the importance of oil and gas as feed stocks for an enormous petrochemical industry.

Some have very appropriately noted that gas, particularly, and oil are too good to burn. We live in a plastic world; that all comes from gas and oil.

And so many of these chemicals came from oil. For custom work, he came in to harvest on the combine. He used oil to drive his combine, oil helped produce the combine. Natural gas, electricity that could have been produced by these fossil fuels, oil or gas or coal. Here is liquid gas here, and gasoline and diesel fuel.

And then we come to the other two nutrients that we give corn in large quantities, that will put some lime on it to make sure that the Ph is okay. And then phosphate and potash. Now, we use fossil fuels in mining and hauling the phosphate and potash.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that probably 95 percent, at least, of all of the energy that goes into producing corn comes from fossil fuels. The corn that we eat is in a very literal sense oil. Because if it were not for oil, unless we were producing corn in a very different way than we do today, we would not have corn to eat.

Let us go back to our selection of the options. And we were talking about ethanol, and methanol is similar. You get ethanol from the carbohydrates in plants and corn. You get methanol from sawdust and things like that. This is a one-carbon alcohol, this is a two-carbon alcohol. And then biomass. Biomass is just using corn stocks or switchgrass or trees or something like that to produce energy.

By the way, we still produce a lot of energy with wood. It is generally in industries where wood waste is a byproduct. If you have a lot of sawdust, you burn the sawdust, and that produces energy. That is why the energy on one of those first charts I showed getting from wood is not zero now, because we are still using a fair amount of energy in some industries from wood because it is a waste product otherwise.

And then, of course, waste to energy. I mentioned that previously. We were looking at that as one of the lowest, that was the lowest on that chart, in fact, energy density. But, never mind. There is a whole lot of it. We still could get some meaningful energy out of it.

And then the last one here: hydrogen from renewables. And hydrogen bears spending just a moment talking about it, because hydrogen, contrary to what many people believe, is not an energy source. Hydrogen is, in effect, Mr. Speaker, pretty much the equivalent of a battery. A battery is a handy way to take electrons, electricity, and store them, and then get them back at another time at another place where you want to use it.

That is pretty much exactly what hydrogen is. There is no hydrogen out there that you can suck out of the air, or you can pump out of the ground. The way you get hydrogen is to invest energy to get it from natural gas, or to split water. Water is made up of two parts of hydrogen and one part of oxygen.

So you can get a lot of hydrogen from water. But you will always spend more energy making the hydrogen than you will ever get out of the hydrogen. Well, you say, gee, why are people talking about a hydrogen economy? And why is that a good idea if it will take more energy to produce the hydrogen than you will get out of the hydrogen?

It really is a good idea. And the reason it is a good idea is because once you have got the hydrogen, and you can produce it from like nuclear, coal, biomass, you cannot have a trunkful of garbage and run your car down, but you could produce electricity, and with electricity you could produce hydrogen, and then your car will run very well on that.

□ 2245

When you are using the hydrogen, if you are burning it, it does not matter how you burn it, if you use it in a fuel cell or reciprocating engine, the fuel cell is much better because it has twice the efficiency. You just get water. So the only pollution you have to worry about is the pollution at the site where you made the hydrogen. And the economies of scale make it a whole lot easier to control the pollution there than it does in a million cars running up and down the road. I am very supportive of the hydrogen economy.

I really need to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, this is not a solution to our energy problem, Mr. Speaker. It will not replace oil. Hydrogen is simply the equivalent of a battery. It is a handy way to take energy from one place, to store it, to take it to another place

where you can use it in a very handy form, that you can use it in a nuclear cell and get at least the twice the efficiency of a reciprocating engine, that is the kind of engine you have in your car or truck, and that produces only water as a by-product which is not polluting.

The next chart we will show you shows some of the characteristics that you will have to look for in substitutes for oil as we run down the other side of Hubbert's Peak. Here on the ordinate we look at energy profit ratios. What that is is how much energy you have to put in to get energy out. If you are putting in one unit of energy and getting one unit of energy out, you do less than that in producing hydrogen. You put one more than one unit to get one unit out, but never mind. It is still a good idea because hydrogen burns so cleanly and is used so efficiently in a fuel cell.

The abscissa shows the economic effectiveness, how easy is it to transport it and use it. So where you want to be is right in the upper right-hand corner and most giant oil fields are up there all alone. That is gas and oil of course. There is not anything out there that competes with these.

Let us look at the alternatives that we have been talking about. Here is the 1970s direct use of coal. It was sort of good on the energy profit ratio but, boy, was it inconvenient to use. It is way over here on the left. Trains used it directly. You had the coal car and you shoveled it into the train and produced heat and steam and you ran the train with that.

Here is photovoltaics. In 1995 they were not very good. Photovoltaics is another name for solar cells. But we are now getting very much better with them. We are probably even better than this chart shows that we are moving up here. But they will never move to the right because they are stuck on the roof of your house or something like that. So you have to use the energy from them if you want to go someplace like to charge a battery or make hydrogen so you can put that in your car and go with that.

Electricity is produced from hydro plants, from coal fire plants, from nuclear plants; and notice that it is down here very close to the abscissas and it cannot much move from there. And notice that the energy profit ratio is not very high. Never matter, because electricity is so convenient. We do so many things with it, that it really does not matter that it is not produced very efficiently. And of course you cannot transport it very well so it is stuck somewhere down here on the abscissa and it never goes very high on the ordinate.

Look down here, in the worst possible place to be in terms of energy-profit ratio and that is tar sands and ethanol. Of course, the worst place to be is here by zero. It has no energy-profit ratio and you cannot do anything with it. Once you get the oil out of the tar sands and once you get the ethanol, then it is very convenient. But notice how far it is down here in terms of energy-profit ratio. We are putting almost as much energy in as we are getting out of it.

Here is U.S. oil in the 1970s. It was up here, very convenient to use. But it is way down in energy profit ratio because we pumped our good oil a long time before 1970, our easy to get oil. We peaked in 1970 as you know. This is the oil use in 1985. It is sliding down. We are now in 2005. 20 years later. Look what it did in these 15 years. For our oil we are down somewhere near zero here. We are putting in almost as much energy as we are getting out. But never mind because the energy we are putting in is more convenient to get, like electrical energy.

I mentioned previously that some of our stripper wells, we are putting in more Btus of electrical energy than the Btus we will get out of the oil. But we are still doing it because oil is a commodity that is just so useful in our society.

The next chart shows us the transition that we need to go through if we are going to be successful in going from our enormous dependence on fossil fuels, particularly oil, and gas, if we are going to transition to these renewables. The first thing we have to do is voluntary conservation.

We have a chart if we can find it of the situation in California. It shows what the Californians did voluntarily. As you can see from this chart, this graph, the average citizen in California uses only about 60 percent of the energy that used in the rest of the country. Now, I know a lot of Californians. They are the biggest delegation here, and none of them believe that they have a lesser quality of life in California than we have in Mississippi or Oregon or Maryland, and they have done that through, much of it voluntary. Not all of it voluntary.

Let us go back to the other chart to show the route California has been following to get where they are. The next is organized voluntary conservation. By the way, there were no rolling blackouts in California because they voluntarily reduced their consumption of electricity by 11 percent which avoided the rolling blackouts that we were sure they were going to have. Now we have organized voluntary conservation. Let us work together. Let us share our experiences.

Monetary incentives, something where government can gets involved. Policies for voluntary conservation.

Efficient technology retrofits. How can we live as well as we are living now using much less energy? We were a very creative people. We really can do this.

Finally, monetary incentives that will increase our efficiency.

The last chart we are going to show here kind of capitulates this and looks at where we are and what we need to be doing. What we clearly need to do is buy time. Remember that earlier chart we are showed, Hubbert's Peak and the 2 percent exponential increase in use of energy? We have got to buy some time or we will be sliding down the other side of Hubbert's Peak, and you buy time by conservation and efficiency.

Conservation you can do very quickly. Turn down the thermostat. Turn out the light when you are not using it. Drive less in your car. Car pool. There are a lot of things we can do for efficiency.

We can buy time by using new technologies. Conservation and efficiency of course go hand in hand. Conservation you can do more quickly. Efficiency you have to develop the technologies to be more efficient. We have done that by the way. Our refrigerators today probably use half the electricity they did a couple of decades ago.

Then we need to use this time wisely. Once we bought some time we need to use wisely.

Now we are about out of time in our special order this evening, and I would like to talk a little bit at another time about Jevons' Paradox and how if the whole world does not do this, Jevons' Paradox which says the harder you work on some problems the worse they get.

Jevons' Paradox could be a real problem here. The whole world really needs to work together here. Suppose we really do heave to and conserve and become more efficient and save a lot of oil and all that happens is that makes it more available to China to grow their economy and grow their military? That is an application of Jevons' Paradox. We are working real hard to solve the problem. And from our personal perspective and national security perspective in this country, we have just made the problem worse because we have made more oil and gas available for China.

But we are all in this boat together and the whole world needs to work together. Let us assume we do. Then we need to use it wisely and we need to make the investments in these alternatives that we should have been making. We have known for at least 25 years that peak oil was coming. If Hubbert was right about the United States, Mr. Speaker, then why was he not right about the world and why did we waste the last 25 years and paid no attention to the obvious necessity of freeing ourselves from this dependence on fossil fuels. For oil, much of that comes, two-thirds of it we import, much of that as the President says from countries that do not even like us.

The benefits of this, additional benefits include business opportunities. We are a very creative culture. We have lots of opportunities to make contributions here. Potential worldwide markets, if we are going to pioneer domestic job creation, environmentally benign technologies that are not producing greenhouse gases.

We need to be a role model. Like it or not we are a leader in the world. We

use a fourth of the world's oil, a fourth of the world's energy, we are a fourth of the world's economy. We are a role model. We have got to be a role model.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can be a good role model, inspiring the rest of the world to do what needs to be done to conserve, have more efficiency, to buy time, to invest that very wisely. This can create a whole new economy with all of the technologies that are necessary to transition to these renewables.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we have to have some other way of measuring success other than how much energy you use, a bigger car, a more expensive vacation, an enormous house that you heat and cool. These are the signs of success and they all require more energy. We are going to have to have a different yard stick by which we measure success. We can do it. I am sure we can but will not do it unless we mobilize, unless we all understand that this is something that we need to work together to solve.

Mr. Speaker, I have confidence that America can rise to this challenge, but the real challenge now is for all of us to understand that if we do not do this we are going to face a very bleak future as was quoted from all of these experts that Matt Savinar quotes in his article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of an appointment in the district.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and May 17.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical emergency.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and before 1:00 p.m. May 17 on account of official business in the district.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of family reasons.

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. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HERSETH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT for 5 minutes, May 23.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, May 19.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, May 19.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 2005, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. BRYAN DAVIS AND HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 22 AND OCT. 25, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Bryan Davis	10/22	10/25	Italy			(3)					
Hon. Donald Manzullo	10/22	10/25	Italy	1,073.00						1,073.00	6,696.61
Committee total											6,696.61

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Returned 30 E.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, May 4, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. JASON FENTON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 21 AND MAR. 1, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Jason Fenton	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,889.02				6,783.02
Committee total					894.00		5,889.02				6,783.02

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JASON FENTON, Apr. 4, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. JACQUELINE MORAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 19 AND FEB. 25, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Jacqueline Moran	2/19	2/22	New Dehli				85.00		160.00		1,180.00
	2/23	2/25	Bangolore				92.00		400.00		1,626.00
Committee total						177.00		560.00	21,921.00	2,806.00	

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACQUELINE MORAN, Mar. 25, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, REV. DANIEL COUGHLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 18 AND MAR. 23, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rev. Daniel Coughlin	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00						708.00
Committee total					1,284.00						1,284.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL COUGHLIN, Apr. 14, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. JANICE McKINNEY AND MS. VANESSA GRIDDINE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 23 AND APR. 2, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice McKinney	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00	(3)					578.00
Vanessa Griddine	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00	(3)					578.00
Janice McKinney	3/25	3/27	Jordan		508.00	(3)					508.00
Vanessa Griddine	3/25	3/27	Jordan		508.00	(3)					508.00
Janice McKinney	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00	(3)					724.00
Vanessa Griddine	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00	(3)					724.00
Janice McKinney	3/29	3/31	Cyprus		780.58	(3)					780.58
Vanessa Griddine	3/29	3/31	Cyprus		780.58	(3)					780.58
Janice McKinney	3/31	4/02	Belgium		790.00	(3)					790.00
Vanessa Griddine	3/31	4/02	Belgium		790.00	(3)					790.00
Committee total					6,761.16						6,761.16

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JANICE McKINNEY, Apr. 8, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. SCOTT PALMER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 30 AND APR. 5, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Scott Palmer	3/30	4/01	France		1,052.64		(3)				1,052.64
	4/01	4/05	Netherlands		2,125.02		(3)				2,125.02
Committee total					3,177.66						3,177.66

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Apr. 22, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice Helwig		1/10	United States				4,804.00				4,804.00
	1/11	1/24	Austria		4,172.00						4,172.00
		2/09	United States				4,803.00				4,803.00
	2/10	3/25	Austria		13,112.00						13,112.00
Committee total					17,284.00		9,607.00				26,891.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRIS SMITH, Chairman, May 10, 2005.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY MEETING IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM; AND NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY MEETING WITH ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PARIS, FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 18 AND FEB. 23, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Hon. John Boozman	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Hon. Randy Forbes	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Hon. Paul Gillmor	2/20	2/23	France		1,716.00		(3) 2,956.10				4,672.10
Hon. Joel Hefley	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Hon. Thomas Petri	2/23	2/23	France		162.00		(3)				162.00
Hon. John Tanner	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Kathy Becker	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Candace Bryan Abbey	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Beverly Hallock	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Kay King	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Susan Olson	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Patrick Prisco	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/22	France		924.00		(3)				2,109.00
Mark Wellman	2/18	2/20	Belgium		1,185.00		(3)				
	2/21	2/23	France		1,386.00		(3)				2,571.00
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational Functions									5,310.06		5,310.06
Miscellaneous									815.68		815.68
Committee total					37,410.00		2,956.10		6,125.74		46,491.84

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Apr. 18, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, JORDAN, AND IRELAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 5 AND JAN. 11, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Kay Granger	1/6	1/7	Italy		218.00		(3)				
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		762.00		(3)				
	1/10	1/11	Ireland		343.00		(3)				1,323.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	1/6	1/7	Italy		218.00		(3)				
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		762.00		(3)				
	1/10	1/11	Ireland		343.00		(3)				1,323.00
Hon. Judy Biggert	1/6	1/7	Italy		218.00		(3)				
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		762.00		(3)				
	1/10	1/11	Ireland		343.00		(3)				1,323.00
Hon. John Shimkus	1/6	1/7	Italy		218.00		(3)				
	1/7	1/11	Jordan		762.00		(3)				
	1/10	1/11	Ireland		343.00		(3)				1,323.00
Mr. Darin Gardner	1/6	1/7	Italy		218.00		(3)				
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		762.00		(3)				
	1/10	1/11	Ireland		343.00		(3)				1,323.00
Mr. Simon Limage	1/6	1/7	Italy		218.00		(3)				
	1/7	1/10	Jordan		762.00		(3)				
	1/10	1/11	Ireland		343.00		(3)				1,323.00
Committee total					7,938.00						7,938.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

KAY GRANGER, Chairman, Mar. 31, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO EGYPT, LEBANON, ISRAEL, JORDAN, AND IRAQ, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 18 AND MAR. 25, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rep. Nancy Pelosi	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Rep. Henry Waxman	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Rep. George Miller	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO EGYPT, LEBANON, ISRAEL, JORDAN, AND IRAQ, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 18 AND MAR. 25, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Rep. Edward Markey	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Rep. Anna Eshoo	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Rep. James McGovern	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Rep. Linda Sánchez	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Rep. Darrell Issa	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Hon. Wilson Livingood	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Philip Schiliro	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Frederick Hill	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Jennifer Crider	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Deborah Spriggs	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Michael Sheehy	3/19	3/20	Egypt		289.00		(3)				289.00
	3/20	3/20	Lebanon				(3)				
	3/20	3/23	Israel		1,086.00		(3)				1,086.00
	3/23	3/24	Jordan		254.00		(3)				254.00
	3/24	3/24	Iraq				(3)				
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

NANCY PELOSI, Chairman, Apr. 18, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GREECE, ALBANIA, AND ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 29 AND APR. 2, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Deborah Pryce	3/29	3/30	Greece		380.45		(3)				380.45
Hon. Kay Granger	3/29	3/30	Greece		380.45		(3)				380.45
Hon. Thelma Drake	3/29	3/30	Greece		380.45		(3)				380.45
Lori Salley	3/29	3/30	Greece		380.45		(3)				380.45
Andrea Fantaros	3/29	3/30	Greece		380.45		(3)				380.45
Shiloh Roehl	3/29	3/30	Greece		380.45		(3)				380.45
Hon. Deborah Pryce	3/30	3/31	Albania		494.00		(3)				494.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/30	3/31	Albania		494.00		(3)				494.00
Hon. Thelma Drake	3/30	3/31	Albania		494.00		(3)				494.00
Lori Salley	3/30	3/31	Albania		244.00		(3)				244.00
Andrea Tantavos	3/30	3/31	Albania		244.00		(3)				244.00
Shiloh Roehl	3/30	3/31	Albania		244.00		(3)				244.00
Hon. Deborah Pryce	3/31	4/2	Italy		1,020.00		(3)				1,020.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/31	4/2	Italy		1,020.00		(3)				1,020.00
Hon. Thelma Drake	3/31	4/2	Italy		1,020.00		(3)				1,020.00
Lori Salley	3/31	4/2	Italy		1,020.00		(3)				1,020.00
Andrea Tantavos	3/31	4/2	Italy		1,020.00		(3)				1,020.00
Shiloh Roehl	3/31	4/2	Italy		1,020.00		(3)				1,020.00
Committee total					10,616.70						10,616.70

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DEBORAH PRYCE, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING IN REYKJAVIK, ICELAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND APR. 4, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Joel Hefley	4/1	4/4	Iceland		1308.00		(3)				1,308.00
Hon. Ben Chandler	4/1	4/4	Iceland		1,308.00		(3)				1,308.00
Hon. John Tanner	4/1	4/4	Iceland		1,308.00		(3)				1,308.00
Susan Olson	4/1	4/4	Iceland		1,308.00		(3)				1,308.00
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational								1,657.61			
Miscellaneous								115.20			
Committee total					5,232.00			1,772.81			7,004.81

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ROME, ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 7 AND APR. 8, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Tom DeLay	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Steny H. Hoyer	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Rosa Delauro	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. David R. Obey	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Charles B. Rangel	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(5)	(6) 4,285.07				5,434.22
Hon. Christopher H. Smith	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Marcy Kaptur	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Christopher Cox	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Michael R. McNulty	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. John A. Boehner	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Anna G. Eshoo	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Tim Holden	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Peter T. King	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Bart Stupak	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Steve Chabot	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Phil English	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Mark Foley	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Gil Gutknecht	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Sheila Jackson-Lee	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Robert W. Ney	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Robert Aderholt	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Mark Green	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Hon. Mike Ferguson	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Scott Palmer	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Brett Shogren	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
John Russell	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Brendan Daly	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Adm. John Eisold	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Wilson Livingood	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	4/7	4/8	Italy		1,058.15	(3)					1,058.15
Committee total					34,918.95		4,285.07				39,204.02

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[5] Military air transportation return only.
[6] Conair outbound.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ROME, ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 22 AND APR. 24, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Peter King	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Donald M. Payne	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Daniel Lungren	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Kevin Brady	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. John Larson	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Grace Napolitano	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Melissa Hart	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Mark Kennedy	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. James Langevin	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Hilda Solis	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. John Sullivan	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Diane Watson	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Steve King	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Thadderus McCotter	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Linda Sánchez	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Luis Fortuno	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Daniel Lipinski	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Michael McCaul	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Hon. Charlie Melancon	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Scott Palmer	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Mike Stokke	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Dean Aguillen	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
David Lafferty	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
David Adams	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Wilson Livingood	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ROME, ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 22 AND APR. 24, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
	4/22	4/24	Italy		1,932.55	(3)					1,932.55
Committee total					56,043.95						56,043.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, May 2, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
J. Matthew Szymanski	10/22	11/06	China				10,714.00		478.00		12,684.00
Rich Beutel	10/22	11/06	China				10,714.00		366.00		12,777.00
Sean Deverey	10/22	11/06	China				10,714.00		482.00		12,896.00
Tom Bezas	10/22	11/06	China				10,714.00		728.00		13,161.00
Hon. Ed Case	11/20	11/20	London				8,263.00		911.00		9,174.00
Military Air between Pakistan and Afghnistan.	11/21	11/22	Pakistan								
	11/22	11/22	Afghanistan								
	11/22	11/23	Pakistan								
	11/23	11/23	Afghanistan								
	11/23	11/24	Pakistan								
	11/24	11/24	London								
Bradley Knox	10/01	10/05	London		636.84				197.64		197.64
	10/05	10/08	Austria		1,019.18				(7)		1,019.18
	10/08	11/11	Czech Republic		1,765.00				(8) 605.00		605.00
Committee total											62,513.82

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation
[7] Returned $439.20.
[8] Returned $160.00.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Apr. 22, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romani		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Hon. Tom Osborne	2/18	2/22	United Kindgom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Hon. Stephanie Herseth	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Hon. Gil Gutknecht	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Hon. Mike McIntyre	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Hon. Bob Etheridge	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Hon. Robin Hayes	2/18	2/22	United Kingddom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland				(3)				
Brent Gattis	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Lynn Gallagher	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Alise Kowalski	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Josh Maxwell	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Brandon Ritchie	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928		(3)				1,928
	2/22	2/22	France				(3)				
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552		(3)				552
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167		(3)				1,167
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343		(3)				343
Hon. Collin Peterson	1/9	1/13	Honduras				(10)				
	1/13	1/16	Panama		708		2,695.45				3,403.45
	2/18	2/20	Japan		816		(3)				816
	2/20	2/22	China		626		(3)				626
	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696		(3)				696
	2/24	2/24	Sri Lanka				(3)				
	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822		(3)				822
	3/20	3/24	Spain		660		4,030.60				4,690.60
Committee total					51,865		6,726.05				58,591.05

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[10] Commercial air transportation.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jim Kolbe	1/07	1/15	New Zealand		(9) 1,686.00						1,686.00
	1/15	1/16	Thailand		(9) 232.00						232.00
	1/16	1/17	Indonesia		(9) 266.00						266.00
	1/17	1/18	Thailand		(9) 232.00						232.00
Misc. Transportation Costs							70.04				70.04
Commercial Airfare [9]							9,897.64				9,897.64
Hon. Mark Steven Kirk	1/10	1/12	Netherlands		658.00						658.00
	1/13	1/15	Pakistan								
	1/16	1/17	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/17	1/18	Pakistan		1,052.00						1,052.00
Commercial Airfare							8,651.88				8,651.88
James W. Dyer	12/30	12/31	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	12/31	1/01	Iraq		61.00						61.00
	1/01	1/02	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	1/02	1/03	Turkey		317.00						317.00
							(3)				
Hon. Frank Wolf	1/07	1/09	Kenya		590.00						590.00
Commercial Airfare							5,029.91				5,029.91
Dixon Butler	2/19	2/26	Russia		2,058.00						2,058.00
Commercial Airfare							2,914.58				2,914.58
Misc. Transportation Costs							144.58				144.58
Scott Burnison	2/19	2/26	Russia		2,058.00						2,058.00
Commercial Airfare							2,914.58				2,914.58
Misc. Transportation Costs							130.04				130.04
Hon. C.W. Bill Young	2/18	2/19	Luxembourg		741.60						741.60
	2/19	2/22	Italy		2,182.00						2,182.00
							(3)				
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	2/18	2/19	Luxembourg		741.60						741.60
	2/19	2/22	Italy		2,182.00						2,182.00
							(3)				
Douglas Gregory	2/18	2/19	Luxembourg		741.60						741.60
	2/19	2/22	Italy		2,182.00						2,182.00
							(3)				
Robert Blair	2/20	2/22	Indonesia		550.00						550.00
	2/22	2/25	Sri Lanka		750.00						750.00
Commercial Airfare							11,462.00				11,462.00
Rodney Bent	2/20	2/22	Indonesia		550.00						550.00
	2/22	2/25	Sri Lanka		750.00						750.00
Commercial Airfare							11,462.00				11,462.00
Hon. Harold Rogers	3/19	3/23	Spain		1,778.00						1,788.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
	3/30	3/31	Ireland		486.00						486.00
							(3)				
Hon. Martin Sabo	3/19	3/23	Spain		1,788.00						1,788.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
	3/30	3/31	Ireland		486.00						486.00
							(3)				
Hon. Ed Pastor	3/19	3/23	Spain		1,788.00						1,788.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
	3/30	3/31	Ireland		486.00						486.00
							(3)				
Stephanie Gupta	3/19	3/23	Spain		1,788.00						1,788.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
Commercial Airfare							3,377.04				3,377.04
Beverly Pheto	3/19	3/23	Spain		437.00						437.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
Commercial Airfare							4,730.64				4,730.64
Scott Burnison	3/19	3/23	Spain		1,788.00						1,788.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
	3/30	3/31	Ireland		486.00						486.00
							(3)				
Carol Murphy	3/18	3/20	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	3/20	3/21	Uzbekistan		123.00						123.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/21	3/22	Afghanistan		65.00						65.00
Misc. Transportation Costs									55.00		55.00
Commercial Airfare							7,000.35				7,000.35
Tom Forhan	3/18	3/20	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	3/20	3/21	Uzbekistan		123.00						123.00
	3/20	3/21	Afghanistan		65.00						65.00
Misc. Transportation Costs									125.00		125.00
Commercial Airfare							7,000.35				7,000.35
Committee total					53,957.80		74,785.63		180.00		128,923.43

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[9] Received only $2,400 per diem.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2005.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 22 AND OCT. 25, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to Hawaii, Wake Island, South Korea, China, Guam; January 6–16, 2005:											
Hon. J. Randy Forbes	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Joe Wilson	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Jeff Miller	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Phil Gingrey	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Ike Skelton	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Niel Abercrombie	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Rick Larsen	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Jim Cooper	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. Madeline Bordallo	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Hon. John F. Sullivan	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
B. Ryan Vaart	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Erin C. Conaton	1/6	1/7	Hawaii								
	1/8	1/8	Wake Island								
	1/8	1/11	South Korea		1,053.00						1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00						1,236.00
	1/15	1/15	Guam								
	1/15	1/16	Hawaii								
Delegation Expenses	1/11	1/14	China				384.51		5,832.06		6,216.57
Visit to Israel with Codel Kyl, January 6–10, 2005:											
Hon. Adam Smith	1/6	1/10	Israel		1,356.00						1,356.00
Visit to Jordan with Codel Granger, January 6–10, 2005:											
Hon. Ellen O. Tauscher	1/7	1/10	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/10	1/11	Ireland		343.00						343.00
Visit to Italy, Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Jordan, Iraq, Denmark, Ireland, January 7–14, 2005:											
Hon. Jim Saxton	1/7	1/8	Italy		264.00						264.00
	1/9	1/9	Uzbekistan								
	1/9	1/10	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/10	Uzbekistan								
	1/10	1/13	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/11	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/12	Iraq								
	1/13	1/14	Denmark		346.00						346.00
	1/14	1/14	Ireland								
Hon. Frank LoBiondo	1/7	1/8	Italy		264.00						264.00
	1/9	1/9	Uzbekistan								
	1/9	1/10	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/10	Uzbekistan								
	1/10	1/13	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/11	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/12	Iraq								
	1/13	1/14	Denmark		346.00						346.00
	1/14	1/14	Ireland								
Hon. Mike Turner	1/7	1/8	Italy		264.00						264.00
	1/9	1/9	Uzbekistan								
	1/9	1/10	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/10	Uzbekistan								
	1/10	1/13	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/11	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/12	Iraq								
	1/13	1/14	Denmark		346.00						346.00
	1/14	1/14	Ireland								
Hon. Gene Taylor	1/7	1/8	Italy		264.00						264.00
	1/9	1/9	Uzbekistan								
	1/9	1/10	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/10	Uzbekistan								
	1/10	1/13	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/11	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/12	Iraq								
	1/13	1/14	Denmark		346.00						346.00
	1/14	1/14	Ireland								
Hon. Marty Meehan	1/7	1/8	Italy		264.00						264.00
	1/9	1/9	Uzbekistan								
	1/9	1/10	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/10	Uzbekistan								
	1/10	1/13	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/11	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/12	Iraq								
	1/13	1/14	Denmark		346.00						346.00
	1/14	1/14	Ireland								
Thomas H. Hawley	1/7	1/8	Italy		264.00						264.00
	1/9	1/9	Uzbekistan								
	1/9	1/10	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/10	Uzbekistan								
	1/10	1/13	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/11	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/12	Iraq								
	1/13	1/14	Denmark		346.00						346.00
	1/14	1/14	Ireland								
William H. Natter	1/7	1/8	Italy		264.00						264.00
	1/9	1/9	Uzbekistan								
	1/9	1/10	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/10	Uzbekistan								
	1/10	1/13	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/11	1/11	Iraq								
	1/12	1/12	Iraq								
	1/13	1/14	Denmark		346.00						346.00
	1/14	1/14	Ireland								
Delegation Expenses	1/10	1/12	Jordan				266.32		3,083.15		3,349.47
Visit to Russia, North Korea, South Korea, China, Hong Kong, Japan; January 8–19, 2005:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		950.00						950.00
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00						408.00
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		950.00						950.00
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00						408.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		950.00						950.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00						408.00
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		950.00						950.00
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00						408.00
Douglas Roach	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		950.00						950.00
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00						408.00
Henry J. Schweiter	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		950.00						950.00
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00						408.00
Delegation Expenses	1/10	1/11	Russia				2,065.00		5,908.00		7,973.00
	1/15	1/16	China				9.80		1,117.38		1,127.18
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong				505.04		2,384.38		2,889.42
Visit to Russia, Staffdel Rusten, January 10–15, 2005:											
William C. Ostendorff	1/10	1/15	Russia		1,786.00						1,786.00
Commercial transportation							5,839.70				5,839.70
Visit to Pakistan, Afghanistan, Jordan, Iraq, Germany, January 12–18, 2005:											
Hon. John Kline	1/12	1/14	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/14	1/14	Afghanistan								
	1/14	1/17	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/15	1/15	Iraq								
	1/16	1/16	Iraq								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		264.00						264.00
Hon. Jim Marshall	1/12	1/14	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/14	1/14	Afghanistan								
	1/14	1/17	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/15	1/15	Iraq								
	1/16	1/16	Iraq								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		264.00						264.00
Hon. Kendrick Meek	1/12	1/14	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/14	1/14	Afghanistan								
	1/14	1/17	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/15	1/15	Iraq								
	1/16	1/16	Iraq								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		264.00						264.00
Jeffrey A. Green	1/12	1/14	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/14	1/14	Afghanistan								
	1/14	1/17	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/15	1/15	Iraq								
	1/16	1/16	Iraq								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		264.00						264.00
Mark R. Lewis	1/12	1/14	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/14	1/14	Afghanistan								
	1/14	1/17	Jordan		762.00						762.00
	1/15	1/15	Iraq								
	1/16	1/16	Iraq								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		264.00						264.00
Delegation Expenses	1/12	1/14	Pakistan				98.42		3,633.67		3,732.09
	1/14	1/17	Jordan				337.98		4,222.84		4,560.82
Visit to Poland with Codel McCotter, January 25–28, 2005:											
Hon. Steve Israel	1/25	1/28	Poland		502.00						502.00
Commercial transportation							5,868.66				5,868.66
Visit to Germany and Ukraine with Codel McCain, February 11–13, 2005:											
Hon. Joe Schwarz	2/11	2/13	Germany		884.28						884.28
	2/11	2/11	Ukraine								
Hon. Ellen O. Tauscher	2/11	2/13	Germany		884.28						884.28
	2/11	2/11	Ukraine								
Hon. Mark Udall	2/11	2/13	Germany		884.28						884.28
	2/11	2/11	Ukraine								
Visit to Japan, China, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Hong Kong, with Codel Duncan, February 17–27, 2005:											
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00						816.00
	2/20	2/22	China		626.00						626.00
	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
	2/24	2/24	Sri Lanka								
	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Visit to Hong Kong, Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, February 18–28, 2005:											
Hon. John McHugh	2/20	2/22	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	2/22	2/24	Vietnam		452.00						452.00
	2/23	2/23	Laos								
	2/24	2/25	Thailand		294.50						294.50
Commercial transportation							8,490.53				8,490.53
Hon. Ken Calvert	2/20	2/22	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	2/22	2/24	Vietnam		452.00						452.00
	2/23	2/23	Laos								
	2/24	2/25	Thailand		294.50						294.50
Commercial transportation							8,490.53				8,490.53
Hon. Jim Marshall	2/20	2/22	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	2/22	2/24	Vietnam		452.00						452.00
	2/23	2/23	Laos								
	2/24	2/25	Thailand		287.00						287.00
Commercial transportation							8,490.53				8,490.53
John Chapla	2/20	2/22	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	2/22	2/24	Vietnam		452.00						452.00
	2/23	2/23	Laos								
	2/24	2/25	Thailand		294.50						294.50
Commercial transportation							8,490.53				8,490.53

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Delegation Expenses	2/20	2/22	Hong Kong				50.83		2,385.42		2,436.25
	2/22	2/24	Vietnam				37.75		1,139.29		1,177.04
	2/24	2/25	Thailand				22.08		1,376.53		1,398.61
Visit to Puerto Rico, Panama, Honduras, February 18–25, 2005:											
Hon. Gene Taylor	2/18	2/20	Puerto Rico								
	2/20	2/22	Panama		472.00						472.00
	2/22	2/24	Honduras		446.00						446.00
Commercial transportation							1,249.79				1,249.79
Henry J. Schweiter	2/18	2/20	Puerto Rico								
	2/20	2/22	Panama		472.00						472.00
	2/22	2/24	Honduras		446.00						446.00
Commercial transportation							1,249.79				1,249.79
Delegation Expenses	2/20	2/22	Panama				1,304.00		974.88		2,278.88
Visit to Jordan, Iraq, Germany with Codel Cole, March 3–8, 2005:											
Hon. Daniel Boren	3/4	3/6	Jordan		712.00						712.00
	3/5	3/5	Iraq								
	3/6	3/6	Iraq								
	3/7	3/8	Germany		214.00						214.00
Commercial transportation							879.20				879.20
Visit to Alaska, Japan, Guam, Hawaii with Codel Issa, March 10–15, 2005:											
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	3/10	3/11	Alaska								
	3/11	3/12	Japan (Iwo Jima)								
	3/12	3/14	Guam								
	3/14	3/15	Hawaii								
Visit to the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Spain with Codel LaTourette, March 18–26, 2005:											
Hon. Tim Ryan	3/19	3/21	United Kingdom		992.00						992.00
	3/21	3/23	France		900.00						900.00
	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Commercial transportation							4,601.60				4,601.60
Visit to Mexico and Panama with Codel Hyde, March 18–23, 2005:											
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00						708.00
Committee total					84,358.34		58,732.59		32,057.60		175,148.53

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Rob Portman	2/26	2/27	Kuwait, Iraq, Jordan		788.00		3,518.74				
	2/27	2/28	Germany		122.00		(3)				
Committee total					910.00		3,518,74				4,428.74

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Fred Upton	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		950.00						950.00
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China, People's Rep		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00						408.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	1/13	1/13	Thailand		236.00		1,959.55				2,195.55
Hon. Frank Pallone, Jr.	1/9	1/10	Sri Lanka		231.99		8,804.51				9,036.50
	1/10	1/12	India		412.00						412.00
	1/12	1/13	Indonesia		295.00						295.00
Hon. Mike Ferguson	1/6	1/9	Indonesia		121.00		10,310.20				10,431.20
	1/9	1/12	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
David Cavicke	2/21	2/25	Brazil		706.60		5,998.00				6,704.60
W. Christopher Leahy	2/21	2/25	Brazil		706.60		5,998.00				6,704.60
Hon. Rick Boucher	2/18	2/22	United Kingdom		1,928.00						1,928.00
	2/22	2/22	France		0.00						0.00
	2/22	2/24	Romania		552.00						552.00
	2/24	2/27	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343.00						343.00
Hon. Barbara Curin	3/19	3/23	Spain		1,788.00						1,788.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
	3/30	3/31	Ireland		486.00						486.00
Hon. Cliff Stearns	3/19	3/23	Spain		1,788.00						1,778.00
	3/23	3/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,084.00						2,084.00
	3/30	3/31	Ireland		486.00						486.00
Andrew Snowdon	3/28	3/30	England		830.00		828.87		283.36		1,942.23

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Thomas Freddo	3/28	3/30	England		830.00		828.87				1,658.87
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	3/23	3/24	Germany		497.00						497.00
	3/24	3/27	Israel		724.00						724.00
	3/27	3/28	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	3/28	3/28	Iraq								
	3/28	3/29	Spain		188.00						188.00
Committee total					24,161.19		34,728.00		283.36		59,172.55

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, May 5, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Peggy Peterson	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,667.76				7,457.76
Carter McDowell	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,667.76				7,457.76
Barbara Matthews	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,667.76				7,457.76
Justin Daly	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,627.05				7,417.05
Michael McEleney	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,627.05				7,417.05
Jonathan Blackmer	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,276.76				7,066.76
Scott Wilber	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,627.05				7,417.05
Joseph Pinder	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		8,225.05				9,015.05
Jaime Lizarraga	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,627.05				7,417.05
Scott Morris	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,627.05				7,417.05
Lawrence Stewart	2/20	2/22	United Kingdom		964.00						964.00
	2/22	2/24	France		924.00						924.00
	2/24	2/26	Belgium		790.00		6,627.05				7,417.05
Hon. Scott Garrett	1/10	1/12	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
	1/12	1/14	India		590.00		6,811.21				7,401.21
Hon. Barney Frank	1/22	1/30	Switzerland		2,168.00		6,784.58				8,952.58
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND APR. 30, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
J. Anthony Haywood	3/7	3/11	Austria		1,392.00		4,901.74				6,293.74
Brien Beattie	2/21	3/01	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
Jaime Hjort	2/19	2/26	India		2,806.00		6,492.37				9,298.37
Jim Moore	2/19	2/26	India		2,806.00		6,492.37				9,298.37
John Hunter	2/19	2/26	India		2,806.00		6,492.37				9,298.37
Edward Kidd	2/19	2/26	India		2,806.00		6,492.37				9,298.37
Lorraine Gavaghan	2/19	2/26	India		2,806.00		6,492.37				9,298.37
Brandon Lerch	2/23	3/02	Germany		2,190.19		7,477.84				9,668.03
	3/02	3/04	Belgium		690.00						690.00
	3/04	3/06	England		830.00						830.00
Jeffrey Baran	1/28	2/01	Iraq		1,016.00		6,353.80				7,369.80
Christopher Shays	1/7	1/9	Indonesia		992.05		2,767.84				3,759.89
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		231.98		3,455.32				3,687.30
	1/10	1/12	Sri Lanka		412.00		2,335.15				2,747.15
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	1/11	1/13	Colombia		212.00		2,879.65				3,091.65
	1/13	1/16	Panama		708.00						708.00
	1/16	1/17	Honduras		223.00						223.00
Hon. Todd Platts	3/24	3/25	Germany		264.00						264.00
	3/25	3/27	Israel		724.00						724.00
	3/27	3/28	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	3/28	3/29	Spain		297.00						297.00
J. Marc Wheat	2/23	2/27	Germany		1,547.00		6,350.56				7,897.56
	2/27	3/4	Belgium		1,725.00						1,725.00
Nick Coleman	2/23	2/27	Germany		1,742.02		6,893.85				8,635.87
	2/27	3/4	Belgium		1,350.85						1,350.85
Hon. Stephen Lynch	3/24	3/25	Germany		264.00						264.00
	3/25	3/27	Israel		724.00						724.00
	3/27	3/28	Jordan		254.00						254.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND APR. 30, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/28	3/29	Spain		297.00						297.00
Hon. Christopher Shays	1/24	1/29	Switzerland		2,546.25		9,258.85				11,805.10
	1/29	2/01	Jordan		762.00						762.00
Lawrence Halloran	1/24	1/28	Switzerland		1,792.00		7,024.85				8,816.85
	1/28	2/01	Jordan		1,016.00						1,016.00
Nick Palarino	1/27	1/28	Turkey		552.00		6,708.76				7,260.76
	1/28	2/01	Jordan		1,016.00						1,016.00
Committee total					40,948.34		104,778.64				145,726.24

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM DAVIS, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Curt Weldon	2/1	2/3	Russia		1,632.00		2,951.94				4,583.94
Jeshua Weerasinghe	2/19	2/23	India		1,180.00		6,318.59				7,498.59
Mandy Bowers	2/19	2/23	India		1,180.00		6,318.59				7,498.59
Committee total					3,992.00		15,589.12				19,581.12

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER COX, Chairman, May 5, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Christopher Otillio	2/17	2/26	India		2,806.00		6,492.37				6,298.37
David Duncan	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
Committee total											$13,100.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB NEY, Chairman, Apr. 12, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Lara Alameh	1/11	1/16	Israel		1,445.00						1,445.00
Douglas Anderson	1/6	1/7	China		313.00						313.00
	1/7	1/9	Indonesia		290.00						290.00
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		232.00						232.00
	1/10	1/12	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
	1/12	1/15	India		885.00						885.00
	1/6	1/15	(4)				10,258.91				10,258.91
Renee Austell	1/26	1/28	Poland		502.00		6,286.66				6,788.66
Hon. Shelley Berkley	1/26	1/28	Poland		502.00		7,591.66				8,093.66
	3/11	3/13	Spain		965.00		5,906.25				6,871.25
Hon. Howard Berman	2/11	2/13	Germany		370.00		(3)				370.00
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	1/6	1/7	China		313.00						313.00
	1/7	1/9	Indonesia		290.00						290.00
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		232.00						232.00
	1/10	1/12	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
	1/12	1/14	India		590.00						590.00
	1/6	1/14	Round Trip Airfare				7,691.29				7,691.29
Ted Brennan	1/10	1/13	Colombia		525.00						525.00
	1/13	1/16	Panama		558.00						558.00
	1/16	1/18	Honduras		496.00						496.00
	1/10	1/18	(4)				2,798.62				2,798.62
Hon. Dan Burton	2/11	2/15	Costa Rica		900.00		1,687.85		(5) 343.00		2,930.85
Hon. Steve Chabot	1/12	1/15	Egypt		867.00		6,428.76				7,295.76
Malik Chaka	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Joan Condon	3/26	3/30	Libya		1,002.00		7,554.85				8,556.85
Frank Cotter	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		(3)				708.00
Ninfa DeLuna	3/17	3/20	Mexico		864.00						864.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		1,187.11				1,895.11
Hon. Eliot Engel	1/10	1/11	Russia		266.00						266.00
	1/11	1/14	North Korea		118.75						118.75
	1/14	1/15	South Korea		351.00						351.00
	1/15	1/16	China		291.00						291.00
	1/16	1/17	Hong Kong (Indonesia)		411.00						411.00
	1/17	1/18	Japan		408.00		(3)				408.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	1/6	1/10	India		1,583.00				(5) 670.13		2,253.13
	1/10	1/13	Sri Lanka		618.00						618.00
	1/6	1/3	(4)				6,901.09				6,901.09
	2/9	2/14	Tahiti		0.0		5,813.10				5,813.10
	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		(3)				708.00
	3/30	4/1	New Zealand		1,261.00		1,341.50				2,603.30
James Farr	3/17	3/20	Mexico		864.00						864.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		1,808.19				2,516.19
David Fite	1/14	1/16	Pakistan		789.00						789.00
	1/16	1/17	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/14	1/17	(4)				8,425.86				8,425.86
Hon. Jeff Flake	1/7	1/9	Indonesia		290.00						290.00
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		232.00						232.00
	1/10	1/11	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
	1/7	1/11	(4)				4,428.30				4,428.30
Hon. Jeff Fortenberry	3/4	3/7	Jordan		550.00		887.35				1,437.35
Kristi Garlock	2/21	2/23	Turkey		390.00						390.00
	2/23	2/25	Italy		850.00						850.00
	2/21	2/25	(4)				5,657.29				5,657.29
Dennis Halpin	3/23	3/27	South Korea		1,204.00						1,204.00
	3/27	3/29	Japan		656.00						656.00
	3/23	3/29	(4)				9,278.42				9,278.42
Hon. Henry Hyde	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00				(5) 33,000.00		33,576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		(3)		(5) 5,035.99		5,743.99
Hon. Darrell Issa	3/12	3/12	Japan		0.0		(3)				0.0
Jonathan Katz	1/11	1/15	Egypt		2,312.00		5,415.84				7,727.84
	2/23	2/25	Ukraine		1,228.00		5,933.49				7,161.49
Kay King	3/25	3/26	Holland		309.00						309.00
	3/26	3/30	Libya		1,002.00						1,002.00
	3/25	3/30	(4)				7,577.47				7,577.47
Robert King	1/7	1/8	China		291.00						291.00
	1/8	1/11	North Korea		963.00						963.00
	1/11	1/13	China		582.00						582.00
	1/7	1/13	(4)				5,551.06				5,551.06
	3/25	3/26	Holland		309.00						309.00
	3/26	3/30	Libya		1,002.00						1,002.00
	3/25	3/30	(4)				7,577.47				7,577.47
Sheila Klein	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		(3)				708.00
Hon. Thomas Lantos	1/7	1/8	China		291.00						291.00
	1/8	1/11	North Korea		963.00						963.00
	1/11	1/13	China		582.00						582.00
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	1/15	1/18	Taiwan		1,005.00						1,005.00
	1/7	1/18	(4)				6,486.54				6,486.54
	3/25	3/26	Holland		381.00						381.00
	3/26	3/29	Libya		1,002.00						1,002.00
	3/25	3/29	(4)				8,232.88				8,232.88
Hon. James Leach	1/6	1/7	China		313.00						313.00
	1/7	1/9	Indonesia		290.00				(5) 8,971.51		9,261.51
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		232.00				(5) 8,355.52		8,587.52
	1/10	1/12	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
	1/12	1/13	India		590.00						590.00
	1/13	1/16	Egypt		578.00						578.00
	1/16	1/18	(4)				7,691.29				7,691.29
Hon. Barbara Lee	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Caleb McCarry	1/10	1/13	Colombia		675.00						675.00
	1/13	1/16	Panama		708.00						708.00
	1/16	1/18	Honduras		396.00						396.00
	1/10	1/18	(4)				2,798.65				2,798.65
	3/17	3/20	Mexico		864.00						864.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		1,278.32				1,986.32
Hon. Betty McCollum	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
	2/25	3/1	Italy		520.00		6,163.07				6,683.07
	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		633.00		(3)				633.00
James McCormick	1/6	1/7	China		313.00						313.00
	1/7	1/9	Indonesia		240.00						240.00
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		232.00						232.00
	1/10	1/12	Sri Lanka		362.00						362.00
	1/12	1/13	India		590.00						590.00
	1/13	1/16	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	1/6	1/18	(4)				7,691.29				7,691.29
Hon. Thaddeus McCotter	1/26	1/28	Poland		502.00		6,441.74		(5) 1,252.00		8,195.74
	3/13	3/11	Spain		965.00		5,096.25				6,061.25
Matthew McLean	1/3	1/5	Botswana		290.00						290.00
	1/5	1/9	South Africa		772.00						772.00
	1/9	1/11	Madagascar		343.00						343.00
	1/11	1/14	Mozambique		576.00						576.00
	1/3	1/14	(4)				10,270.67				10,270.67
	2/20	2/23	Indonesia		648.00						648.00
	2/23	2/26	Sri Lanka		652.00						652.00
	2/20	2/26	(4)				11,169.95				11,169.95
John Mackey	1/10	1/12	Turkey		552.00						552.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		1,052.00						1,052.00
	1/16	1/17	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/10	1/17	(4)				8,849.72				8,849.72
	2/21	2/26	Colombia		1,125.00		1,752.15				2,877.15
Alan Makovsky	1/11	1/15	Egypt		2,312.00		5,415.84				7,727.84
	3/25	3/26	Holland		381.00						381.00
	3/26	3/30	Libya		1,002.00						1,002.00
	3/25	3/30	(4)				7,577.47				7,577.47
Pearl Alice Marsh	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Richard Mereu	3/11	3/13	Spain		945.00		3,533.50				4,479.00
	3/21	3/23	Belgium		648.50		5,908.13				6,556.63
Thomas Mooney	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		1,792.61				2,500.61
Paul Oostburg-Sanz	1/5	1/8	El Salvador		475.00						475.00
	1/8	1/11	Madagascar		334.00						334.00
	1/11	1/14	Mozambique		551.00						551.00
	1/5	1/14	(4)				14,499.46				14,499.46
	3/18	3/20	Mexico		526.00						526.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		437.00		(3)				437.00
Hon. Donald Payne	1/8	1/9	Kenya		0.0		9,588.01				9,588.01
Hon. Ted Poe	1/29	2/1	Jordan		762.00		6,353.77				7,115.77
Amy Porter	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Patrick Prisco	2/18	2/21	Belgium		1,185.00						1,185.00
	2/21	2/23	France		924.00						924.00
	2/23	2/25	Austria		596.00						596.00
	2/18	2/25	(4)				3,284.25				3,284.25
John Walker Roberts	3/19	3/23	Belgium		1,035.00		6,496.13				7,531.13
Rotem Roizman	2/22	2/23	Turkey		226.00						226.00
	2/23	2/25	Italy		566.00						566.00
	2/22	2/25	(4)				5,657.29				5,657.29
Hon. Edward Royce	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Susan Schiesser	3/17	3/20	Mexico		864.00						864.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		1,187.11				1,895.11
Douglas Seay	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		(3)				708.00
Thomas Sheehy	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	1/8	1/9	Indonesia		121.00						121.00
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		232.00						232.00
	1/10	1/13	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
	1/8	1/13	(4)				10,369.89				10,369.89
Sam Stratman	1/14	1/15	Thailand		232.00		5,700.00				6,002.05
	3/17	3/20	Mexico		864.00						864.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		1,744.32				2,452.32
Sarah Tillemann	1/7	1/8	China		291.00						291.00
	1/8	1/11	North Korea		963.00						963.00
	1/7	1/11	(4)				1,796.87				1,796.87
Mark Walker	3/17	3/20	Mexico		814.00						814.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		658.00		1,682.32				2,340.32
Hon. Diane Watson	1/8	1/10	Thailand		463.99						463.99
	1/10	1/12	Sri Lanka		412.00						412.00
	1/12	1/13	India		590.00						590.00
	1/8	1/13	(4)				6,339.83				6,339.83
	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00						590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Lynne Weil	1/7	1/8	China		291.00						291.00
	1/8	1/11	North Korea		963.00						963.00
	1/11	1/13	China		582.00						582.00
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	1/15	1/18	Taiwan		1,005.00						1,005.00
	1/7	1/18	(4)				7,342.87				7,342.87
Hillel Weinberg	3/20	3/23	Belgium		1,184.00						1,184.00
	3/23	3/25	United Kingdom		755.00						755.00
	3/25	3/30	Egypt		1,145.00						1,145.00
	3/20	3/30	(4)				7,889.45				7,889.45
Hon. Gerald Weller	1/10	1/13	Colombia		318.00						318.00
	1/13	1/16	Panama		708.00						708.00
	1/16	1/18	Honduras		496.00						496.00
	1/10	1/18	(4)				2,879.65				2,879.65
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/11	1/13	Egypt		578.00		5,415.84				5,993.84
	2/23	2/25	Ukraine		1,228.00		5,933.49		(5) 475.10		7,636.59
Lisa Williams	1/6	1/13	India		2,073.00		5,887.07				7,960.07
Judy Wolverton	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00						576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		(3)				708.00
Peter Yeo	1/7	1/8	China		291.00						291.00
	1/8	1/11	North Korea		963.00						963.00
	1/11	1/13	China		582.00						582.00
	1/13	1/15	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	1/15	1/17	Taiwan		335.00						335.00
	1/7	1/17	(4)				6,646.79				6,646.79
Committee total					108,601.54		358,902.92		(5) 58,103.25		525,607.71

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Round trip airfare.
[5] Indicates delegation costs.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	1/8	1/13	France, Paris		1,848.00		6,271.40				8,119.40
	1/13	1/17	Strasbourg		1,564.00						1,564.00
Philip Kiko	1/8	1/13	France, Paris		1,848.00		6,271.40				8,199.40
	1/13	1/17	Strasbourg		1,564.00						1,564.00
Hon. Louis Gohmet	3/3	3/5	Iraq		204.00		(3)				204.00
	3/6	3/8	Germany		314.00		2,835.42				3,149.42
Hon. Daniel Lungren	3/18	3/26	Beijing		(4)		(3)				
	3/27	3/31	Hong Kong		1,744.00		2,885.00				4,629.30
Hon. Howard Coble	3/18	3/20	Mexico		576.00		(3)				576.00
	3/20	3/23	Panama		708.00		(3)				708.00
Committee total					492.00		7,922.11				28,633.52

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] To be submitted.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Stevan Pearce	1/8	1/11	Korea		1,053.00		(3)				1,053.00
	1/11	1/15	China		1,236.00		(3)				1,236.00
Hon. J.D. Hayworth	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00		(3)				816.00
	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00		(3)				696.00
	2/24		Sri Lanka—Day Trip				(3)				
	2/25	2/27	Honk Kong		822.00		(3)				822.00
Hon. Richard Pombo	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Hon. Neil Abercrombie	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,023.57		946.75				1,970.32
Hon. Jay Inslee	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Hon. Grace Napolitano	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		444.00		(3)				444.00
Hon. Tom Tancredo	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Hon. Jeff Flake	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Hon. Dennis Rehberg	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Hon. Dennis Cardoza	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		453.00		3,714.68				4,167.68.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Hon. Donna Christensen	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		859.19		(3)				859.19
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Tony Babauta	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Kristen Bossi	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Steve Ding	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Chris Foster	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Rob Howarth	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Dan Kish	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Lisa Wallace	2/19	2/20	Panama		236.00		(3)				236.00
	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		(3)				861.00
	2/23	2/26	Brazil		661.00		(3)				661.00
	2/26	2/29	Trinidad and Tobago		1,245.57		(3)				1,245.57
Todd Willens	2/20	2/23	Argentina		861.00		4,784.65				5,697.65
Dave Whaley	3/5	3/12	Italy		3,570.00		5,355.74				8,925.74
Committee total					63,258.31		14,801.82				78,060.13

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

RICHARD W. POMBO, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND APR. 1, 2005.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Dreier	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND APR. 1, 2005.—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Lincoln Diaz-Balart	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		2,377.04				3,101.04
Hon. Doc Hastings	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00
Hon. Phil Gingrey	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00
Bradley Smith	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00
Hugh Halpern	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00
Ed Cassidy	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00
Robert Lawrence	3/23	3/25	Egypt		578.00		(3)				578.00
	3/25	3/26	Jordan		359.65		(3)				359.65
	3/27	3/29	Israel		724.00		(3)				724.00
	3/29	3/30	Cyprus		780.58		(3)				780.58
	3/30	3/30	Lebanon		67.00		(3)				67.00
	3/31	4/01	Belgium		790.00		(3)				790.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/04	3/06	Jordan		508.00		(3)				508.00
	3/06	3/08	Germany		764.00		879.20				1,643.20
Chris Caron	3/04	3/06	Jordan		508.00		(3)				508.00
	3/06	3/08	Germany		764.00		879.20				1,643.20
Adam Jarvis	3/04	3/06	Jordan		508.00		(3)				508.00
	3/06	3/08	Germany		764.00		879.20				1,643.20
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DAVID DREIER, Chairman, May 10, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Judy Biggert	1/7	1/10	Jordan		872.00						872.00
Amy Carroll	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,975.00		874.87				2,849.87
Olwen Huxley	2/18	2/27	India		3,348.00		6,492.37				9,840.37
Hon. Lamar Smith	2/18	2/21	United Kingdom		1,928.00						1,928.00
	2/21	2/21	France								
	2/21	2/23	Romania		320.00						320.00
	2/24	2/26	Greece		1,167.00						1,167.00
	2/27	2/28	Ireland		343.00						343.00
Committee total					9,953.00		7,367.24				17,320.24

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

———Apr. 12, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rich Beutel	1/09	1/15	China				8,350.57		1,104.20		9,454.77
									351.00		
	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
J. Matthew Szymanski	2/17	2/21	India		590.00						590.00
	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
Tom Bezas	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
Sean Deverey	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
Patrick Wilson	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
Jim Meenan	2/21	3/1	China		894.00		5,908.58				6,802.58
Bradley Knox	2/28	3/2	France		924.00		6,184.28		125.66		6,309.94
									(3) 798.33		
Committee total											57,170.19

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Returned currency.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Apr. 22, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Mark Zachares	1/2	1/8	Japan		1,224.00		7,249.60				8,473.60
Hon. Wayne Gilchrest	1/6	1/14	Indonesia		290.00						290.00
	1/9	1/10	Thailand		231.98		(7) 71.76				303.74
	1/6	1/14	Sri Lanka		412.00		(6)				412.00
	1/6	1/14	India		590.00		8,356.06				8,946.06
Hon. Michael Burgess	1/12	1/14	Pakistan		263.00	(3)					263.00
	1/14	1/14	Afghanistan			(3)					
	1/14	1/17	Jordan		762.00	(3)					762.00
	1/15	1/15	Iraq			(3)					
	1/16	1/16	Iraq			(3)					
	1/17	1/18	Germany		264.00	(3)					264.00
Hon. John Duncan	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. Tim Holden	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. Henry Brown	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. Lincoln Davis	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Chris Kennedy	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Jimmy Miller	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Jim Berard	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. Jim Coon	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. Stacie Soumbeniotis	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00	(3)					816.00
Hon. John Duncan	2/20	2/22	China		626.00	(3)					626.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	2/20	2/22	China		626.00	(3)					626.00
Hon. Tim Holden	2/20	2/22	China		626.00	(3)					626.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	2/20	2/22	China		626.00	(3)					626.00
Hon. Henry Brown	2/20	2/22	China		626.00	(3)					626.00
Hon. Lincoln Davis	2/20	2/22	China		626.00	(3)					626.00
Hon. Chris Kennedy	2/20	2/22	China		626.00	(3)					626.00
Jimmy Miller	2/20	2/22	China		626.00						626.00
Jim Berard	2/20	2/22	China		626.00						626.00
Jim Coon	2/20	2/22	China		626.00						626.00
Stacie Soumbeniotis	2/20	2/22	China		626.00						626.00
Rep. John Duncan	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Jerry Costello	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Tim Holden	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. E.B. Johnson	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Henry Brown	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Lincoln Davis	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Chris Kennedy	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Jimmy Miller	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Jim Berard	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Jim Coon	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. Stacie Soumbeniotis	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00						696.00
Rep. John Duncan	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Jerry Costello	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Tim Holden	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. E.B. Johnson	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Henry Brown	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Lincoln Davis	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Chris Kennedy	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Jimmy Miller	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Jim Berard	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Rep. Jim Coon	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Stacie Soumbeniotis	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
Hon. Russ Carnahan	3/3	3/3	Kuwait								0.00
	3/3	3/6	Jordan		508.00		879.30	(4)			1,387.30
	3/6	3/8	Germany		518.00	(3)	2,835.42	(5)			3,353.42
Hon. Steve LaTourette	3/19	3/21	United Kingdom		992.00		(8) 6,848.10				7,840.10
Hon. Corrine Brown	3/19	3/21	United Kingdom		992.00		(8) 5,052.10				6,044.10
Hon. E.B. Johnson	3/21	3/21	United Kingdom				(8) 4,601.60				4,601.60
Hon. John Mica	3/19	3/21	United Kingdom		992.00		(8) 5,820.72				6,812.72
Hon. Bill Shuster	3/19	3/21	United Kingdom		992.00		(8) 4,601.60				5,593.60
Jimmy Miller	3/19	3/21	United Kingdom		992.00		(8) 4,601.60				5,593.60
Ward McCarragher	3/18	3/21	United Kingdom		1,488.00		(8) 4,601.60				6,089.60
Glenn Scammel	3/18	3/21	United Kingdom		1,488.00		(8) 4,601.60				6,089.60
Adam Tsao	3/18	3/21	United Kingdom		1,488.00		(8) 4,601.60				6,089.60
Matt Wallen	3/18	3/21	United Kingdom		1,488.00		(8) 4,601.60				6,089.60
Jennifer Esposito	3/18	3/21	United Kingdom		1,488.00		(8) 4,601.60				6,089.60
Hon. Steve LaTourette	3/21	3/25	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Hon. John Mica	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Jimmy Miller	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Ward McCarragher	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Glenn Scammel	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Adam Tsao	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Matt Wallen	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Jennifer Esposito	3/21	3/23	Paris France		900.00						900.00
Hon. Steve LaTourette	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. E.B. Johnson	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Hon. John Mica	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Jimmy Miller	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Ward McCarragher	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Glenn Scammel	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Adam Tsao	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Matt Wallen	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Jennifer Esposito	3/23	3/25	Italy		1,106.00						1,106.00
Hon. Steve LaTourette	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Hon. Corrine Brown	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Hon. E.B. Johnson	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Jimmy Miller	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Ward McCarragher	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Glenn Scammel	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Adam Tsao	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Matt Wallen	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Jennifer Esposito	3/25	3/26	Spain		477.00						477.00
Hon. John Mica	3/25	3/26	Italy		553.00						553.00
	3/26	3/30	Italy		2,088.00						2,088.00
Committee total					79,499.98		73,925.86				153,425.84

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Jordan to Germany (Commercial airfare)
[5] Germany to U.S.
[6] All trips U.S. to countries in U.S.
[7] Trip to Thailand.
[8] U.S. to London, Madrid to U.S., roundtrip.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 10 AND MAR. 15, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Lane Evans	3/12	3/12	Japan								
Kevin Gash	3/12	3/12	Japan								
Kimo Hollingsworth	3/12	3/12	Japan								
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BERNADINE DOLSON, Clerk, Apr. 27, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND FEB. 27, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Jim McDermott	1/22	1/24	Chad		590.00		(3)				590.00
	1/24	1/25	Algeria		272.00		(3)				272.00
Hon. John Larson	2/11	2/13	Germany		370.00		(3)				370.00
Hon. Ron Lewis	2/18	2/20	Japan		816.00		(3)				816.00
	2/20	2/22	China		626.00		(3)				626.00
	2/22	2/25	Thailand		696.00		(3)				696.00
	2/24	2/24	Sri Lanka		0.00		(3)				0.00
	2/25	2/27	Hong Kong		822.00		(3)				822.00
Committee total					4,192.00						4,192.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, May 2, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT W. NEY, Chairman, Apr. 13, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, Apr. 25, 2005.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1981. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for a FY 2006 budget amendment for the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services, Justice, and the Treasury; and the United States-Canada Alaska Rail Commission; (H. Doc. No. 109–26); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1982. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report regarding the progress made in launching the Physician Group Practice demonstration, pursuant to Public Law 106–554, section 412 (114 Stat. 2763A–515); 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 May 12, 2005, the following reports were filed on May 13, 2005]

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2360. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2361. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[The following actions occurred on May 13, 2005]

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1817. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–71 Pt. 2).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1817. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–71 Pt. 3).

[Filed on May 16, 2005]

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1224. A bill to repeal the prohibition on the payment of interest on demand deposits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 1215. A bill to provide for the implementation of a Green Chemistry Research and Development Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 278. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–83). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on May 13, 2005]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Government Reform, Science, Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1817 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself and Mrs. CUBIN):

H.R. 2362. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCKEON, and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 2363. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty on persons who are convicted of killing peace officers and who flee the country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2364. A bill to establish a Science and Technology Scholarship Program to award scholarships to recruit and prepare students for careers in the National Weather Service and in National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration marine research, atmospheric research, and satellite programs; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2365. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement for educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 2366. A bill to extend the current Department of Defense telecommunications benefit program through the end of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom and to provide for the application of the program to other contingency operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2367. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain Mexican children, and accompanying adults, to obtain a waiver of the documentation requirements otherwise required to enter the United States as a temporary visitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2368. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for immediate implementation of full concurrent receipt for retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability of both military retired pay paid by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs paid by reason of their disability; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. FILNER (for himself and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 2369. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the Purple Heart to be awarded to prisoners of war who die in captivity under circumstances not otherwise establishing eligibility for the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 2370. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to issue a medal to certain veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam War as a direct result of that service, or who were presumptively exposed to ionizing radiation, herbicide agents, or chemical agents during their service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2371. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on bitolylene diisocyanate (TODI); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2372. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-(Methoxycarbonyl)benzylsulfonamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2373. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-chlorobenzenesulfonamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2374. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ESPI; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 2375. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on CMBSI; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 2376. A bill to designate the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands National Marine

Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. KLINE (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 2377. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on certain automotive catalytic converter mats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 2378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit interest on Federally guaranteed water, wastewater, and essential community facilities loans to be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2379. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Department of Veterans Affairs to fill prescriptions for drugs and medicines written by private physicians; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2380. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on gemifloxacin, gemifloxacin mesylate, and gemifloxacin mesylate sesquihydrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2381. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on PHBA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2382. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Butralin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 2383. A bill to redesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at 19550 Kelso Road in Byron, California, as the ''C.W. 'Bill' Jones Pumping Plant''; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 2384. A bill to adjust the boundary of Martin Van Buren National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution commemorating Mystic Seaport: the Museum of America and the Sea in recognition of its 75th year; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution welcoming His Excellency Hamid Karzai, the President of Afghanistan, on the occasion of his visit to the United States in May 2005 and expressing support for a strong and enduring strategic partnership between the United States and Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H. Res. 279. A resolution condemning the recent vote by the British Association of University Teachers to boycott Bar-Ilan University and Haifa University; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

23. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 104 urging the Congress of the United States to authorize and appropriate funds to allow all members of the Armed Forces Reserve Component to access the TRICARE Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

24. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 813 Joint Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to close the Brunswick Naval Air Station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

25. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 225 recognizing the month of May 2005 as ''Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Awareness Month'' in Pennsylvania and memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide additional funding for research in order to find a treatment and cure for ALS; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

26. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 memorializing Congress to enact highway reauthorization legislation with a level of funding that closes the gap between federal fuel tax dollars paid by Michigan motorists and dollars received to address Michigan's transportation needs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 22: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 23: Mr. ISSA, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 65: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 136: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 193: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 297: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 299: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 303: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 314: Ms. HOOLEY.

H.R. 358: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 421: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 438: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 535: Mr. FARR and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 558: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 559: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 560: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 581: Mr. SHAW, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 583: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 594: Mr. CLEAVER and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 615: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 662: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 663: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 699: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. NEY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WU, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HOOLEY, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 713: Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 745: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 788: Mr. CUBIN.

H.R. 824: Mr. CLAY and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 873: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 880: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 908: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 916: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. Mr. HOOLEY, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 938: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 972: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 988: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 1126: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1130: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1150: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1204: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORD, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1215: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 1216: Mr. GORDON, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1232: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1245: Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1262: Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1291: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1316: Mr. WICKER and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1376: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1384: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1406: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1409: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1426: Ms. HOOLEY and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 1474: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1492: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1505: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1554: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1558: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1575: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1581: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1600: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1606: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1607: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1619: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1632: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1651: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1671: Ms. HOOLEY and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1680: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1686: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1689: Mr. HYDE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PENCE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1764: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1776: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 1790: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1835: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1898: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1944: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1973: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2000: Ms. HOOLEY and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 2012: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2017: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2018: Mr. MILLER of Florida
H.R. 2041: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2045: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 2047: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 2074: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2088: Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 2106: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2107: Mr. BASS.
H.R. 2125: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 2126: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 2127: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2134: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2218: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2238: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOLT, MR. SCHIFF, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2326: Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WATT.
H.R. 2328: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2337: Mr. OTTER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 2346: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 2351: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2358: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. FORBES.
H.J. Res. 12: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. WEINER.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Res. 123: Mr. WOLF and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H. Res. 167: Mrs. CUBIN.
H. Res. 185: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H. Res. 246: Mr. CASE.
H. Res. 266: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. OTTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. TANCREDO

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 536. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. TOM DAVIS OF VIRGINIA

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of section 516, add the following:

Provided further, That this section shall cease to be effective at such time as the President has selected a single agency to conduct security clearance investigations pursuant to section 3001(c) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 50 U.S.C. 435b) and the entity selected under section 3001(b) of such Act has reported to Congress that the agency selected pursuant to such section 3001(c) is capable of conducting all necessary investigations in a timely manner or has authorized the entities within the Department of Homeland Security covered by this section to conduct their own investigations pursuant to section 3001 of such Act.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. HOSTETTLER

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 12, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $29,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $29,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. HOSTETTLER

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 7, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $95,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. HOSTETTLER

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $500,000)''.

Page 4, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $5,505,000)''.

Page 12, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $193,200,000)''.

Page 16, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $21,156,000)''.

Page 19, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $47,500,000)''.

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $117,539,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. HOSTETTLER

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $500,000)''.

Page 4, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $5,505,000)''.

Page 7, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $95,000,000)''.

Page 12, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $193,200,000)''.

Page 12, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $29,000,000)''.

Page 16, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $21,156,000)''.

Page 19, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $47,500,000)''.

Page 23, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $117,539,000)''.

Page 36, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $20,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $29,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. LOBIONDO

AMENDMENT NO. 7: In title I, in the item relating to ''OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $130,000,000)''.

In title I, in the item relating to ''OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $130,000,000)''.

In title I, in the item relating to ''OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $16,000,000)''.

In title I, in the item relating to ''OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $190,000,000)''.

In title II, in the item relating to ''UNITED STATES COAST GUARD-ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $466,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. SIMMONS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 19, line 1, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $24,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 19, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $24,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. SOUDER

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 2, line 9, after ''$133,239,000'' insert '', of which $6,000,000 shall be for the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement to carry out its responsibilities under section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. POE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following (and conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly):

SEC. 509. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to carry out section 105(a)(4) and (5) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act of 2001 (49 U.S.C. 44917(a)(4) and (5)).

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 37, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $20,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 14, line 21, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 536. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to support or supplement the the acts of volunteer patrols at or in the vicinity of the borders of the United States.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. MENENDEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 3, line 15, insert ''(decreased by $50,000,000)'' after ''$146,084,000''.

Page 26, line 23, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)'' after ''$2,781,300,000''.

H.R. 2361

OFFERED BY: MR. RAHALL

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR SALE OR SLAUGHTER OF FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS.

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the sale or slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros (as defined in Public Law 92–195).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 16, 2005 No. 64

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.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.

Merciful God, how precious is Your steadfast love. We take refuge in the shadow of Your wings. We thank You that You are present not only in green pastures and beside the still waters but in the valley of the shadow of death. Give us the wisdom to know You are near in sunshine and in storms.

Prepare our lawmakers to face the challenges of today with an awareness of Your willingness to lead and guide them. Remind them that You never give up Your pursuit of our hearts, and that Your love follows us into the darkest night of the soul.

Lord, let Your goodness and mercy follow us throughout the days of our earthly pilgrimage, until we dwell in Your house forever.

We pray this in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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, the leadership time is reserved.

TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Inhofe amendment No. 605, to provide a complete substitute.

Dorgan amendment No. 652 (to amendment No. 605), to provide for the conduct of an investigation to determine whether market manipulation is contributing to higher gasoline prices.

Inhofe (for Ensign) amendment No. 636 (to amendment No. 605), to authorize the State of Nevada to continue construction of the U.S.-95 Project in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Allen/Ensign amendment No. 611 (to amendment No. 605), to modify the eligibility requirements for States to receive a grant under section 405 of title 49, United States Code.

Schumer amendment No. 674 (to amendment No. 605), to increase the transit pass and van pooling benefit to $200.

Sessions modified amendment No. 646 (to amendment No. 605), to reduce funding for certain programs.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we return to the consideration of the highway bill. The managers are here to work through the remaining amendments this afternoon, and we will have votes on at least one amendment at 5:30, or sometime around 5:30. The specific time we will state shortly but at around 5:30 today. We have an agreement for finishing this bill tomorrow. Under the agreement, Senators may offer amendments today from the limited list we agreed to last week. We do hope most of these amendments will not require votes. There are a few remaining amendments that will need rollcall votes prior to passage. I once again thank the managers for their hard work, and I look forward to finishing the bill tomorrow so we can get it to conference as soon as possible.

LEBANON

Mr. President, in my leader remarks for the past week, I have come to the Senate floor to briefly comment on a recent trip to the Middle East. Over the April recess I had the privilege of traveling to Israel, the West Bank, Jordan, Egypt, and Lebanon. In each of these stops, I met with officials and community leaders. I also made a special point of meeting with opposition leaders as well.

With each conversation, I learned more about the challenges facing this complicated part of the world. I became convinced that despite the deep differences that divide them, each party is committed to and wants peace and prosperity. Each side knows that dialog is the only way forward.

Nowhere has this been on more astonishing display than in Lebanon. As we all witnessed, following the assassination of former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri in February, hundreds of thousands of Lebanese citizens took to the streets to peacefully protest foreign occupation and interference. The images on television were remarkable. Central Beirut was awash in this sea of flags of red, green, and white. Proudly defiant citizens passed out roses to the soldiers who had been sent in to contain them.

It was a triumphant moment for the Lebanese people and a turning point in their country's history. Our delegation had the opportunity to walk through Martyr Square, as that square is called, where, on March 14, there were hundreds of thousands of people who came forth to express the will of the people.

Syrian military and intelligence personnel had been stationed in Lebanon for decades and had consistently denied the Lebanese people the sovereignty and territorial integrity deserved by all independent nations. In addition, heavily armed militias, such as the Deborah terrorist group, have operated with virtual impunity in Lebanon and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

have been allowed to pursue their radical agenda.

The last few months have been times of turmoil and opportunity for the Lebanese people. For the first time in decades, the Lebanese people are free of the interference of the Syrian military.

However, it is still not clear that Syria is fully complying with the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559. Resolution 1559 calls for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and intelligence personnel, and the disarming of armed militias. Although Syria claims to have removed all of its intelligence personnel from Lebanon, this has not been confirmed. And groups such as Deborah refuse to disarm.

Resolution 1559 also calls for free and fair elections. Our first meeting in Beirut was with members of the opposition. They represented parties and religious sects—Christian, Druze, and Muslim. These leaders were well versed in the requirements for a successfully functioning democracy. In particular, they discussed the need to restore accountability, to restore transparency, to secure an independent judiciary, and to rebuild their economy so all Lebanese people have a stake in the future. Their commitment to freedom, the rule of law, and democratic governance was truly inspiring. They are intensely aware of the importance of this historic opportunity to secure a truly free democracy, and they were all united in holding elections on time in late May. While I am hopeful, it remains to be seen how their unity will hold once that new government is formed.

We then met with the Prime Minister, Prime Minister Najib Mikati. I was greatly encouraged when he echoed many of the concerns that had been expressed earlier in the day by leaders of the opposition. He spoke of the need for an independent judiciary and respect for Lebanese sovereignty. I agreed with his assessment that economic reform required a strong private sector that is truly globally competitive.

He also expressed confidence that Syria had withdrawn all of its intelligence agents and that the Lebanese people would soon see the benefits of freedom from foreign occupation.

The Prime Minister also echoed the assurances of Parliamentary Speaker Nabih Berri that free and fair elections would take place as scheduled.

Finally, I had the opportunity to visit with participants in a program called AMIDEAST. This program was established by our State Department shortly after 9/11, seeking to rebuild a better understanding of the United States by selecting young Lebanese students to attend American schools and live with host families for a year. I had the opportunity to meet with two students who will soon be in Tennessee.

President Bush has rightly emphasized the importance of public diplomacy in our efforts to spread freedom and democracy. My interactions with the participants of AMIDEAST confirmed my belief that more such programs are needed throughout the region. We need to make a more concerted effort to reach out to the people of the Middle East, especially the young, and demonstrate to them that they can achieve their hopes and aspirations for peace and freedom.

My visit to Lebanon and the determination exhibited by the Lebanese people in the past few months have been truly inspiring. I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in continuing to support the Lebanese people as they strive to achieve their dream of a free and prosperous Lebanon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

WISHING SENATOR PAUL SARBANES WELL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would first like to say we have just received word that PAUL SARBANES has been taken to the hospital. He was attending the funeral of Chairman Rodino in New Jersey. We hope that for him and Chris everything works out fine. But I think everyone who is part of the Senate family should give their thoughts and prayers to PAUL SARBANES, a wonderful human being. I am confident he will be OK, but he is at a hospital now in New Jersey.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS AND THE NUCLEAR OPTION

Mr. President, the majority leader stated the Senate will turn to the subject of judicial nominations this week. We are ready for that. We stand united against an outrageous abuse of power that would pack the courts with out-of-the-mainstream judges.

The time has come for those Senators of the majority to decide where they stand, whether they will abide by the rules of the Senate or break the rules for the first time in 217 years—217 years—of American history. Will they support the checks and balances established by the Founding Fathers or vote to give the President unaccountable power to pick lifetime judges?

I am confident and hopeful there will be six Republican Senators who will be profiles of courage. I have had Senators come to me, even today, Republican Senators, in personal conversations, telephone conversations, today and over the weeks, who have said: We know you are right. We know you are right. But we can't vote with you.

Boy, I will tell you, that is—I told my staff today, these conversations have been some of the biggest disappointments I have ever had in my political life. To have people say they know they are breaking the rules, but they want to—I don't know all the reasons—maybe so the President likes them or they think he likes them. I don't know all the reasons. It is hard for me to intellectually understand, emotionally understand how a Senator could say they know we are right but they are willing to break the rules to change the rules. I believe there must be at least six out there who are willing to stand up and be, I repeat, profiles in courage.

While we are ready to debate this issue, I am deeply pained we need to do so. The Senate in which I have spent the last 20 years of my life is a body in which the rules are sacrosanct. We may choose to amend the rules by a two-thirds vote. We may enter into unanimous consent agreements to waive the rules. But never before in the history of the Senate has a partisan majority sought to break the rules in order to achieve momentary political advantage.

We know that the Parliamentarian has said—and it is a nonpartisan office—this is the wrong way to go forward. I have had conversations with the Parliamentarians myself. So I repeat, never in the history of the Senate has a partisan majority sought to break the rules in order to achieve momentary political advantage, because that is what it would be. If this happens, it will be a short-term win for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle but a long-term loss for the Senate and for the American people.

I have worked so hard, Mr. President—I am not boasting about how hard; we have all worked hard, but I have spent the majority of my time in the last month on this issue. I have said privately and publicly this is the most important issue I have ever worked on in my 40 years in public service.

In an effort to avoid this confrontation and preserve constitutional checks and balances, I have made every effort to be reasonable—every effort. Here on the floor, I offered last Monday an up-or-down vote on Thomas Griffith, a controversial nominee to the DC Circuit. Last Thursday, I offered to have an up-or-down vote on three nominees to the Sixth Circuit, two of whom were filibustered last year.

These are not judges we would choose, but we know the difference between opposing bad nominees and blocking acceptable ones. In making what I thought were good-faith offers, I asked the majority: Do you want to confirm judges or do you want to provoke a fight? Regrettably, all of my proposals have been rejected—all of my proposals. There were certainly more than these, and I am not going to go through the proposals I made privately. I have only talked about those I have made separate from these offers.

I wrote to the majority leader last week and suggested two ways to break the impasse. First, I made clear my previous offer to allow an up-or-down vote on one of the most controversial nominees remaining on the table.

Second, I suggested we consider changing the rules in accordance with the rules—not too unique; if you want to change the rules, follow the rules—if the majority leader were to put his

proposal in the form of a Senate resolution and allow it to be referred to the Rules Committee.

I have spoken to Senator DODD. In fact, he was here last week to speak on this matter, but because of what was going on in the Chamber he was unable to do that. Senator DODD said he would do everything in his power as ranking member to expedite this consideration.

Neither of these good-faith suggestions have been accepted, and I guess it is clear why, I am sad to say. Republicans in the Senate demand to have it all. A 95-percent confirmation rate is not good enough. Votes on some of the most controversial nominees isn't good enough. They are prepared to do whatever it takes to achieve total victory.

Meanwhile, the White House appears to be pulling strings.

At a meeting I had in the White House, I asked the President: Mr. President, you could avoid so much controversy in the Senate. We could move forward on your agenda so much easier if you would intervene on this so-called nuclear option and help us resolve it.

He said to me: I have nothing to do with that. That is all up to you—not me but the Senate leaders—I am staying out of this.

Well, within hours after that, deputy White House Chief of Staff Carl Rove was quoted as discouraging any middle ground, all or nothing. Then Vice President CHENEY gave a speech in which he said: All or nothing. On Friday, the Washington Times—and this is really interesting for those of us who love the Senate. On Friday, the Washington Times reported that White House Press Secretary Scott McClellan ''flatly rejected any talk of compromise that would confirm only some of the President's blocked nominees.'' The White House is telling the Senate how to operate? The Press Secretary of the President is telling the Senate what to do and not to do? The White House, through their Press Secretary, flatly rejects an offer of compromise. What has this body come to?

It is disturbing that the White House is playing an aggressive role to discourage compromise. Every high school student in America learns about checks and balances. The Senate advice and consent role is one of the most important checks on Executive power. The White House should not be lobbying to change Senate rules in a way that would hand dangerous new powers to the President over two separate branches—the Congress and the judiciary.

Of course, the President would like the power to name anyone he wants to lifetime seats on the Supreme Court and other Federal courts, but that is not how America works. The Constitution doesn't give him that power, and we should not cede that power to the executive branch.

As the majority leader admitted with Senator BYRD last week, there is no constitutional right to an up-or-down vote on judicial nominees. If there were, more than 60 of President Clinton's nominees had their rights violated. In fact, the Senate has rejected hundreds of judicial nominations over the years. Legal scholars say 20 percent of those selected for the Supreme Court have not gone forward. Prior to 1917, there was no way to stop the filibuster, and lots of judges simply didn't come forward. So we have rejected hundreds of judicial nominations over the years, some by an up-or-down vote, some by filibuster, and some by simple inaction. In each case the Senate was acting within its authority under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution.

My friend, Senator FRIST, says he wants a fairness rule, but a rule allowing the President to ram extreme judges through the Senate is unfair to the American people. Meanwhile, we need to get back to the people's business and put people over partisanship. We were sent here to govern, and right now we are not doing that. Gas prices are up, families have lost health insurance, pension plans are unstable, to say the least, and the situation in Iraq is grave. The Senate, literally, is fiddling while Rome is burning.

Mr. President, I am going to continue to talk to the majority leader. I am going to talk and talk and talk as much as I can to try to resolve this issue. I know there are other efforts at compromise under consideration. But unless cooler heads prevail, this confrontation will be upon us later this week. If it comes to that vote, Democrats and responsible Republicans—if it comes to that vote, Democrats in the Senate and responsible Republicans in the Senate will vote to preserve checks and balances and preserve the principle that the Senate rules must not be broken.

Mr. President, the eyes of the Nation are upon us. There have been few moments of truth like this one in the history of this great institution. The American people will see whether the Senate passes this historic test.

Would the Chair announce what the business is before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business is H.R. 3.

Mr. REID. There is no time for morning business this morning; is that true?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There has been none requested.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are at the point now where I believe we are going to hear from a number of Members who have submitted amendments and some who simply want to talk about the bill, some who want to talk about the formulas. We have had some requests for time. It is my understanding that we are going to have our vote at 5:30. It does mean we have limited time between now and then. Let me just make a comment or two about this and then ask—

Mr. REID. Would the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. INHOFE. Of course.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 638, 690, and 723 be removed from the list of first-degree amendments to H.R. 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 619 TO AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. REID. On behalf of Senator LAUTENBERG, I call up amendment No. 619.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the pending amendment is laid aside and the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 619.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase penalties for individuals who operate motor vehicles while intoxicated or under the influence of alcohol under aggravated circumstances)

Strike section 1403 and insert the following:

SEC. 1403. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR HIGHER-RISK DRIVERS DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED OR DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 164. Increased penalties for higher-risk drivers driving while intoxicated or driving under the influence

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION.—The term 'blood alcohol concentration' means grams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood or the equivalent grams of alcohol per 210 liters of breath.

''(2) DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED; DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE.—The terms 'driving while intoxicated' and 'driving under the influence' mean driving or being in actual physical control of a motor vehicle while having a blood alcohol concentration above the permitted limit as established by each State.

''(3) HIGHER-RISK IMPAIRED DRIVER LAW.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'higher-risk impaired driver law' means a State law that provides, as a minimum penalty, that—

''(i) an individual described in subparagraph (B) shall—

''(I) receive a driver's license suspension;

''(II)(aa) have the motor vehicle driven at the time of arrest impounded or immobilized for not less than 45 days; and

''(bb) for the remainder of the license suspension period, be required to install a certified alcohol ignition interlock device on the vehicle;

''(III)(aa) be subject to an assessment by a certified substance abuse official of the State that assesses the degree of abuse of alcohol by the individual; and

''(bb) be assigned to a treatment program or impaired driving education program, as determined by the assessment; and

''(IV) be imprisoned for not less than 10 days, or have an electronic monitoring device for not less than 100 days; and

''(ii) an individual who is convicted of driving while intoxicated or driving under the influence with a blood alcohol concentration level of 0.15 percent or greater shall—

''(I) receive a driver's license suspension; and

''(II)(aa) be subject to an assessment by a certified substance abuse official of the State that assesses the degree of abuse of alcohol by the individual; and

''(bb) be assigned to a treatment program or impaired driving education program, as determined by the assessment.

''(B) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—An individual referred to in subparagraph (A)(i) is an individual who—

''(i) is convicted of a second or subsequent offense for driving while intoxicated or driving under the influence within a period of 10 consecutive years;

''(ii) is convicted of a driving-while-suspended offense, if the suspension was the result of a conviction for driving under the influence; or

''(iii) refuses a blood alcohol concentration test while under arrest or investigation for involvement in a fatal or serious injury crash.

''(4) LICENSE SUSPENSION.—The term 'license suspension' means, for a period of not less than 1 year—

''(A) the suspension of all driving privileges of an individual for the duration of the suspension period; or

''(B) a combination of suspension of all driving privileges of an individual for the first 45 days of the suspension period, followed by reinstatement of limited driving privileges requiring the individual to operate only motor vehicles equipped with an ignition interlock system or other device approved by the Secretary during the remainder of the suspension period.

''(5) MOTOR VEHICLE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'motor vehicle' means a vehicle driven or drawn by mechanical power and manufactured primarily for use on public highways.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'motor vehicle' does not include—

''(i) a vehicle operated solely on a rail line; or

''(ii) a commercial vehicle.

''(b) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), on October 1, 2008, and each October 1 thereafter, if a State has not enacted or is not enforcing a higher-risk impaired driver law, the Secretary shall transfer an amount equal to 3 percent of the funds apportioned to the State on that date under paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) of section 104(b) to the apportionment of the State under section 402 to be used in accordance with section 402(a)(3) only to carry out impaired driving programs.

''(2) NATIONWIDE TRAFFIC SAFETY CAMPAIGNS.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) reserve 25 percent of the funds that would otherwise be transferred to States for a fiscal year under paragraph (1); and

''(B) use the reserved funds to make law enforcement grants, in connection with nationwide traffic safety campaigns, to be used in accordance with section 402(a)(3).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for subchapter I of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 164 and inserting the following:

''164. Increased penalties for higher-risk drivers driving while intoxicated or driving under the influence.''.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as I was saying, we do have a lot of people who want to be heard on this bill. I believe I have said several times this could very well be the most significant vote we will have this year. It is a vote that we actually had last year. Senator JEFFORDS and I worked for 3 years on this bill, along with Senator BOND and Senator BAUCUS. The four of us have been shepherding this bill. Now it looks as if we are very close to getting a bill.

Last year, our bill was funded at $318 billion. It was passed on to conference, and we lacked one signature of getting a conference report, so it did not happen. As a result, we are operating on our sixth extension. I know the occupant of the chair understands the significance of this. It means all the reforms we have in here, streamlining reforms, will not be a reality if we are not able to pass a bill, if we have to operate on a seventh extension. It means we are not going to have any help for the donee States. We will not have any help for the sparsely populated States. We are not going to be able to have the commission that is going to look into new ways of funding highways. We started off back in the Eisenhower administration. Since he started the national highways program, we have been funding them essentially the same way ever since, but this bill appoints a commission that is going to be creative and do a lot better job than we have done before.

The formula—you always find someone objecting to the formula. It takes into consideration about 10 different things: size of the State, density of the State, the donor status of the State—things that are very significant in order to be totally equitable. One of the factors is the highway fatalities in the State on a per capita basis. That has to tell you something. If one of the States has a lot more fatalities on the highway, it means they have greater needs. My State of Oklahoma has terrible bridges. We are ranked dead last. We were tied with the State of Missouri, but I think we are now last. We want to correct that. We want this bill. It is very important that we have this bill. We are going to have our vote tomorrow, and we want to hear from anyone down here.

I ask Senator JEFFORDS, did you want to make any comments at this time?

Mr. JEFFORDS. No.

Mr. INHOFE. I don't see Senator BAUCUS. I ask Senator BOND, do you want to make any comments?

Mr. BOND. No.

Mr. INHOFE. Senator THOMAS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I will not take long. I know there is lots for us to do, but I wanted to come over to the floor and express my support for the movement and the passage of the highway bill. I, first of all, wish to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the work they have done. Having been on that committee in years past, I know how difficult a task it is and what a great job they have done.

We have been now some 5 or 6 years waiting to do what we really need to do, clearly need to do. All of us have highway problems. All of us have need for an infrastructure. It is certainly one of the things that creates more jobs than almost anything we could possibly have. And the transportation system is something we clearly need for the future. So I guess I am a little disappointed that it has taken as long as it has for us to move forward. But now we do have an opportunity to do that, and certainly it is the time to do it. This bill has been reviewed by almost everybody in the place. We don't need to spend a lot more time talking about it. Certainly, there will be some amendments. However, the House has passed a similar bill. I think we should stick to the highway funding as it was set up in the budget, frankly, but that is an issue that will be resolved in time.

So I just hope we can pass it here. I think these decisions as to how the money is used should be made in the States, and we do not want a bunch of decisions made here as to the details of transportation.

I will not take more time, but I do want to say that it is discouraging and frustrating for us to take this long to move forward. We have so many things out there we need to be doing. The Energy bill is just as important as this, perhaps even more. We have laid it aside and continue to wait. We need to be looking at the future both in the highway bill and energy as to where we are going to be in 10 or 15 years and make some policy decisions with respect thereto.

One of the real problems, of course, with highway funding is that all, practically all of the work that is done on highways is done by contracting with our various State departments that handle highways. When you do contracting, you have to have knowledge of the time ahead as to what your financing is going to be because contracting is done in the future.

So I hope we can get on with this bill. I think we need to be talking about budgets. That is one of the things that is very important to us. Energy is very important to us. I think we need to get over this idea of stalling.

I noticed the minority leader has said we are talking about breaking the rules. We are not breaking the rules. We are going to change the rules so that we can move forward. I think it is time to stop the chatter about that as well and move on to something that we can do.

So we need a bill. Extensions are no longer acceptable. Our State DOTs cannot wait long periods of time. Our construction time in Wyoming, for example, is very short during the summer.

So, Mr. President, I again thank the managers of this bill for moving forward. Let's get it done.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for an excellent point, and that point is we are on our sixth extension now. Some extensions are 30-day extensions, some of them are 6-month extensions, and you can't expect the contracting community out there to be able to plan in an efficient way to spend the money to build the highways, to build the

bridges, or repair the highways if they can't plan in advance. This would give us 5 more years on a 6-year authorization. It is absolutely imperative.

I say to my colleagues that we are now operating on the bill, so whoever seeks recognition can get recognition as he or she desires.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. INHOFE. I don't believe we are yielding time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object, I don't want to object, but we have a short period of time until we have to go to the highway bill vote. We have a long list of people who want to speak on the highway bill. What I would ask of the Senator from Hawaii is that instead of his speaking for 15 minutes, he go ahead and start, and if anyone wants to seek recognition on the highway bill, they could do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I will not ask for time. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 1037 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we have several requests to speak prior to 4 o'clock and then more prior to 5:30 on the highway bill which is the regular order. So far, those speakers who want to speak in morning business have been kind enough to say that they would not mind being interrupted, if necessary, if someone came down to talk about the highway bill. I appreciate that and remind my colleagues that we don't have a lot of time between now and the vote at 5:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I intend to introduce a bill and speak about it briefly. I will do that with the proviso that if someone comes and wishes to speak about their amendment on the highway bill, I will be happy to relinquish the floor.

Is the Senator from Iowa wishing to speak on an amendment?

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator from Iowa, chairman of the Finance Committee, has a title under this bill. If you don't mind, I am sure there will be time.

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to defer. I know this highway bill is important to get passed as soon as possible. I am happy to yield the floor and perhaps, following the Senator from Iowa, if there is an opportunity, I will make my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it should be quite obvious from America's increasing dependence on foreign sources of oil that it has now reached a very critical threshold which calls for immediate action. This bill before us is part of our immediate action, as it has some things in it to increase our availability of domestic supplies of energy. Global oil prices and supplies remain beyond our reach, just as surely as our own demand here at home will remain constant. Abroad, oil prices and supplies are at best in a state of flux, very unpredictable. At worst, you could say that things are beyond our control.

Our obvious goal in a lot of our energy legislation—some of it is part of this bill and part of the debate we had 2 years ago on the highway bill—is to get some of this under our control by having less dependence upon foreign sources of oil.

In China, for instance, the competition for oil is unprecedented. So determined is China to protect itself and its burgeoning growth against global uncertainty, they have recently secured supplies from both Canada and Venezuela and are actively seeking oil from producers upon whom the United States has traditionally relied. Some experts suggest that we have now reached our global supply limits, perhaps even that we have exceeded them.

If they are correct—and of course we hope they are not—we face more shortages and rising prices. The answer to these very real and vexing questions about the global security of supply and price for America's oil demands are far beyond this Senator and indeed even beyond this legislation before the Senate.

However, I believe, with this amendment as part of the managers' package, we will go a long way toward reducing our domestic dependence upon oil dedicated to our transportation sector. We are gulping vast amounts of imported oil in an increasingly futile attempt to quench our thirsty addiction to petroleum. Today, our transportation sector accounts for two-thirds of the total United States demand. This forces us to import a whopping 60 percent of our petroleum needs.

I remember a time when we thought it was inconceivable America would ever exceed even 50-percent reliance upon foreign oil. Yet, we have, and then we exceeded even that, until here we are today at more than 60 percent. What can we do now to alleviate the problem? How can we do so here at home?

The President pointed something out when he spoke last week about the pressing needs to develop and implement comprehensive national energy policy, and I think it bears repeating if only through paraphrasing. President Bush indicated that technology would provide our Nation with the means to reduce our demand for petroleum-based fuel, thus reducing the high price of gasoline. The President also stressed we must embrace domestic alternative fuels as a critical midstep on the pathway toward hydrogen, which may well prove to be our ultimate fix. But the simple fact remains that a sustainable, affordable hydrogen program is still decades away. Transitioning America away from our entrenched dependency on foreign petroleum fuels to cleaner, cheaper domestic alternatives is occurring right now here at home. We should not be oblivious to it. I agree with the President that these domestic alternatives need to be embraced and encouraged. To that end, therefore, as chairman of the Finance Committee, I have developed a proposal entitled the ''Volumetric Excise Tax Credit for Alternative Fuels.'' It would be just like VEETC for ethanol and biodiesel that we passed last year, only extended to alternative fuels. This proposal would help significantly accomplish that goal of being less dependent upon foreign sources of energy.

The VEETC proposal would provide for the expansion and modification of the Volumetric Excise Tax Credit for Alternative Fuels. Our proposal will expand last year's excise tax formula, as it relates to ethanol, to include an excise tax credit for all domestic alternative fuels which would displace imported petroleum. This is how it would work. Some fuels, such as natural gas, presently pay a partially reduced rate of excise tax into the highway trust fund.

However, because these motor vehicles exact the same amount of damage to our roads and highways, my amendment would have them pay an increased rate of Federal excise tax into the highway trust fund. With this mechanism, the President's objective of displacing as much imported oil as possible is met. As importantly, the increased excise tax payments would go a long way toward increasing revenue into the highway trust fund for the near term and well into the foreseeable future.

This is not a new concept. Congress passed, and the President signed into law, a similar provision last year providing the same treatment for ethanol and biodiesel. In an effort to further encourage other domestic alternative fuels, this new VEETC amendment that we will be taking up which enjoys broad bipartisan support, it constitutes a simple expansion on the part of the framers to include other alternative fuels which displace imported petroleum-based fuels. Adoption of the VEETC for alternative fuels would constitute a win-win. It puts more money into the highway trust fund, while at the same time promoting domestic sources of motor fuel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, again, I seek permission to speak as in morning business. I will relinquish the floor if somebody wishes to speak about the highway bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PIRACY AND COUNTERFEITING BY CHINA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am introducing some legislation today, along with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM from South Carolina to construct. It deals with the issue of piracy or counterfeiting of goods by China. It relates to the substantial loss of U.S. jobs, and $200 billion in harm to the U.S. economy as a result of the piracy and counterfeiting that is going on in China.

What is our Government's reaction to this problem? Our government's reaction to date can be characterized as somewhere between looking worried, a deep frown, or thumb-sucking. Essentially, it is doing nothing to stand up for this country's economic interests.

Let me describe the problem. The U.S. Trade Representative has concluded that: ''China has not resolved critical deficiencies in intellectual property rights protection and enforcement and, as a result, infringements remain at epidemic levels.''

In short, the Chinese are cheating, counterfeiting American goods and robbing jobs from our country. Chinese fake goods coming into the United States grew 47 percent last year. The Chinese government is not doing anything about it. Investigations of counterfeiting in China, as you see, have taken a nosedive. The vast majority of products in the United States that are counterfeits or pirated are Chinese; 67 percent of the counterfeit products in this country are Chinese counterfeit products.

The question is, What are we going to do about it? Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I are offering a sense of the Senate resolution—and we will ask the Senate to vote on it at some point—calling for the immediate launch of a WTO case against China for gross violation of U.S. intellectual property rights.

On April 29, last month, the U.S. Trade Representative released a report finding that China had broken its promises to crack down on this piracy and counterfeiting. They have done nothing. They promised the moon, and they have done nothing. The question is, Will this country stand up for its own economic interests?

Mr. President, let me give you specific case that I think is interesting. Time magazine wrote recently about a new car produced by Chery, an automobile company in China—that's right, not Chevy, but Chery the Chery Automobile Company.

A Chinese firm called the Chery Automobile Company has stolen production-line blueprints for a new GM car called the Chevrolet Spark. The Chery Automobile Company is going to be producing that car, which they call the QQ, and they plan to sell five models, including an SUV, in the United States. Chery has teamed up with the man who brought the Subaru to America in the 1960s. Their plan is to import up to a quarter of a million Cherys starting in 2007.

GM is now in court. General Motors filed an action alleging that their production-line blueprints were stolen.

But it is not just that. It is so many different products. Take a look at the products that all of us know—films, publishing, software, electric equipment, automotive parts, on and on—have been counterfeited and pirated. It means American lost jobs and a higher trade deficit to the tune, we are told, of $200 billion in piracy and counterfeiting.

Now, given that we had specific promises by China that they would begin to crack down on this with respect to their entrance into the World Trade Organization, and the fact we know they have done nothing—our own U.S. Trade Ambassador says they have done nothing, that it is ''epidemic''—when will this country take action?

Winston Churchill once told a story of being taken to a carnival by his parents. He was speaking to his adversary in the House of Commons, and he told the story about seeing the sideshow's big canvas sign that says, ''Come Inside and See the Boneless Wonder,'' a man apparently born without bones. Winston Churchill said he was with his parents that day; his parents thought it was too traumatic to take a young boy into a carnival sideshow to see the boneless wonder. He never got to see it until that day on the floor of the House of Commons. When he addressed his adversary, he said, ''Finally, I see a boneless wonder.''

Boneless wonder is a good way to describe, in my judgment, those involved in trade policy in this country, who fail to stand up for this country's economic interests, who don't have the backbone to stand up and say it is in our country's interests, in the interest of our jobs, to take action against those who pirate or counterfeit American intellectual property. I have talked often on the Senate floor about trade with China and Japan and Korea and with Europe. There has been a lack of spine on many fronts. In this case, I am speaking specifically about counterfeiting and piracy by the Chinese, with whom we have the largest trade deficit in history.

Now we see that the USTR says it is in epidemic proportions—piracy and counterfeiting—and yet nothing is being done. The question is, Will we do something? Will we finally have the nerve to say we want a WTO case to be commenced against the Chinese?

This is a sense of the Senate resolution asking that the USTR commence a WTO case against the Chinese. Again, it is not me who says that the Chinese have cheated. The U.S. Trade Representative said himself that: ''China has not resolved of the critical deficiencies in intellectual property rights protection and enforcement and, as a result, infringements remain at epidemic levels.''

That amounts to massive wholesale stealing going on. It affects this country in a very detrimental way. Will we begin to finally take action? I have mentioned before that part of our trade problem is due to the incompetence of our trade negotiators. There is no other way to describe it. In the bilateral trade negotiation that occurred with China about 5 years ago, our negotiators agreed that China would impose 25-percent tariff on any American cars we tried to sell in China, and we would impose only a 2.5-percent tariff on Chinese cars coming into this country. That is fundamentally incompetent. I don't have any idea who would have agreed to that, but it obviously pulls the rug out from our country's interests.

Now, we hear that General Motors has filed an action against Chery Automobile Company in China for producing a car called the QQ, which General Motors says was stolen from the production blueprints of General Motors for one of their vehicles. And cars like these are headed to our market soon, where the floodgates are wide open.

It all comes around. Incompetent negotiators on our side, piracy and counterfeiting on their side, and unwillingness on our side to stand up for this country's economic interests; and meanwhile we watch the exodus of American jobs and the sapping of our economic strength because of trade rules, trade agreements, and the lack of enforcement that represents a basic unfairness to the producers and workers in this country.

So the question remains: When will our Government stand up for American workers? When will our Government stand up for American producers? I am talking about unfair trade, and about a Chinese Government that does nothing about it. It is past the time—long past—when our country should expect action. The citizens of our country deserve a Government that does better for them in demanding fair trade.

So my colleague and I will introduce the resolution today. It is a sense of the Senate resolution that calls for a WTO case to be filed by our Trade Ambassador against China for gross violations of U.S. intellectual property rights.

There are so many examples of piracy and counterfeiting that I will not begin to chronicle them, but I will say this: I know that many U.S. companies that are victimized by counterfeiting do complain mightily, but they are also very nervous about an action being filed against this kind of stealing and cheating. It is time for them to decide whether they are interested in solving the problem or just complaining about it. If they are interested in just complaining about being victims, then they are going to ultimately be happy if the trade ambassador continues to do nothing. But in my judgment, it is a disservice to our country's interests at a time when we have the highest trade deficits in history, at a time when we are trying to hang on to American jobs, trying to stem the flow

of American jobs outside of our country that are moving abroad in wholesale numbers. It is a disservice to our country's interests for us not to stand up when we see unfair trade and take action against it.

That is why Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I have submitted this resolution today. That is why I hope in the coming days and weeks we will be able to have an opportunity for the Senate to express itself. Does the Senate believe we ought to have our trade ambassador file an action with the WTO, or does it not believe that? Does it believe this is a serious problem, or does it think it is simply an annoyance?

I hope most Senators will agree with Senator GRAHAM and myself that this is a very serious problem and one that deserves an opportunity to be corrected.

Mr. President, let me now take a moment to congratulate Senator INHOFE and Senator JEFFORDS for their work on the highway bill. This is business that has been around the Senate for over 2 years. Most all of us wished—and I know no one more than the chairman and ranking member—we had passed a highway bill a long while ago, but it has taken some effort to get the kind of highway bill to the floor of the Senate that they have been able to get here.

I very much appreciate their leadership. Is this bill perfect? No, but it is an awfully good bill. Tomorrow, hopefully, when we finally pass this legislation and get to conference, my hope is the conference will have the wisdom to accept the Senate bill. There is a very big difference between the Senate bill and the House bill. My thoughts go with the chairman and ranking member and the conferees as they go to conference because this is a very important piece of legislation, and I compliment them.

Finally, all the papers warned us this will be some momentous week with respect to the so-called nuclear option and other issues. Just as I think all of us feel good about talking about a highway bill which is important and which strengthens this country, I think all of us would much prefer to be on the floor of the Senate talking about jobs, health care, energy, and about all the other issues that are so important. My hope is at the end of this week, we will get back to those issues as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his comments on the highway bill. It is very significant. It probably could very well be the most significant bill we will be voting on this year.

If I can get the attention of the Senator from North Dakota, I have had occasion to give four 1-hour China speeches on the floor of this Senate in response to the 2004 report to the Congress on the China Economic and Security Commission. I do not know whether the Senator from North Dakota has read that yet, but I am going to call that up with a resolution to implement the recommendations.

This is far more serious than even some of the issues the Senator from North Dakota mentioned in his excellent comments. If we look at how China is now using up the resources we are depending upon, if we go to any of the countries in Africa, such as Nigeria and the coast of Guinea where they have huge reserves, we find the Chinese are building huge stadiums, coliseums, and roads, and paying for it themselves to get the corner on those markets we will be dependent upon at some time. They are dealing with countries such as Iran and exchanging nuclear technology.

I have been deeply concerned about the Chinese, not just in what they have been able to do in terms of their nuclear capabilities, but also their conventional capabilities. It was in 1998 that GEN John Jumper came forth and said something that startled a lot of people, but we knew it all the time, and that is the Russians are now making a strike vehicle, an SU–30, that is better than our strike vehicles, the F–15 and F–16. And then we find out China has purchased, in one purchase, 240 of these vehicles. Their buildup of conventional forces and what they are doing economically to this country is very disturbing to me. It has to be addressed.

I hope the Senator from North Dakota will join us in trying to implement the recommendations of this 2004 study—it was 4 years in the making—of the security and economic problems we are facing today as a result of the Chinese buildup.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question. I agree with what Senator INHOFE has described with respect to the Chinese, and I think he would agree neither of us is attempting to paint the Chinese as an adversary. Our intention is to make China a long-term friend of our country, but for that to happen, the Chinese need to do the right thing on trade and security issues.

I have described today with respect to piracy and counterfeiting some very troubling issues, and Senator INHOFE knows and I know and others know there are some very serious and very troubling issues with respect to international security. That is the movement of critical materials and technology to the wrong parts of the world, the purchase of that technology by the Chinese.

Our intention and our hope is to work with the Chinese. But I think a country cannot sit back and say, whatever happens happens, whatever you are doing, that is fine. You have to stand up to things you find troubling. People take advantage of you if you let them take advantage of you. The same thing is true of countries, whether it is trade or international security. We have a responsibility to speak out with respect to issues, whether it be the Chinese or others, when we think they are an affront to our economic interests and our long-term national interests.

I appreciate the comments of Senator INHOFE.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, this Commission worked 4 years. They studied it from a security and economic standpoint. It was bipartisan and had every expert one can think of on the Commission. They came out with some very strong recommendations. I would hope the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from South Carolina might want to expand what they are doing after reading the recommendations. Maybe we can join forces at a later date and have a resolution recommending the adoption of the recommendations of this Commission.

Mr. President, again, we are on the highway bill. Senator JEFFORDS, the ranking member of the EPW Committee, and I worked so well together on this. I have to say before he makes his comments, there are a lot of provisions in this bill that he likes better than I like, and there are provisions I like better than he likes. That is what it is, that is how we got to where we are today. It has been a great working relationship, and I anticipate we are going to be successful in getting this bill passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his kind words. We are making progress. I know we are going to come out with a good bill. I look forward to working with him.

Today we begin the third week of debate on this very important legislation. The bill before us, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005, better known as the highway bill, is important to the Nation.

Too many Americans are sitting in traffic. The Texas Transportation Institute, which ranks U.S. cities on the severity of their congestion, tells us in a recently released report that the average commuter in Atlanta sits in traffic for 67 hours each year; Washington, DC, for 69 hours; San Francisco, 72 hours; in Los Angeles, the average commuter sits in traffic for an astounding 93 hours each year. That is almost 4 days each year wasted while sitting behind the wheel in traffic.

I would hope we could move away from our reliance on cars and make better use of public transit, but the reality is the number of cars on the roads increases each year.

The bill before us will help cities in all of our States reduce congestion by adding additional travel lanes, by building overpasses at busy intersections, and using the best technology available to keep our traffic moving.

We need this bill to make our roads safer. More than 42,000 Americans will die in traffic accidents this year. The bill before us will help States make

dangerous intersections and curves safer by putting up better warning signs, by building guardrails, and by building center median dividers.

This bill will make our roads safer by helping States build wider shoulders for disabled vehicles, by building rumble strips to slow down traffic, and by building fences to discourage jaywalkers. This bill will save lives.

Once again, I thank the chairman, Senator INHOFE, Senator BOND, and Senator BAUCUS for all their efforts in moving this bill forward. And while I am glad we expect to pass this bill tomorrow through the Senate, I remind all of my Senate colleagues we still have a lot of work to do ahead.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont brought up a very interesting point when he said this bill will save lives. We have a whole safety core in this bill. This was done in the Commerce Committee's portion of the bill. That is why when we have a very complicated formula, one of the factors in the formula is the fatality rate on a per-capita basis of the States because that is one indicator that there is a problem with surface transportation and a problem that can be corrected with this bill.

We had called this bill the SAFETEA bill because it has the safety provisions that will save lives. I can speak for my State of Oklahoma and many others that more than half the States are above this average in terms of fatalities. We need to do something about this. We cannot do it if we extend it.

I do not think people realize that if we do not pass this bill by tomorrow and get it to conference and back from conference prior to the termination of this sixth extension—and that is May 31—then we will have to get another extension. If we get another extension, we will be doing the same thing we have done over the last 2 years with extensions, and that is continue it as it was under the 7-year-old TEA–21. There have been a lot of changes since then.

All those Senators representing donor States, such as my State of Oklahoma—I can remember when Oklahoma would only get back 75 percent of what they sent in, and now we have made improvements. The bill passed 7 years ago, TEA–21, brought up the minimum to 90.5 percent. If we had passed the bill we had last year at a higher funding level, that would have been 95 percent.

In other words, every donor State or every State would get back 95 percent of what they sent in. That would be better than the 90.5 today. At this reduced funded level, it will be about 92 percent.

The point is this: If we do not pass a bill, it is not going to happen. We are not going to have any relief for the donor States. The safety core program Senator JEFFORDS talked about—he is right, it is a life-or-death issue. If we do not pass this bill, people are going to die. People are going to die because we don't have any safety provisions in the extension so none of those would be adopted.

We have streamlining provisions. I think we all hear stories about how some of our antiquated rules, regulations, and statutes have made it almost impossible to get roads built and have made them cost something close to 15 percent more. We have streamlining provisions and reviews of this process in the bill, but if we don't pass the bill we will be operating under an extension, and that is not going to happen.

I mentioned earlier today this all started with President Eisenhower, actually Major Eisenhower, back in World War II when he realized he was unable to move troops and equipment around the United States to prosecute World War II as well as he should have been able to. So when he became President, he decided to have this National Highway System and we passed this bill. We have been operating the same way since then, almost 50 years now, raising money to pay for our infrastructure in America the same as we did 50 years ago.

We have done two things. First, we are giving the States the ability to be creative. I know a lot of people think no decision is a good decision if it is made in Washington. I have learned, after having been in State government and mayor of a city, that the closer you get to the people, the better the decision is and the more accurate it is. We recognize this. We allow the States not just to do things in general but also to come up with creative funding mechanisms, where they exercise the maximum of the private sector involvement in order to get these problems resolved.

In this bill we hope to pass, we even have a national commission to explore how to fund transportation in the future. This is something that will not happen if it is an extension. So we need to have this. That is why it is important.

We have the Safe Routes to School provision. I could probably name 20 different provisions of this very large bill, but this is one that several Members had a great passion for. I know several Members in the other body, as well as Senator JEFFORDS, were concerned about the Safe Routes to School provision. This is something that will save young people's lives, but if we do not do it and instead operate under an extension, we will not have that provision in there.

Anyone who has been in business and who has watched and waited, knows what you have to go through to get contracts, how you plan the financing, and that when you get the labor pool and your resources, in order to get the very most from them, you have to plan years in advance. The problem with the extension is it could be a 2-month extension or a 1-month extension or it could be 6 months. They are out there trying to address serious problems such as we have in Oklahoma with our bridges.

By the way, we have had several losses of life in my State of Oklahoma—two in the fairly recent past—due to bridges crumbling and killing people. So we need to correct this problem. We cannot do it unless we pass the bill.

A lot of the States are complaining right now, the border States—California, Arizona, Florida, Texas—about the fact that, because of NAFTA, a lot of excess traffic is going through their States. We want to do something about that and we are doing it. We have a borders provision in this bill that gives them some of that relief. We will not be able to do that if we do not pass the bill. It is not going to work with an extension.

Right now we have chokepoints such as the canals we have in Oklahoma. People do not realize they are navigable. I remember many years ago when I was in the State senate, in order to try to get the point across to people that we have a navigable channel that goes all the way to my hometown of Tulsa, OK, or Catoosa, and in order to show this we managed to take a World War II submarine, the USS *Batfish*, from Texas, in the boneyard, and moved it all the way to Oklahoma, and it is sitting in Muskogee to tell that story.

The point is, if we have channel traffic activity, we have railroads, we have air, and we have surface, this provides chokepoints. We address the chokepoints as a major part of this bill.

The last and maybe most important thing is we have firewalls. When a person goes to the pump and pays Federal excise taxes when they buy a gallon of fuel, that person expects that money will go to improving highways and go to transportation. That is a no-brainer. That is what is supposed to happen. That is what we told the people is going to happen. But that is not what is happening. The insatiable appetite of members of an elected body to spend somebody else's money is something we have to deal with on a regular basis. So we have a trust fund and people pay money into the trust fund, but every time they have a chance to steal money out of the trust fund, they do.

What the Finance Committee tried to do, and I applaud them, they have put this together so they cannot do this that easily. For example, someone was complaining about the way this finance package is working. They said we have this program where we have hybrid cars so we give them financial advantages to encourage them so we can look out for the environment and save money on fuel and not aggravate the already existing energy shortage problem we have in America.

What do they do? They give them that money. But they take it out of the trust fund. It has nothing to do with

that. This is environmental policy, economic policy, but it is paid for by the trust fund. This is wrong.

In 1998, when President Clinton was President, he had a balanced budget amendment. He was going to balance the budget. But a lot of that money, $8 billion, was out of the trust fund to go toward the deficit. At that time I voted against it. All my conservative friends said, You want to do something about the deficit, don't you? But I said, Not on the back of the highway trust fund.

The point I want to make is there have been raids on the trust fund, and not just the highway trust fund but others. In this legislation we hope to pass tomorrow, we have firewalls built in so they can no longer raid the highway trust fund. If there is no other reason to pass this bill, this would be enough of a reason.

There will have been some complaints concerning our approach. There are two different basic approaches that one might take, putting together something such as the allocation of money that goes to the States. One is used in the other body. I served 8 years on the Transportation Committee in the House of Representatives. I know how that works over there. Frankly, it is more on projects than anything else. Not that there is anything wrong with that, except it would seem to me, and it seems to the majority of people in this body, better if you allocate on formula an amount of money then that goes back to the States and those States determine how to use it. In the State of Oklahoma we have eight transport districts, eight transportation commissioners. They sit down in a room. Certainly they know more about the needs in Oklahoma than we know here in Washington, DC. So we allocate the money in accordance with a lot of factors.

We have low-income States as a factor. If you are in a State such as Wyoming or Montana that has a low population density, yet you have to have roads to get across it, that is a consideration. If you have a high fatality rate, as we mentioned before, that is a consideration. We want to consider the number of interstate lane miles they have, the age of those, the traffic on those—all these things are factors that are in a formula. It might be politically a lot smarter to line up 60 Senators and say this is what we are going to do in your States and forget about all the rest of them and just do projects. We could do them. It is perfectly legal. We elected not to do that. We elected to do it the hard way with a complicated formula, and by the way, that is one nobody likes and that is probably a pretty good indication it is a pretty good formula. There are things I don't like. There are areas where I don't believe Oklahoma is being treated fairly. I am sure every one of the 100 Senators in this body can say the same thing.

We are still waiting now. We will be having a vote. We are 2 hours away from the vote. So we will wait for those to come down.

AMENDMENT NO. 706 TO AMENDMENT NO. 605

On behalf of Senator SNOWE, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment 706.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for Ms. SNOWE, proposes an amendment numbered 706 to amendment No. 605.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To specify which portions of Interstate Routes 95, 195, 295, and 395 in the State of Maine are subject to certain vehicle weight limiatins)

On page 410, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 18____. VEHICLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS IN MAINE.

Section 127(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended in the last sentence by striking ''respect to that portion'' and all that follows through ''New Hampshire State line,'' and inserting ''respect to Interstate Routes 95, 195, 295, and 395 in the State of Maine,''.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I observe Senator SNOWE is en route and unless someone else wants to gain access to the floor, 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. WYDEN. 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. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me reserve the right to object and ask the Senator if he would amend his unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business. However, if a Member comes with an amendment—since the cutoff is 25 minutes away—the Senator agrees not to speak for more than a couple of minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. I very much appreciate the work of the Senators from Vermont and Oklahoma, and if we have a Senator, I will wrap up within a couple minutes of time at that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCLOSURE OF CEO PENSION FUNDS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this is a time when millions of our families are walking on an economic tightrope. I will talk for a couple of minutes about the double standard that applies with respect to the pension rights of our workers. When we look at what is happening today in America with the workers—for example, at United Airlines, we saw it at Enron, as well—the pensions of our workers are in a free fall, but the pensions of the executives, the CEOs, are safe and secure in a tidy lockbox. I don't think that is right.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I will do everything I can to change it. I have been trying to figure out exactly how much money the CEO of any major company is receiving in this country in his or her pension package. This is a very difficult exercise. It is sort of like trying to find a needle in multiple haystacks.

To begin the effort to try to figure out what these executives are paid, I was first instructed to call the Department of Labor to obtain a copy of a company's annual report of employee benefit plans. This is what is called the form 5500. After I did that, I was told to contact the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission to get hold of the company's 10(k) filing for the year in question.

Armed with these two documents, you then have to figure out the amount of unfunded liability for all of the groups the company pays, and then subtract that number from a line item in the 10(k) form. Even when you go this route, what you have is, at best, a rough estimate that requires a background in pension legislation, an intimate knowledge of SEC requirements, and a degree in calculus.

It seems to me that American workers, at a time when they are seeing their pensions shellacked—we saw it at Enron in Oregon where we had workers who used to have close to $1 million, and their private pension funds now have $3,000 or $4,000. They deserve better than to have to try to figure out, through a bevy of forms and stock options, deferred accounts, years of service calculations, equations—one form of paper after another—they deserve better than to try to have to sort all that out to see what the executives are making in their pensions while they are seeing their pensions evaporate in front of their eyes.

Senator KENNEDY has done very good work in terms of trying to sort this out so as to determine when a company tries to unload their responsibilities at a time of crisis.

The Senate Finance Committee, on a bipartisan basis, should do more. What the Senate ought to be doing at a time when we are seeing our workers suffer and their pensions disappear, the Senate ought to make sure that shareholders and the public can find out exactly and conveniently what these executives will be getting upon their retirement.

I am proposing a bit of sunshine come into these executive pension lockboxes. Let's do for the workers whose pensions are being offered up for the CEOs, a bit of justice. Let's also do it for taxpayers because with every company that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation steps in to rescue, the agency's deficit grows. From an estimated $23 billion today, it is anticipated to grow to an expected $40 billion with the takeover of additional airlines.

We are seeing our workers sacrifice. The question is, What are they sacrificing for? Apparently, on the basis of the news in the last couple of weeks, some of these workers are sacrificing in order to fund the retirement packages for the CEOs. That is not my view of making tough decisions together. That is not my view of coming together and dealing with a tough problem in an equitable way. It is a double standard.

If you ask the average person on the street if they knew, for example, that the worker was going to be at risk with their pensions while the enormous pension of the CEO was protected, those workers wouldn't have any idea that was the case. They would say the same rules apply to everyone.

We are seeing they don't. Look particularly at the pension arrangement for the CEO at United. Three months before United Airlines filed for bankruptcy in 2002, the company placed $4.5 million in a special bankruptcy protected trust for the CEO. So right now we are seeing the workers of United Airlines face the devastation of their pensions literally disappearing. They look at this double standard. The people at the top do not have to sweat it. That is not right. We ought to have one set of pension rules for everyone in this country. It ought to be based on disclosure and transparency.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee I am going to do everything I can in this session, on a bipartisan basis, to get this passed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his excellent statement. I offer to work with the Senator to see if we can bring about some action to take care of those problems.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since we are right to the 4 o'clock deadline, that the managers' amendment proposed by myself and the ranking member be introduced at a time after 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, there are many people to thank in what has been a long 3-year process.

First, Chairman INHOFE. It has been an honor and a privilege to work with the Senator from Oklahoma. He has always been fair and considerate, and I enjoy our friendship. We have a couple weeks, possibly months, more to go to get this bill done. I look forward to working with him.

Senator BOND also has been wonderful to work with. He brings spirit, enthusiasm to all his work, and a lot of humor, and I appreciate our close working relationship. He is a good friend.

Senator BAUCUS, my colleague on this side, is a very close friend and has been a great addition to the team and this process. The Senator from Montana is a true legislator. He knows how to get things done. Without him, I don't think we would be as far as we are here today. It is an honor to work with such an intelligent and fair-minded Senator.

There are many staff to acknowledge, also. I have always told my staff director, Ken Connolly, that in order to succeed in his job, he needed to hire a strong team and to hire staff smarter than me and him. Well, in this case, it wasn't difficult. Anyway, let me run through a few staff members who have helped the cause of moving this bill.

Senator INHOFE's staff: Ruth VanMark, Andrew Wheeler, James O'Keefe, Nathan Richmond, Angie Giancarlo, Greg Murrill, John Shanahan, Marty Hall, and others; Senator BOND's staff: Ellen Stein, John Stoody, Heideh Shahmoradi; Senator BAUCUS's staff: Kathy Ruffalo returned to the Senate just this past spring to help us complete this legislation. She has been a fantastic addition to that team.

On my staff, there are many people to thank, including JoEllen Darcy, Catharine Ransome, Margaret Wetherald, Chris Miller, and MaryFrancis Repko.

However, there are four key people who need to be acknowledged and thanked for bringing this bill to us today. Malia Somerville has been the glue that kept our team together; Alison Taylor, the best chief counsel of any committee in either body of Congress; J.C. Sandberg, the only staffer who really knows what is in the bill, and the hardest worker in the Senate; and Ken Connolly, my staff director, who has built such a good team. To him I owe a great deal for the work that has been done.

All of these staff members, I am sure, are looking forward to final passage tomorrow. They are even more eager, I am sure, to go to conference.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I also am going to thank staff. This was not easy. We have endured 3 years now. Ruth VanMark has been with me 18 years and has all of the background in the other body in the Transportation Committee. They will all be glad to get a good night's sleep at some time. We go from here into conference.

I suggest that we be aware that our 4 o'clock deadline has passed now. We have exempted the managers' amendment so it can be done at a later time. We are now down from 173 amendments to 7, so we have 7 to be voted on between now and tomorrow. At the conclusion of that, we will then vote on final passage and send it to conference. I hope leadership is working on both sides of the aisle to appointing conferees and that we can get it to conference and get it back.

I keep responding that I believe we can do this within the May 31 deadline and avoid an extension. We can show that things can happen in an expeditious way in the Senate, whether people believe it or not. If we get this passed tomorrow, we would have time to do it, if we are committed to making it a reality.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, earlier this week, I offered an amendment, which was passed unanimously, to eliminate the ability to toll existing interstate highways. I did this because I believe in using our tax dollars that we collect to support the Federal interstate highway program. But we ought to do it fairly.

The majority of the highway system was designed in the 1950s to meet the needs of the westward expansion of a rapidly growing nation. Today, we face different needs. For example, new areas of population growth, especially along the southern tier, require new infrastructure, and also with the trade coming from NAFTA, we are seeing an even more increasing load that adds to the transportation burdens of our border regions.

Strong trade partnerships with Mexico and Canada have provided great benefits for us, but the resulting traffic is damaging the highway network in my State and others, such as Arizona and Michigan.

Most of the goods in our economy ride on our Nation's highways. In large part, over the past 50 years, the Federal highway aid program has assisted the States in producing one of the world's finest highway networks.

To meet our needs, Congress must reauthorize surface transportation programs this year. States are responsible for converting the resources this legislation provides into infrastructure that allows traffic to move efficiently, and we want and need to undertake that construction.

My major concern with the Federal highway program is that Texas has been a donor State for 50 years, contributing billions to other States to enable them to build their highway network. As a strong adherent of a National Transportation Safety Board system, I understand that large States, such as Texas, should assist smaller and rural States with their transportation needs because we all profit from the comprehensive highway network. What concerns me is the level of support Texas has been forced to provide to other States.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Texas and other donor States received

as little as 76-percent rate of return on what our taxpayers send to Washington. With the 1998 bill, TEA–21, Texas's rate of return rose to 90.5 percent in the formula program.

This program produced real dollars. From 1994 to 2003, Texas contributed $20 billion to the highway trust fund and received $18 billion in return. If not for other donor State Senators, such as the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma, and improving the rate of return, Texas would have received only $15.8 billion. The additional $2.4 billion has been critical for us to meet our transportation needs. However, Texas has still given $2 billion to other States over this period.

States such as Texas, California, Arizona, Colorado, and Michigan are contributing more and more, and we are the States that need the most new infrastructure to handle the greatest population growth. In addition, most of the donor States are border States with unique needs resulting from trade.

Texas has more than 300,000 highway miles, the most of any State in our Nation. Texas highways are almost 10 percent of the national total. Eighty percent of NAFTA traffic travels through my home State of Texas. But while the entire Nation benefits from the resulting commerce, Texas bears the brunt of maintenance and upkeep on our highways.

In 2003, more than 4 million trucks, hauling 18 billion pounds of cargo, entered from Mexico through 24 commercial border-crossing facilities. More than 3 million of those trucks, or 68 percent, entered through Texas. In addition, 90 million personal vehicles from Mexico also travel through the southwest border States.

The donor States are the fastest growing States in America and are most responsible for the growth in the highway trust fund. Ironically, the formula in this bill offers the least relief to the States where cities are developing most rapidly.

In 1998, Texas accounted for 7 percent of the highway trust fund receipts. In 2004, it rose to 9 percent, and during this bill, it may top 10 percent. In other words, we are paying a larger and larger share.

The formula in the bill reported out of committee created a floor guaranteeing every State at least 110 percent of the total cash it received under TEA–21. To limit costs, no State may receive more than a certain percentage, 130 percent in year 1, of the TEA–21.

So even if a State's contribution to the trust fund grows in excess of 130 percent, it hits the ceiling and it hits pretty fast on growing States such as Texas, capping our funding.

Using cash as the measuring stick rather than the percentage a State contributes to the trust fund ignores whether a State is growing or shrinking, and it ignores whether it is giving more to the fund or less. This methodology hurts our growing States, and it helps the donee States which are contributing less to the trust fund.

For example, Pennsylvania's share of contributions during TEA–21 was 4.1 percent, but it is expected to contribute just 3.9 percent of the trust fund during SAFETEA. It does not make sense to guarantee an increase in cash when a State is contributing less.

The formula in the pending substitute is made worse. Not only does it increase spending for the bill by $11 billion, it increases the floor to 115 percent. So Pennsylvania is now guaranteed to receive 15 percent more cash than it received from Washington in 1998, even though it is contributing a smaller proportion of the trust fund. Superdonor States, such as Texas, move up to an average return of only 91.3 percent.

While this is an improvement, it is not enough. The committee tells me I should like this legislation because while total spending grows 30 percent, Texas will see a 37-percent dollar increase compared to 6 years ago. However, Texas's increase has little to do with the formula and instead is the result of Texas buying more gas and paying more taxes into the highway trust fund.

It is fair, if a State's contribution is growing faster than the average, that it should receive higher than the average in return. This bill does not give Texas the resources to adequately expand our infrastructure at the rate the traffic is growing on the NAFTA corridor of Mexico and around our fast-growing cities. If Texas received all of the money that we contribute to the fund, this disparity would be reduced.

I believe the ability to pay for highway project needs with their own contribution exists for most States, with very few exceptions, particularly in the West, and funding increases should be based on growth and need rather than tradition.

I am not suggesting that we cut off aid to other States altogether, but I do think we can reduce this disparity in the current donor-donee system. It has been too large for too long and unfairly limits the ability of States to benefit from their tax dollars.

We all want the Federal highway system to be good throughout our Nation, and that may require some donor status, but donating almost 10 cents of every dollar is not necessary, and it is not fair.

I recognize the needs of donee States vary widely, but we have never before created this special class of donor State to carry the heavier load, and I hope we will not do it when this bill is finished.

At a minimum, we should all receive at least 92 percent in year 1 rather than having to wait until the final year to get to that level.

I have worked with the chairman for a long time trying to come up with a formula that would help mitigate the border States' particular needs because we are border corridors and most of us are growing States. I have come up with a lot of alternatives. None of them have been acceptable to the chairman and the ranking member of the committee.

It is my hope that as this bill goes out of the Senate, which it will, we will be able to work in conference for some more fair allocation that is based on a State's needs, a State's taxing, and a State's efforts. It is only fair that the States that are growing, that are putting more money into the highway trust fund should get some bonus for doing that to help them with the needs they have.

I think we have gone in the wrong direction, and I certainly hope we will come much closer to a fair allocation. I am not saying there should be 100 percent, but 91.3 percent is a mighty price for Texans to pay when it is growing at such a fast rate and has the most highway miles of any State in our Nation.

I look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member as this bill does sail out of here. I cannot possibly support it in this current configuration. I still hold out hope that if we can come up to the 92-cent level, we would be in a much better position to feel good about this legislation, helping all of our States instead of just the donee States. And I hope the door will still be open to helping all of the States feel good about this effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Texas for her comments. I know the depth of her interest and the passion she has for doing everything she can for her State.

I have said several times on the floor of the Senate how difficult it is to come up with formula approaches. It is difficult. It is a tough thing to do. There are so many factors that go into it, such as the interstate lane miles, miles traveled, principal arteries, cost to repair and replace deficient highway bridges, weight nonattainment maintenance areas, low-population States, donor States, donee States, fast-growing States. Again, it would have been so much easier to do it the way it has been done before and the way we have done it, actually, in the other body just by making a political list, and when we get to the 60 votes saying: All right, that is it, the other 40 of you guys, it is your problem.

We try not to do that. There is not one State represented in this Senate that cannot complain about some parts of the formula. We have tried hard. When we passed the bill out of committee, starting in 2005 through 2009 in Texas, 90.5 percent was all the way to 2009, and then it was 92 percent. Now in 2006, 2007, 2008 at 91 percent and going to 92 percent.

Of course, the Senator is right that Texas is a very large State, so it represents very large amounts of money. But it is a half percent more in each of those 3 years of 2006, 2007, 2008. We have

tried to do it. We tried to work with each one of the States.

As I say, I know her depth of interest. We spent many hours trying to work out variances.

The problem we always have is nothing happens in a vacuum. If we take care of a problem in Texas, then that aggravates a problem in Pennsylvania.

So formulas are tough. They are tough to deal with politically. They are tough to deal with rationally. I think we have tried to do the very best we can. With that, I am glad to yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do understand exactly what has happened to the bill. I do understand the difficulty. The Senator is responsible for getting the number of votes he has to have to get the bill out of the Senate, and my colleague has those votes.

I do hope, in conference, he will look at the border corridor issue which, when the bill came out of committee, was above the line, outside the formula, and did give some of the help to these fast-growing border States that have the NAFTA traffic coming in directly, which then fans out to the rest of the country where it is dissipated. I hope my colleague will take that into account.

I was the one who authored the border corridor idea. It really did help when it was, as we discussed, above the line. I just hope, as you do fix particular problems for other States—whether they be pass-through States or other types of designations—you will look at the border corridor issue, which would help both northern corridor States such as Michigan and southern border States such as California, Arizona, and Texas. It is still going to make us very big donor States, but it would mitigate it, to a great extent, because that is where our biggest problem is. We have three border corridors and two of them are clogged completely, all the way through Texas. That is not helpful to anyone.

I don't want to toll a highway that is already in place. We have spoken on that. But I think we need to try to look at that issue in conference—if you can do something that would mitigate that particular problem.

Mr. INHOFE. It is a very reasonable request the Senator from Texas is making. I observe we talked about this "above the line/below the line." We plowed this furrow several times. However, when you get in conference, there are things that can be done. I can assure the Senator the State of Texas will be well represented in conference. I am sure we will hear proposals, and there will be some give and take in all areas.

Of course, we will be dealing with another whole body over there, so it is hard to predict what will come out. But we will try to get to it expeditiously and see that Texas—as I say, they will be well represented. I think we all understand that.

We are now waiting. We are, as I said before, down to about seven amendments. There could be a germaneness problem with some of them. Some of them could be worked out. My guess is, other than the managers' amendment, which Senator JEFFORDS and I will be propounding, there are probably, realistically, maybe four votes that we will be having. That is my guess what it will be. We have announced already we are going to have one tonight at 5:30, which is just an hour and 6 minutes from now.

After that, we invite Senators to stay here and debate their amendments. I think we probably will not have votes until tomorrow morning. We can debate these amendments. I think by that time there may be as many as three or four amendments that would be appropriate for us to debate. Then we can get on to the final passage.

As it is right now, we have plenty of time tonight. We have another hour and 5 minutes before the vote. I am sure Senator JEFFORDS joins me in making this request: Members who are authors of these amendments, they know who they are, come down. We are open for business. Come down and debate your amendments.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President I will briefly talk about a provision in the Commerce title of the highway bill. We have the Commerce title, Banking, Finance, and EPW title. Section 7370 creates a hazardous material cooperative research program. It authorizes $2 million a year for each year, including 2006 through 2009, for hazardous material transport research projects on topics that are "not adequately addressed by existing Federal private sector research programs."

The section goes on to require that at least one of the studies "provide an assessment of the need and feasibility of substituting less lethal substances than toxic inhalation hazards in the manufacturing process."

I oppose the provision and hope it can be removed in conference. I will be actively opposing it in conference to see it is removed. There is no such language in the House portion.

The concept at the heart of this provision is called inherently safer technology and it is not about transportation but a longstanding wish of some of the environmental extremist communities. The EPW has spent the last 4 years working on the issue of chemical security and this issue of FIST has arisen several times in the context of the security debate. The idea of inherently safer technology predates September 11. It was around long before the tragedy of September 11. It has never been about security. It has never been about transportation. It is a concept that dates back more than a decade when the extremist environmental community—Greenpeace and others—was seeking bans on chlorine, the chemical used to purify our Nation's water. After September 11 they decided to play upon the fears of the Nation and repackage FIST as a solution to potential security problems. Now they seek to repackage it again as a transportation issue, which it is not.

This issue is not about security. It is not about transportation. It is about trying to find a research justification for giving the Federal Government authority to mandate that a private company change its manufacturing process or the chemicals they use. The study's parameters reveal this intent when it states "substituting less lethal substances than toxic inhalation hazards in the manufacturing process."

There are entire books written about the subject of FIST by various groups, including current efforts by the Center for Chemical Process Safety and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers to update their 1996 "gold book" on the subject. These are chemical process experts. The Federal Government is not.

I do not believe mandatory FIST is good for our Nation's security. Besides that, it is not a transportation issue. If it is something you want to debate in the Senate as a freestanding bill, do it that way, but do not sneak around behind and throw little a part into this bill through the Commerce title that has nothing to do with transportation.

I mention this and anything else we find in the bill that perhaps we have overlooked that has nothing to do with transportation, we will make every effort to make sure it gets out when it is in conference.

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. SCHUMER. 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will speak on another subject, but as per an agreement with the Senator from Oklahoma, should someone else come to the Senate floor and wish to speak on the subject of the bill at hand, I will yield the floor.

NUCLEAR OPTION

Mr. President, I will change the subject to the subject on everyone's mind other than the transportation bill, probably more on our minds than just about anything else, and that is the upcoming nuclear option. Right now, we are on the precipice of a constitutional crisis. We are about to step into the abyss. I want to talk for a few minutes why we are on that precipice and why we are looking into the abyss.

Let me first ask a fundamental question: What is the crisis that calls for the undoing of two centuries of tradition? What is the crisis that requires such an unprecedented parliamentary sleight of hand? What is the crisis that calls for a response that is so controversial and extreme that Senator LOTT coined the term ''nuclear option'' to describe it?

Is it that President Bush has had the terrible misfortune of having only 95 percent of his judicial nominees confirmed? That is, 208 out of 218? It can't be that. Every President should have the luck of George Bush and have so many nominees confirmed to the bench. I might also add, in part because of this high confirmation rate, court vacancies at the end of last session were at their lowest rate in 14 years. So it can't be either vacancies on the bench or overwhelming rejection of the President's nominees because neither is the fact.

Is it that the Constitution, as my strict constructionist friends across the aisle like to argue, requires an up-or-down vote on every judicial nominee? Is that the crisis? No, Senator FRIST acknowledged as much last week when he conceded, after a question from Senator BYRD, that there was no such language in the Constitution.

In fact, it is a great irony that those on the other side of the aisle who are seeking this nuclear option in the name of strict construction are being activists, as they call it, because they are expanding the Constitution, reading in their own views in the Constitution when the very words do not exist.

It is my understanding that is what the Constitution-in-exile school holds; that is, what the strict constructive school of Justice Scalia holds. If the words are not in the Constitution, you do not read them in.

Is the word ''filibuster'' in the Constitution? No. Are the words ''majority vote,'' ''up-or-down vote'' in the Constitution? Absolutely not. That is not the crisis, either.

Let me ask again, Why are we on the brink of destroying what is good in the Senate and destroying whatever is left of good will in the Senate? Is it that the public, in high dudgeon, is demanding this radical rule change? Are Republican Senators merely doing their jobs as legislators, responding to a generalized public calling for the abolition of the filibuster? Clearly not.

It is not the American people at large who are demanding detonation of the nuclear option. Indeed, in poll after poll, first, people say they do not know what it is when asked, and then when it is described to them, the people have made clear they believe the filibuster is an important check and balance to be preserved, not vaporized. Most recently, for instance, according to a Time magazine poll, the American people are against the nuclear option 59 to 28.

Nor is it rank-and-file Republicans who are clamoring for an end to filibusters on judges. A Wall Street Journal poll showed 41 percent of Republicans support giving the Democrats the right to keep the filibuster going. They, like most Americans, are wondering, and rightly so, why we are talking more about the nuclear option in the Senate than about nuclear proliferation in North Korea.

Nor is it the business establishment—clearly, usually, a conservative constituency—that is calling for a change in the rules. To the contrary, the business community wants the Senate to get busy addressing important issues they believe will get the economy back on track. The Chamber of Commerce and many other business groups have either publicly or privately stated their opposition to invoking the nuclear option.

Is it the ''gray heads'' of the conservative movement who are calling for this? No. By and large, elder statesmen from the conservative movement are not demanding this radical move. Many, including such leading figures as George Will and Ken Starr, have criticized the nuclear option and urge restraint—so have Senators Armstrong and McClure, hardly beacons of a liberal influence in this country or in the Senate.

So if there is no constitutional requirement, and there is no vacancy disaster, and there is no public clamoring for the extinguishing of the minority rights to filibuster, why are we here? Why are we on the edge of the abyss? Why are we—at least the majority—being motivated to plunge this Senate, this city, and this country into a constitutional crisis, into an end of what is ever left of comity in the Senate, which is the body that has at least some comity left?

Well, let me tell you why I fear we are here. We are here, I fear, because the nuclear option is being pushed largely by the radioactive rhetoric of a small band of radicals who hold in their hands the political fortunes of the President and a minority of sitting Senators who would be President. The once conservative Republican Party has, I believe, been hijacked by activist, radical, rightwing ideologues who are exerting too much influence over Senators.

These ideologues have taken to intimidating and even threatening the independent judiciary. They have, among other things, compared judges to the KKK and claimed that the independent judiciary is worse than al-Qaida. Unfortunately, these extreme groups are exerting disproportionate influence on certain Senators from the other side who—because of pure political pressure—are proceeding at pace with the nuclear option.

There is, to be sure, much irony and hypocrisy in this dance. It is particularly perverse that many of my colleagues purport to preserve the principle of majority rule by doing the bidding of a distinct, but politically powerful, minority.

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I would like to finish my remarks, and then I would be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. VITTER. OK, but I say to the Senator, I understood you had been given the floor until someone came to the floor to speak on the highway bill. About how much longer?

Mr. SCHUMER. I probably will need no more than 5 minutes, if that is OK with my colleague.

Mr. VITTER. OK, that will be fine.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator. I appreciate that very much.

It seems the only conservatives who are strongly in favor of the nuclear option—who are pushing it—are some Senators who might wish to run for President.

Now, to hear the tirades of those demanding the nuclear option is spine tingling.

Conservative activist James Dobson compared the nine Supreme Court Justices to the Ku Klux Klan's men in robes.

Pat Robertson said the threat posed by judges was ''more serious than a few bearded terrorists who fly into buildings.''

Conservative lawyer-author Edwin Vieira said Justice Kennedy should be impeached and invoked Joseph Stalin's murderous slogan, which he said worked very well for him:

> [W]henever he ran into difficulty: ''no man, no problem.''

Do we hear any denunciation of this inflammatory rhetoric? No. Denunciations of heinous characterizations of independent judges? No.

Instead, Senators—some maybe with Presidential ambitions—are kowtowing to these extremists. When the Democratic Party kowtowed to extremists on the left, we paid the price. It is a lesson I think we have learned. It is a lesson that ought to be learned by my colleagues on the other side.

Now, let's try to examine the record. And this is the No. 1 point I want to make. Look what conservatives are saying, conservatives not running for President or running for office, but people whose conservative credentials go unchallenged. These are not moderates. These are not liberals. They are true conservatives, and a chorus of their voices is speaking out against the nuclear option.

True conservatives, independent thinkers who are not under pressure from the likes of Tony Perkins and Pat Robertson and others, have eloquently made the case against the nuclear option. These conservatives have two things in common: They were strongly in favor of George Bush for President, and they are strongly against the nuclear option.

Here are some of the names. Many leading conservative commentators and thinkers are against it, such as George Will and Kenneth Starr. Many former Republican Senators are against it, such as Senator Armstrong, Senator McClure, Senator Wallop, Senator Simpson. Many editorial boards

that endorsed George Bush for President are against it—the Dallas Morning News.

I recognize that in these polarized times maybe the words of a Democratic Senator from New York will have little sway across the aisle, but what about the words of some icons and leaders of the conservative movement?

I urge my colleagues who have not yet made up their minds and been committed to the nuclear option to heed these words. Most of those who have not made up their minds are far more moderate than the voices that we listed here, but they should be listened to in this instance. It is rare that you get so many conservatives—not in office, not under the thumb of these extreme, small-numbered groups—but rarely do you get such a chorus.

Here are the arguments of the conservatives. The conservatives understand that destroying an important tradition of the Senate is not conservative. Conservatism has a long tradition in American politics. I agree with some of its tenets and disagree with many others. But true advocates and students of that tradition recognize better than anyone the violence that the nuclear option does to conservative principles.

Ken Starr said in one leading magazine:

> It may prove to have the kind of long-term boomerang effect, damage on the institution of the Senate, that thoughtful Senators may come to regret.

How about former Senator Armstrong? He said this:

> Having served in the majority and in the minority, I know that it's worthwhile to have the minority empowered. As a conservative, I think there is value to having a constraint on the majority.

Let me repeat that: ''As a conservative, I think there is value to having a constraint on the majority.''

Jim McClure and Malcolm Wallop:

> It is disheartening to think that those entrusted with the Senate's history and future would consider damaging it in this manner.

Second, these conservatives realize that the Constitution, even in expansive reading, let alone strict constructionism, does not support the nuclear option.

In advocating for the nuclear option, Republicans in the Senate have abandoned conservative principles for convenient propaganda. In doing so, however, they are committing a level of intellectual hypocrisy that we have not seen since Bush v. Gore. To make sure that strict constructionist judges are placed on the bench, the nuclear advocates are reading the Constitution so broadly and elastically that it would make the most activist judge cringe. Do not take my word for it.

Mr. President, I know my colleague is getting ready to speak, and I am almost finished. I appreciate his indulgence.

Here is what George Will said:

> Some conservatives say the Constitution's framers ''knew what supermajorities they wanted''—the Constitution requires various supermajorities, for ratifying treaties, impeachment convictions, etc.; therefore, other supermajority rules are unconstitutional.

These are the words of George Will, not CHUCK SCHUMER.

> But it stands conservatism on its head to argue that what the Constitution does not mandate is not permitted.
>
> Some conservatives say there is a ''constitutional right'' to have an up-or-down vote on nominees. But in whom does this right inhere: The nominees, the President? This is a perverse contention, coming from conservatives eager to confirm judges who will stop the promiscuous discovery by courts of spurious constitutional rights.

That is George Will, not CHUCK SCHUMER.

Here is what Stephen Moore, founder of the arch conservative Club for Growth says:

> Eviscerating the filibuster would violate the spirit of the Constitution and endanger our rights as individuals against excessive governmental power.

These conservatives also understand that no party lasts forever in the majority and the nuclear option may come back to haunt Republicans. For short-term political gain, Republican Senators are willing to trash a tradition that will hurt themselves in the long run.

Former Senator Simpson recognizes this:

> [T]here isn't a question in my mind that when the Republicans go out of power and they, they're looking for protection of minority rights, they're going to be alarmed and saddened.

Finally, the conservatives also understand that once triggered, there will be no stopping the continued erosion of the filibuster. The legislative filibuster is also at great risk. Listen to former Senators McClure and Wallop:

> It is naive to think what is done to the judicial filibuster will not be done to its legislative counterpart, whether by a majority leader named Reid, or Clinton, or Kennedy.

Here is David Hoppe, former chief of staff to Senator LOTT:

> That's the problem with the nuclear option, because it will not stop there. The next step when somebody needs it will be to get rid of the filibuster on legislative issues.

In conclusion, we are here. We are at a defining moment in the world's greatest deliberative body. Now, this week, in the next few weeks, will enough of my colleagues across the aisle act with courage and conviction? Will enough of them resist the extremist entreaties of a tiny but vocal minority who only want their way 100 percent of the time, not 99, not 98, not 97? Will enough of them pay heed to the arguments made by independent conservatives of their own party, whether it is George Will or Bill Armstrong or Ken Starr or so many of the others I mentioned?

Time is running out. Time is running out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, now that time has run out, I am excited to be here to talk about the highway bill, important work of the American people that we must get done this week. I am here to stand in strong support of H.R. 3, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005.

Last year, I traveled Louisiana extensively, campaigning all around the State. I heard concerns expressed in every part of the State about the importance of making sure that we in Louisiana get our fair share of Federal highway funding. In the past, Louisiana was a donor State, which means our State's taxpayers contributed more in gas tax revenue than they got back from the Treasury in highway moneys. As one of the newest members of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I worked hard this year to ensure that we try to change this unfair state of affairs. So Louisiana's rate of return will substantially increase under the bill before us from about 90.5 cents for every dollar that we send in Louisiana taxpayer money to the Federal Government to 95 cents on the dollar. That is a huge jump. It is still not a dollar—we need to go further—but it is a dramatic improvement.

This increase will provide my State with $2.9 billion over the next 5 years, funding that is critical to ensure that work continues on one of my State's major corridors, I–49, as well as many other Louisiana highway projects.

Providing additional funding for I–49 has been a goal of mine since my days in the House of Representatives. Upon assuming my seat in the Senate this January, I have continued to fight for those additional I–49 dollars. That is why I initiated a letter in February to Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member JEFFORDS calling for them to support a significant level of funding for the corridor improvement program in the highway reauthorization bill. That letter was cosigned by five colleagues.

As a member of the committee that produced that bill, I am also pleased that we were able to agree on language that would redress a serious transportation and safety issue for my State. You see, Louisiana is the 22nd most populous State, yet it ranks third in the Nation in the number of collisions at highway-railroad crossings and fifth in the Nation in the number of railroad fatalities.

Along the 3,000 miles of tracks in Louisiana are over 6,000 rail crossings, more than any other State except Illinois. So the bill we crafted would provide $178 million for the elimination of hazards and the installation of protective devices at railroad highway crossings.

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues, in particular those on the Environment and Public Works Committee, for agreeing to the inclusion in the highway bill of three significant amendments that I offered. I thank Chairman INHOFE for his work on behalf of these amendments.

One of the amendments would ensure that emergency evacuation routes are

emphasized as a program priority under the Multistate Corridor Program. The second amendment I authored would channel additional dollars to hurricane evacuation routes under the Federal Infrastructure Performance and Maintenance Program. And the third will help local officials complete much faster, and at much lower cost locally, a highway project connecting the parishes of Houma and Thibodaux, LA. The inclusion of these amendments in the managers' amendment will greatly benefit Louisiana and other coastal States across the country that experience frequent hurricanes.

As noted in the Times Picayune and other Louisiana newspapers, the 2004 evacuation of Louisiana due to Hurricane Ivan was disturbingly slow and marked by traffic gridlock. Traffic was backed up for 26 hours in Baton Rouge and 14 hours in New Orleans, while nearly 4,500 cars per hour were crossing the Mississippi River on I–10 at the peak of evacuation. Two of my amendments will provide additional funding for evacuation routes such as I–49, La. 1, and La. 3127 during hurricanes or other emergencies. Providing Federal resources to upgrade and maintain evacuation routes throughout the State will certainly help avoid the astounding gridlock and danger that occurred during the evacuation of Hurricane Ivan.

The third amendment I offered will expand the scope of an existing Federal highway project without increasing the cost-share burden on the local community and State. Without my amendment, the areas of Houma and Thibodaux, LA, would have had to come up with as much as $5 million more money. This transportation project will establish a new north-south evacuation route that is vitally important to residents of Houma and Thibodaux and all of those areas in southeast Louisiana.

I thank, again, the full EPW Committee, the chairman, Mr. INHOFE, the ranking member, Mr. JEFFORDS, the subcommittee chairman and the subcommittee ranking member and all of the staff who have assisted on this bill, particularly Andrew Wheeler and Ruth Van Mark. I call on my colleagues to support the chairman and ranking member in their efforts to shepherd this bill through the Senate and through important conference committee negotiations.

Congress has been extending funding for Federal aid to highway programs six times. The current extension is set to expire on May 31 this year, a little over 2 weeks away. We need to pass this bill. Then we need to quickly go to conference with the House and resolve our differences with the other Chamber before that important May 31 deadline.

That is when the current extension expires and funding for Federal aid to highway programs will run out. I know that is a tall order, but all of our States' transportation needs, our Nation's transportation needs cannot wait any longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is being modest because he has had a great deal of influence on the amendments. A critical problem in Louisiana is beach erosion. He has persuaded our committee, in an articulate way, to become much more aggressive in solving that problem. We are a much better committee because of him. I thank him for his hard work on the committee.

It is my understanding the senior Senator from Massachusetts wishes to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, first, I commend my friend and colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER. I was listening to him when he mentioned some of our former colleagues, all with whom I have served. He mentioned Senator Armstrong, and he also mentioned Senator McClure, and Senator Simpson, who was a good friend. I served with him on the Judiciary Committee. He mentioned Senator Durenberger. An excellent article was written by Senator Mathias last week. He mentioned Senator Wallop, and the list goes on. They are seven or eight members of the Senate who served in recent times and have a very good sense of the institution's importance, the importance of the powers of this institution and the relationship to the executive. They have a very keen awareness of the advice and consent role and understand this is a balance that both have responsibilities to fulfill. I think very deeply that Members of the Senate who have strong views on these nominees should not be muzzled, silenced, and they should not be gagged.

The point I might have missed from my friend from New York is the restatement that 96 percent of this President's nominees have been approved. That is always something that causes constant amazement, I find, from people who call my office in Massachusetts inquiring about my position. They find out that 96 percent of the President's nominees have been approved and they wonder what this battle is all about. Then when you tell them this was not a battle the Members of the Senate were interested in, that it was as a result of the President sending back to the Senate those who have previously been rejected and indicated that they were going to add other individuals as well, such as the current general counsel of the Defense Department, Mr. Haynes, who was the architect of the whole torture and emasculation of the Geneva Conventions—these are individuals who are far outside of the mainstream of judicial thinking. I have had the chance to address many of these issues in the markups of the Judiciary Committee in recent times, particularly with regard to Mr. PRYOR, who is from the State of Alabama.

I took great pride in working with my colleague and friend from Iowa on the Americans with Disabilities Act. We spent a good deal of time negotiating that legislation. We had strong, bipartisan support at the very end. And then to read Bill Pryor's assessment of what that act said and his interpretation of it is completely antithetical to what the legislation was about, the language that was clear and explicit, and what the sense of the intent and the supporters of that legislation were about. The list goes on. So we welcome this debate.

I agree with the Senator from New York that this is a monumental decision. We are talking about changing the rules of the game in the middle of the game. Americans may not understand completely all of the parliamentary maneuvers here that are available in the Senate, but they understand when you have an agreed set of rules, you don't change them in the middle of the game, and I think they also understand that when Members have strong views and believe nominees who are going to have lifetime appointments to the Supreme Court—not 3½ years, such as this President has in the remainder of his term, but a lifetime commitment—those who have strong views ought to be able to speak to those views and have a right to be heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 674

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on another matter, I rise in strong support of Senator SCHUMER's amendment to raise the amount employers can give workers tax free for mass transit commuter costs from the current $105 a month to $200 a month.

In the face of high fuel costs and constant urban congestion, more commuters using mass transit makes increasingly good sense, and the tax benefit is an effective way to encourage it.

The current benefit of $105 a month is too low to cover most mass transit costs in major metropolitan areas, and it is counter-productive that current law provides a benefit almost twice that size for parking—$200 a month.

I have here a diagram that indicates the commuter fees for the different parts coming into Boston. Even from this distance, you can look at them. For Fitchburg, $198; $181 for Lowell; $191 for Gloucester; and the list goes on. From the South Shore, $198; from Stoughton, $149; and $198 from Worcester.

This amendment is good transportation policy and good environmental policy too. It is an energy policy that makes sense as workers see more and more of their paychecks go up in smoke at the gas pump. It is an energy policy that I hope we can all support.

In Massachusetts, the change will help nearly 200,000 commuters who purchase monthly T-passes to commute by bus, subway or commuter rail to work.

By increasing the commuter tax break to parity with the parking benefit—$200 a month—the amendment will cover the cost of every monthly T-pass sold in Massachusetts.

The highest monthly T-pass cost from Worcester, Middleborough/Lakeville or Fitchburg is $198, and would be covered in full, as would fares from Gloucester and Haverhill.

Commuters could have the full $181 cost of commuting from Lawrence or Lowell covered or the $149 cost from Brockton.

By raising the cap to $200, the amendment will also encourage more new employers to participate in the program. They will be able to give an affordable benefit of much greater value to their employees.

And as more employers come into the program, we can cut down on gridlock in Boston and other urban areas across the country.

In Boston, gridlock cost the average commuter 51 extra hours a year. Congestion nationwide costs $63 billion a year in wasted productivity and energy.

The amendment means more moms and dads will have more time to spend with their children, instead of being stuck in traffic. And more employees will get to work on time, meaning higher productivity.

We cannot afford to waste fuel like this anymore. Our dependence on foreign oil is a national crisis. The amendment will help save some of the 2.3 billion gallons of gas a year now being lost to unnecessary congestion. This amendment will mean clearer air in our cities and less wear and tear on our roads.

In so many ways, this is a smart amendment and a fair amendment, and I urge our colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to give a progress report. We are down to four or five amendments now. Many of them have been agreed to or have been withdrawn. We don't have anyone at this moment who is going to ask for a vote tonight. We had previously scheduled a vote at 5:30. We did not anticipate at that time that we would be getting the cooperation we are getting from the Members who have worked things out. So I announce on behalf of the leadership that we will not be having the vote at 5:30 tonight.

Let me make a couple of comments. I know anxieties are high concerning the so-called nuclear option, or what we call the constitutional option. I hesitate to take up time. If anybody comes to talk about the highway bill, we will stop and talk about the highway bill.

If you stop and realize what we really want, what we have been asking for is a vote. People are entitled to have a vote on the floor of this Senate. They are nominees. You may not like the nominees of the President for the circuit court positions, but certainly these people at least deserve an up-or-down vote.

It is kind of interesting to see how the minority has changed its mind from just a short period ago.

Senator BIDEN on March 19, 1997, said:

But I also respectfully suggest that everyone who is nominated ought to have a shot, to have a hearing and to have a shot to be heard on the floor and have a vote on the floor . . . It is totally appropriate for Republicans to reject every single nominee if they want to. That is within their right. But it is not, I will respectfully request, Madam President, appropriate not to have hearings on them, not to bring them to the floor and not to allow a vote . . .

Senator BOXER on May 14, 1997, said:

According to the U.S. Constitution, the President nominates, and the Senate shall provide advice and consent. It is not the role of the Senate to obstruct the process and prevent numbers of highly qualified nominees from even being given the opportunity for a vote on the Senate floor.

Senator DASCHLE on October 5, 1999, said:

I find it simply baffling that a Senator would vote against even voting on a judicial nomination . . . We have a constitutional outlet for antipathy against a judicial nominee—a vote against that nominee.

Senator DURBIN on September 28, 1998, said:

I think that responsibility requires us to act in a timely fashion on nominees sent before us. The reason I oppose cloture is I would like to see that the Senate shall also be held to the responsibility of acting in a timely fashion. If, after 150 days languishing in a committee there is no report on an individual, the name should come to the floor. If, after 150 days languishing on the Executive Calendar that name has not been called for a vote, it should be. Vote the person up or down. They are qualified or they are not.

Senator FEINSTEIN on September 16, 1999, said:

A nominee is entitled to a vote. Vote them up; vote them down . . . What this does to a [nominee's] life is, it leaves them in limbo . . . It is our job to confirm these judges. If we don't like them, we can vote against them. That is the honest thing to do. If there are things in their background, in their abilities that don't pass muster, vote no.

On October 4, 1999, she said:

Our institutional integrity requires an up-or-down vote.

And on May 19, 1997, Senator FEINSTEIN said:

Mr. President, the time has come to act on these nominations. I'm not asking for a rubber stamp; let's hold hearings on those nominees who haven't had them, and vote on all of them, up or down, yes or no.

Senator KENNEDY on January 28, 1998, said:

The Constitution is clear that only individuals acceptable to both the President and the Senate should be confirmed. The President and the Senate do not always agree. But we should resolve these disagreements by voting on these nominees—yes or no.

And on February 3, 1998:

We owe it to Americans across the country to give these nominees a vote. If our Republican colleagues don't like them, vote against them. But give them a vote.

Senator KOHL on August 21, 1999, said:

[T]here are many other deserving nominees out there. Let's not play favorites. These nominees, who have to put their lives on hold waiting for us to act, deserve an 'up or down' vote.

Senator LAUTENBERG on June 21, 1995, said:

Talking about the fairness of the system and how it is equitable for a minority to restrict the majority view, why can we not have a straight up-or-down vote on this without threats of filibuster? When it was Robert Bork or John Tower or Clarence Thomas, even though there was strong opposition, many Senators opposed them. The fact is that the votes were held here, up or down.

Senator LEAHY on June 21, 1995, said:

When President Bush nominated Clarence Thomas to the U.S. Supreme Court, I was the first member of the Senate to declare my opposition to his nomination. I did not believe that Clarence Thomas was qualified to serve on the Court. Even with strong reservations, I felt that Judge Thomas deserved an up-or-down vote.

On October 14, 1997:

I cannot recall a judicial nomination being successfully filibustered. I do recall earlier this year when the Republican Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I noted how improper it would be to filibuster a judicial nomination.

October 22, 1997:

I hope we might reach a point where we as a Senate will accept our responsibility and vote people up or vote them down. Bring the names here. If we want to vote against them, vote against them.

June 18, 1998:

If we want to vote against somebody, vote against them. I respect that. State your reasons. I respect that. But don't hold up a qualified judicial nominee . . . I have stated over and over again on this floor . . . that I would object and fight against any filibuster on a judge, whether it is somebody I opposed or supported; that I felt the Senate should do its duty. If we don't like somebody the President nominates, vote him or her down.

September 16, 1999:

I . . . do not want to see the Senate go down a path where a minority of the Senate is determining a judge's fate on votes of 41 . . . [D]uring the Republican administrations I rarely ever voted against a nomination by either President Reagan or President Bush. There were a couple I did. I also took the floor on occasion filibusters to hold them up and believe that we should have a vote up or down.

Again on September 16, 1999:

I do not want to get having to invoke cloture on judicial nominations. I think it is a bad precedent.

October 1, 1999:

Nominees deserve to be treated with dignity and dispatch, not delayed for 2 and 3 years. We are talking about people going to the Federal judiciary, a third independent branch of Government. They are entitled to dignity and respect. They are not entitled atomically for us to vote aye, but they are entitled to a vote, aye or nay.

October 3, 1999:

When we hold a nominee up by not allowing them a vote and not taking any action one way or the other, we are . . . doing a terrible disservice to the man or woman to whom we do this.

March 7, 2000:

The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court said: ''The Senate is surely

under no obligation to confirm any particular nominee, but after the necessary time for inquiry it should vote him up or vote him down.'' Which is exactly what I would like.

October 11, 2000:

I have said on the floor, although we are different parties, I have agreed with Gov. George Bush, who has said that in the Senate a nominee ought to get a [floor] vote, up or down, within 60 days.

Senator LEVIN on June 21, 1995, said:

The President is entitled to his nominee, if a majority of the Senate consent.

Senator LINCOLN at a press conference on September 14, 2000, said:

If we want people to respect their government again, then government must act respectably. It's my hope that we'll take the necessary steps to give these men and these women especially the up or down vote that they deserve.

Senator REID on March 7, 2000, said:

Once they get out of committee, let's bring them here and vote up or down on them. . . . I think anybody who has to wait 4 years deserves an up-or-down vote.

. . . If there is a Senator who believes there is a problem with any judge, whether it is the one we are going to vote on at 5 o'clock or the two we are going to vote on tomorrow, or Thursday, they have every right to come to talk at whatever length they want. But with Judge Paez, it has been 4 years. There has been ample opportunity to talk about this man. He has bipartisan support.

On June 9, 2001, in an interview on Evans, Novak, Hunt, and Shields said:

[W]e should have up or down votes in the committee and on the floor.

Senator SCHUMER on March 7, 2000, said:

The basic issue of holding up judgeships is the issue before us, not the qualifications of judges, which we can always debate. The problem is it takes so long for us to debate those qualifications. It is an example of Government not fulfilling its constitutional mandate because the President nominates, and we are charged with voting on the nominees.

. . . I also plead with my colleagues to move judges with alacrity—vote them up or down. But this delay makes a mockery of the Constitution, makes a mockery of the fact that we are here working, and makes a mockery of the lives of very sincere people who have put themselves forward to be judges and then they hang out there in limbo.

These are people who are now saying they do not want to have a vote on these nominees. We have nominees who have been waiting not for weeks or months but for years. I believe some of these Senators who before had a philosophy that everyone is entitled to a vote ought to turn around and give the current nominees a vote. I have a great deal of respect for these people, except I would like to have them express some level of consistency.

The issue has become a bit clouded and confusing. When one talks about the various polls, I suggest that one can word a question to get almost any kind of answer one wants. When it gets down to the facts, the Constitution says the President nominates and the Senate is either to confirm or not confirm. It does not say anything about a mandatory supermajority. It just says confirmed. That is a simple majority, Mr. President.

Again, I invite Members to come to the Chamber. We are going to keep the floor open. There will not be any votes tonight on the amendments. We are down to about four amendments, although they should be debated tonight if at all possible. We need to get the debates behind us so we will be prepared to vote tomorrow morning.

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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INACCURATE PRESS REPORTS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, while we are waiting for Members to come down to the Senate floor to offer their amendments, to talk about their amendments, and be prepared for votes tomorrow morning, I will share with you that we have had a lot of erroneous reports concerning what is going on in Iraq and in other sensitive areas of the world. Quite frankly, I believe the greatest disservice that has been done to our troops in Iraq has been by the press, by the press not giving an accurate accounting as to what is really happening there.

I am a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and as such I have taken on the responsibility of spending time in Iraq, Afghanistan, Africa, and different places where terrorism may come due to the squeeze in the Middle East. But as far as Iraq is concerned, I will share a couple of experiences.

One was a couple days after the January 30 election. So many people in the media were trying to say the election is not going to come off on January 30, it is not going to happen; democracy is not going prevail there; they are not going to be able to make the deadlines; they are not going to be able to handle the elections and they are not capable of doing it on their own; they do not have the security because they would have to provide all the security for the elections. Yet a few days after that, you might remember, of the three elements over there, the Sunnis were the ones—not the Shiites or the Kurds—but the Sunnis were the ones wanting to obstruct the elections—the most anti-American of all the groups. Yet the day after the election, the two primary Sunni leaders stood and said publicly that they were surprised it went the way it did. They wanted to be in on this. They wanted to participate. We know subsequent to that they have.

I remember testimonials by different people who had participated in that election. One was a lady who said she could not read the ballot because of the tears in her eyes. She couldn't see the ballot.

Another person told me through a translator that she was in there to vote, and it occurred to her at the time they were voting that this was not just the first time in 35 years of a bloody regime of Saddam Hussein, but it was the first time in 7,000 years that they had an opportunity for self-determination.

It is a huge thing happening over there. Who would ever have dreamed at any time in the last 35 years that they would actually be participating in a free election?

Now we have seen what has happened since then. Sure, the terrorists over there who do not want this to happen are out there and they are killing as many of the Iraqis as possible to try to obstruct this new freedom that is coming their way.

The last time I was there, I decided it would be a good idea to spend time in the Sunni triangle. That is where most of the hostilities are. It was the Sunnis who were the ones holding out last, the ones who were supporting Saddam Hussein. I recall going to Falluja, just a matter of a few weeks ago, and in Falluja there was a general whose name was Mahdi. He was the general, the commanding officer of the brigade. He was the brigade commander for Saddam Hussein. He hated Americans and he had the background to demonstrate how deeply that hatred went, the murders and all these things going on.

Yet that general, after we moved the Marines into Falluja and they started going door to door, and they were embedded with the Iraqis, this general was so impressed with the Marines that he made a statement. When they rotated the Marines out and said the Marines were going to have to go into a rotation, they had become so close working and fighting together that when they all got together before the Marines left, he said they all cried. There was a general looking at me saying: We cried because we didn't want the Marines to leave. He renamed the security forces of Falluja the Iraqi Marines. He named them after us.

While we were there in Tikrit, the home of Saddam Hussein, there was an explosion. It was at a place they called a police station, but it was a training area where they were training Iraqis for the security forces. It killed 10 immediately and seriously injured 30 more so they could not be trained. The families of these 40 individuals who were either killed or were severely injured offered up another member of each of their families to substitute for the one who was killed or the one who was injured. It was the type of sacrifice you would never dream possible a few years before—a few days before, really.

I remember going all over the Sunni triangle in a Blackhawk helicopter, 100 feet off the ground. That is the only safe way to get there. There are terrorists who have SAMs, surface-to-air missiles, although some pretty crude.

Many American families who have sent care packages to the troops over there—candy, cookies, these different

things—what they have done with these is repackage them and, as we were going over the Sunni triangle and looked down at these small villages, all the kids were out there and we threw them candy and things like that, and they were waving American flags and cheering. This is not the picture you get from the media.

I applaud the job our guys and gals have done over there, our troops. Of course, many have lost their lives, but people don't stop to realize how many more lives would have been lost if we had not been involved in that area, offering that kind of freedom.

Now we see a lot of terrorists are going into other areas. One of the good things I would announce that is going on right now is down in Africa we are now in the process of assisting Africans in forming five African brigades, and these African brigades, we will put them in a position to help them train themselves so when something like this erupts down there it will not be the Americans who have to do it.

I just wanted to take this time to applaud our troops for the great job they are doing. I really believe, as great a disservice as the press has provided, that the people of America know better. They are showing they do know better.

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. INHOFE. 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. 761 TO AMENDMENT NO. 605

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside for the consideration of the managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 761.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of amendments.'')

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 761) was agreed to.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE DONALD YOUNG

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, it is with tremendous sadness that I rise today to commemorate the life and work of Detective Donald ''Donnie'' Young of the Denver Police Department.

In the early morning hours of Sunday, May 8, Detective Young tragically lost his life while working off-duty as a security guard at a private party in Denver. Today, I join the people of Denver and my home State of Colorado in mourning the loss of a dedicated public servant, and a devoted husband and father.

Detective Young is remembered by his family, friends, and colleagues as a man who was always willing to help others in need, whether by hopping out of his truck on a broken foot to help a stranded driver out of a snowdrift, lightening the mood with his unique sense of humor, or working overtime to help protect women from the threat of domestic violence, Donnie never failed to embody the selflessness and compassion so common among his 850,000 brothers and sisters serving as law enforcement officers in this country today.

It will come as no surprise to those men and women and anyone familiar with their line of work that Donnie was also exceedingly modest; it is consequently left to the rest of us to give the many awards and honors he received over the course of his 12-year career in law enforcement the attention they deserve. In recognition of the bravery and dedication he displayed on countless occasions, Detective Young received three of the Denver Police Department's four most prestigious awards, including the medal of honor for his role in the 1994 rescue of two kidnapping victims.

Yesterday, more than 20,000 people gathered in our Nation's capital to formally honor and remember Detective Young and other law enforcement officers recently injured or slain in the line of duty. This day was marked in part by a Senate resolution I had the privilege of cosponsoring that recognizes May 15, 2005, as Peace Officers Memorial Day, in honor of Federal, State, and local officers killed or disabled while working to protect the public. Having served as Attorney General for the State of Colorado, I know firsthand the sacrifices our men and women in law enforcement make on a daily basis, and I am deeply proud to have had the honor of serving in the same family as Detective Young and others like him.

Today, I join my former brothers and sisters in the law enforcement community—in Colorado and across the Nation—in grieving the loss of a passionate and capable public servant, Detective Donald ''Donnie'' Young.

I thank the Chair. 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. INHOFE. 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. 652

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to the Dorgan amendment, No. 652.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 636 AND 674 WITHDRAWN

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Ensign amendment No. 636 and the Schumer amendment No. 674 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to report that the Senate transportation bill not only continues but also greatly expands a program I authored in the TEA–21 law to promote smart growth initiatives. When TEA–21 became law in 1998, this pilot program was the first Federal program ever created to provide incentives to help States and local governments pursue smart growth policies.

The good news is that the Senate transportation bill recognizes the value of this groundbreaking program by providing a substantial funding increase.

The original smart growth pilot program I authored, the Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program, TCSP, provided $25 million per year to investigate and address the relationships between transportation projects, communities and the environment. Under the SAFETEA bill now before the Senate, funding for this program would nearly double to about $47 million per year.

The not so good news is that 7 years after Congress enacted the TCSP program it remains the only Federal program to provide incentives for smart growth. In the last 7 years, the problems of urban sprawl have only gotten worse. Clearly more needs to be done.

Sprawl development not only hurts our citizens where they live and breathe, it also hits them in their wallets. A number of studies have come out that show the costs of sprawling growth are significantly higher than more compact, managed growth patterns. These studies show that taxpayers can save billions of dollars in public facility construction and operation and maintenance costs by opting for growth management.

Because of the major impacts federally funded transportation projects can have, there is an appropriate role for the Federal Government in ensuring these projects and the development they spawn are both economically and environmentally sound.

That role should not be to embroil the Federal Government in land use decisions that have historically been State and local issues. We do not want Federal zoning.

Instead, the proper role for the Federal Government is to create incentives to encourage and build on the State and local efforts to address transportation and growth that are already underway. I am very pleased that the Senate SAFETEA bill extends and expands the TCSP program to help local communities grow in environmentally sustainable ways by creating incentives for smart growth management.

The additional funding for TCSP in the Senate transportation bill is a good start. But if we are going to improve both our Nation's infrastructure and our quality of life, we need to do more at the Federal level to provide incentives to support smart growth policies.

My home State of Oregon leads the Nation in developing innovative approaches to manage our growth and to tie transportation policies in to growth management. Our statewide land conservation and development program requires each municipality to establish an urban growth boundary to define both the areas where growth and development should occur and those areas that should be protected from development. This system keeps agricultural and forest lands in productive use and preserves ''green corridors'' for hiking, biking and other recreational uses that are located in or close to urban areas. Our transportation planning and construction efforts reinforce these policies by not only avoiding developing in environmentally sensitive areas but also by helping make the areas where we want development to occur more accessible.

Oregon recognizes that it is not enough to tell people where they can not build. For our system to work, we have to make it easier to develop the areas where we want growth to occur. And we do not just give lip service to this principle. We actually put our money where our mouth is to make sure the development we want occurs.

These policies make the State of Oregon, Metro, the city of Portland, and other localities in our State ideal candidates to apply for funding under the Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program.

I greatly appreciate the support of Chairman INHOFE, Chairman BOND and Senators JEFFORDS and BAUCUS in working with me to increase funding substantially for this important program in the bill. Thanks to their efforts the bill now before the Senate will enable State and local smart growth policies to merge more smoothly with our transportation policies.

As Congress considers other Federal infrastructure programs, I will be looking for ways to build on the success of TCSP. The TCSP model can also be adapted for water, sewer and other federally funded infrastructure to help save taxpayers money and support State and local governments smart growth efforts. By following that approach, Congress can provide our citizens with both better infrastructure and better quality of life.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF COL. KENT MURPHY

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the Senate's attention the retirement of a distinguished member of our military, Col. Kent Murphy, who is retiring this year after a distinguished 25-year career in the Air Force.

Colonel Murphy started his career at the U.S. Air Force Academy, graduating in 1980. From there, he went on to the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, USUHS, and became a doctor in the Air Force Medical Corps. Dr. Murphy served in varying assignments in the United States and overseas while in the Air Force. He has held surgical positions ranging from a F–16 flight surgeon to a staff surgeon in the Air Force Academy Hospital's Department of Otolaryngology, where he later became department head. He has been an adjunct assistant professor at USUHS and the senior otolaryngology malpractice consultant for the Office of the Air Force Surgeon General. Certainly, such a career serving his country as a doctor in the Air Force would be laudable in its own right, but Colonel Murphy went far beyond that.

In 1997, Colonel Murphy founded the Center of Excellence for Medical Multimedia at the U.S. Air Force Academy. There, Colonel Murphy pioneered the concept of information therapy throughout the Air Force Medical Service. He developed high-tech programs, using the Internet, video and CD/DVD ROM, that are the cornerstone of Air Force efforts to educate service members, dependents and retirees about important medical conditions such as pregnancy, hypertension and diabetes. Additionally, he served as the chairman of the Prorenata Health Media Foundation to help create access to these innovative programs for underserved populations across the Nation. In August of 2003, he was awarded the Frank Brown Berry Prize by US Medicine magazine—the highest honor in Federal Healthcare. Colonel Murphy is the only Air Force physician to have won this prestigious honor and the youngest recipient to date.

I am proud to call Colonel Murphy a friend and thank him today for his service to the Air Force and our country. I would be remiss however if I did not also thank his loyal wife Cindy. As anyone who has been around the military will attest, a good military spouse is vital to the success of the servicemember. As Colonel and Mrs. Murphy head out now into civilian practice, I know that they will continue to make lasting contributions to all Americans.•

THE RECOGNITION OF DETECTIVE DONALD R. ''DONNIE'' YOUNG

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise to honor all law enforcement officers who protect our families and communities against crime during National Police Week 2005. Also, I ask to pay special tribute to Detective Donald R. Young of Denver, CO, and others officers like him who have given their lives in service.

Communities readily rely on law enforcement officers to answer the call in times of great need. These men and women serve to enforce not only our laws, but to defend the weakest and most vulnerable among us. I think it is suitable that we salute and recognize these dedicated heroes with a National Police Week.

Detective Donald R. ''Donnie'' Young was shot and killed in Denver, CO, on May 8, 2005. He was working off duty at the time, providing security detail at a baptismal event. Detective Young was a 12-year veteran of the Denver Police Department. He leaves behind a wife and two young daughters.

Along with Detective Donald R. Young, I ask that we pay homage to all our fallen heroes. Law enforcement officers knowingly put themselves in harms way every day. It is important to take this time to remember their service. We must acknowledge their efforts as some of the bravest among us and share our gratitude for their sacrifice with their families.

I rise to humbly pay my respect to law enforcement officers everywhere and honor the legacy that fallen officers leave behind.•

RECOGNIZING KAHUKU HIGH SCHOOL ''WE THE PEOPLE'' TEAM

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure and pride to announce that students from Kahuku High School, on the Island of Oahu, honorably represented Hawaii at the national finals of ''We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution.'' These Hawaii students joined more than 1,200

students from across the country to visit Washington, DC, and take part in national competition during the first week of May. These bright students showcased their exemplary knowledge of the U.S. Consitution, and did my State proud against competition from other States. I applaud the achievement of the Kahuku students for placing in the Top 10 of National Finalists out of the 51 schools participating.

The ''We the People'' program is administered by the Center for Civic Education and is an extensive educational program developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and Bill of Rights. The 3-day competition is modeled after hearings in the U.S. Congress and provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge before a panel of adult judges while they evaluate, take, and defend positions on relevant historical and contemporary issues. Their testimony is followed by questions designed to probe the students' depth of understanding and ability to apply their constitutional knowledge.

I recognize the following 23 Kahuku students who proudly represented the State of Hawaii: Genevieve Allen, Yesenia Arevalo, Amanda Baize, Bonnie Cameron, Meri Ching, Dannah Christensen, Krystle Corpuz, Oliver Howells, Lorna Kekua, Jokke Kokkonen, Jacquelyn Lautaha, William Law, Catalina Markowitz, Ajri McArthur, Sara Mirels, Brad Rasmussen, Ashley Rillamas, Lizette Sauque, Noelle Spring, Shirly Tagayuna, Joseph Trisolini, and Morgan Wright. I especially thank their teacher, Ms. Sandra Cashman, for once again seizing this opportunity to educate students about the significance of the American institutions of constitutional democracy. The mere fact that Kahuku students competed here for 11 of the last 12 ''We the People'' competitions is a testament to Ms. Cashman's skills as a civics education teacher.

As a former Kahuku High School teacher, I take pride in these students who rose to the challenges presented in this competition, and gave impressive performances. I know that it is because of school and parental support, dedication, and commitment that these students were empowered and encouraged to excel in this arena. These students have no doubt made everyone in their school, their families, and their friends proud of what they achieved. We should all recognize that they are learning and advocating the fundamental ideas that identify us as a people and bind us together as a nation. The zeal and diligence these students showed in their understanding of Government ought to serve as a symbol for all citizens to pursue.●

EXCELLENCE IN NURSING

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I celebrate the hard work and dedication of all nurses that serve the veterans of our great Nation. In particular, I congratulate the recipients of the Secretary's Award for Excellence in Nursing and Advancement of Nursing Programs. These recipients were nominated for dedication to their profession and for outstanding service to our veterans and to the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA. The honor bestowed on these individuals is greatly deserved.

The 2005 Nursing Award Recipients for Excellence in Nursing include: Marthe Moseley, Kim Pyatt, Ferris Jones, and John Cheng. The recipients of the 2005 Award for the Advancement of Nursing Programs are Timothy B. Williams and Rebecca Newson Williams. All these individuals have demonstrated high level of achievement and dedication through their service with VA.

Marthe Moseley, PhD, RN, CCRN, CCNS, is an award recipient from the South Texas Veterans Health Care System. Dr. Moseley coordinates and evaluates integrated programs that demonstrate clinical excellence in the field of orientation, competency development and implementation. She has been a key consultant to entities such as the National Dialysis Conference; Brook Army Medical Center; and Wilford Hall Medical Center, Air Force. Dr. Moseley has been a leader in improving the quality and effectiveness of care for critically ill patients.

Kim Pyatt, RN, BSN, of the Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Center, has been an outstanding and positive nurse for the past 5 years. She served as a staff nurse and a night charge nurse in the Nursing Home Care Unit, NHCU, before being selected as the Geriatrics and Extended Care Wound coordinator in 2002. Ms. Pyatt has a great passion for veterans and for providing excellent nursing care in the NHCU.

Ferris Jones, LPN, works in the Puget Sound Health Care System with the Mental Health Service in the Homeless Care Line, Domiciliary Care Program, and also through a residential program that treats veterans for post traumatic sress disorder. His strong medical background, training in the U.S. Army, and experience in mental health have worked together to set a standard of excellence. He has contributed to quality of care through evaluations of procedures for the Domiciliary Care Program and the development of an educational orientation video for those newly admitted to the program.

John Cheng, from the Northport VA Medical Center, has been a nursing assistant in Extended Care since 1998. Mr. Cheng as continued to provide top quality, as well as encouragement, to his veteran patients. Mr. Cheng recently spent a great deal of time with a young traumatic brain injury patient who had been admitted to the NCHU. During this time, Mr. Cheng demonstrated compassion and selfless dedication to treating patients. He did the little things that are necessary during a time of extended treatment, such as developing a relationship with this young patient. Mr. Cheng is also dedicated to professional growth. He is the only employee to graduate from the VA-sponsored Licensed Practical Nurse, LPN, program and is now working on achieving his registered nurse degree.

Timothy B. Williams is the director of the VA Puget Sound Health Care System. Mr. Williams has worked closely with nursing and physician leadership to implement innovative strategies to optimally deliver patient care, in spite of limited resources. He has continuously sought opportunities to ensure nurse support and to encourage professional development of nursing at all levels. Mr. Williams has also been an effective supporter of VA efforts to recruit and retain nursing staff.

Rebecca Newsom Williams, RN, MPH, is the associate director for Patient/Nursing Services for the VA Eastern Colorado Health Care System. In her role, Ms. Williams directs the integration of all nursing related activities throughout the VA Eastern Colorado Health Care System, in collaboration with the executive leadership team. Ms. Williams has demonstrated excellence in her leadership by recognizing the need for combined research and clinical practices.

As you can see, these phenomenal nurses deserve to be applauded for their accomplishments. Through their commitment and compassion to our Nation's heroes, they themselves also become heroes to our veterans.

As ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I again congratulate these distinguished award recipients. They demonstrate the need and importance of excellence at every level of care giving, for every patient. In this time of critical need for nurses, it is imperative that we thank these nurses who have chosen to serve in the VA health care system for their diligence and dedication.●

HIGH TECHNOLOGY ENTREPRENEURSHIP HONORED

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, Idaho's small businesses make up over 95 percent of total businesses in the State. New companies launch their products and services every day. These businesses are the lifeblood of Idaho's economy and their existence indicates the overwhelming entrepreneurship that abides in our communities large and small. A unique public-private partnership between the Idaho National Lab, Boise State University, and the Idaho Department of Commerce and Labor is helping these vital organs of Idaho's economy grow and function to their best potential. The Small Business Administration recently recognized this effort, giving Idaho TechConnect a national ''Best Practices'' award at an economic development conference here in Washington.

Idaho TechConnect has been instrumental in providing small high tech business entrepreneurs with development assistance, and facilities and services to assess the progress and direction of their business expansion. The partnerships with industry and higher education provide these ventures with inspiration, innovation, outside experience and consultation from those in academia as well as the established and thriving high tech industry in Idaho.

Sharing resources, whether intellectual or tangible, provides outcomes that are productive and long lasting. The people and organizations involved with Idaho TechConnect are to be commended on their commitment to our State's economy and by extension, communities and families. This tremendous honor by SBA is most certainly well deserved.●

LARAMIE HIGH SCHOOL AND THE CAPITOL HILL CHALLENGE

● Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the efforts of Natasha Olsonawski, a teacher at Laramie High School in Laramie, WY, along with Traci Gardner and Cassandra Shotkoski, both Laramie High School seniors graduating this month. All three participated in the Capitol Hill Challenge, a nationwide stock market game to test participants' knowledge of our financial markets and ability to save and invest wisely. I am proud to say that the team from Laramie High School finished seventh in this national competition, and first among Western states.

Under the direction of Mrs. Olsonawski, Traci and Cassandra studied financial statements and newspaper articles to create a winning investment strategy. More importantly, they gained valuable experience about personal finance that will be useful throughout their lives. As an accountant, I understand the importance of knowing how to balance a checkbook, establish a good credit record, and achieve a secure financial future. It is encouraging to know that our nation's young people are learning these skills too, and using them in their daily lives.

I congratulate the team from Laramie for their hard work. I also wish Traci and Cassandra good luck in their future endeavors.●

IN RECOGNITION OF SOUTH LAUREL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

● Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today I honor the Laurel High School's Boys Basketball Team for winning the Kentucky High School Athletic Association State Championship on March 19, 2005. As you may know, winning a State high school championship is no small feat. A great number of teams have to be defeated before any team even gets into the playoff. Once in the playoff that team is able to prove decisively whether or not they are the champions.

I am proud to say that South Laurel High School's Boys Basketball Team proved themselves the champions. This accomplishment took hard work, focus, patience, and team spirit. It is important that all our young people learn these qualities. And I would like to point out that in winning the State championship, they have not only attained a trophy, but more importantly, they have developed characteristics that will always be of help to them later on.

Winning a State championship is a great athletic achievement. I want the boys of this team to be proud of themselves, as I am proud of them. They have done well. I extend my heartfelt congratulations to the Boys Basketball Team of South Laurel High School, and I encourage them to keep up the good work.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and two treaties which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Co-Chairman, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. WOLF of Virginia, Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama.

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–2142. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notification of Registered Vessels of Their Assignments for the A Season Atka Mackerel Fishery in Harvest Limit Area (HLA) 542 and/or 543 of the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (BSAI)'' received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2143. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of Directed Fishing for Atka Mackerel with Gears Other than Jig in the Eastern Aleutian District (Area 541) and the Bering Sea Subarea of the BSAI Management Area and Announcement of the Opening and Closure Dates of the First and Second Directed Fisheries Within the Harvest Limit Area in Statistical Areas 542 and 543'' received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2144. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of Commercial Run-Around Gillnet Fishery for Gulf Group King Mackerel in the Southern Florida West Coast Subzone'' received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2145. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments; Corrections'' received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2146. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closing Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2147. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibiting Directed Fishing for Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processor Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2148. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reallocation of Pacific Cod from Vessels Using Jig Gear to Catcher Vessels Less than 60 Feet (18.3 meters) Length Overall Using Pot or Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2149. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, received on May 4, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2150. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, received on May 4, 2005; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2151. A communication from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''STB Ex Parte No. 542 (Sub-No. 12) Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services—2005 Update'' (STB Ex Parte No. 542 (Sub-No. 12)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2152. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revised Contact Information, Nomenclature Change and Correction of Citation Error'' (RIN0694–AD48) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2153. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Expansion of the Country Scope of the License Requirements that Apply to Chemical/Biological (CB) Equipment and Related Technology; Amendments to CB-Related End-User/End-Use and U.S. Person Controls'' (RIN0694–AD37) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2154. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notice of Federal Trade Commission Publication Incorporating Model Forms and Procedures for Identity Theft Victims'' (RIN3084–AA94) received on May 4, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2155. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules Implementing the CAN–SPAM Act of 2003'' (RIN3084–AA96) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2156. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 305—Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act ('Appliance Labeling Rule') (Clothes Washer Ranges)'' (RIN3084–AA74) received on May 4, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2157. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Washington, KS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (2005–0096)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2158. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Harper, KS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (2005–0095)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2159. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Harrisburg, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (2005–0098)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2160. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Harrisburg, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (2005–0097)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2161. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Class E Airspace; Burns, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (2005–0094)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2162. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Class E Airspace; Blanding, UT'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (2005–0093)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2163. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 747–200F and 200C Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (2005–0206)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2164. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (2005–0205)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2165. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments (14); Amdt. No. 454'' ((RIN2120–AA63) (2005–0003)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2166. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (83); Amdt. No. 3180'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (2005–0012)) received on May 3, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2167. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Elizabeth River-Eastern Branch, Norfolk, VA [CGD05–04–209]'' (RIN1625–AA09) received on May 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2168. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Elizabeth River, Eastern Branch, Virginia [CGD05–05–031]'' (RIN1625–AA09) received on May 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2169. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation for Marine Events; Severn River, College Creek, Weems Creek and Carr Creek, Annapolis, MD [CGD05-05–023]'' (RIN1625–AA08) received on May 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2170. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; National Maritime Week Tugboat Races, Seattle, WA [CGD13–05–004]'' (RIN1625–AA08) received on May 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2171. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Chicago, IL [CGD09–05–009]'' (RIN1625–AA00) received on May 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2172. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zones (including 4 regulations): [COTP Mobile–05–007], [COTP Mobile–04–057], [COPT San Juan–05–002], [CGD13–05–013]'' (RIN1625–AA87) received on May 8, 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2173. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Development Fund for Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2174. A communication from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2175. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 2004; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2176. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pennsylvania Regulatory Program'' (PA–124–FOR) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2177. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in the anti-narcotics campaign in Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2178. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract in the amount of $100,000,000 or more to New Zealand, Israel, and Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2179. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's report relative to corrosion prevention control and mitigation efforts and planned improvements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2180. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting, the report of proposed legislation relative to the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2181. A communication from the Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an A–76 competition of the Marine Corps accounting function; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2182. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting, the report of a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2183. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Financial Markets, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft bill relative to the U.S. Agriculture Department (USDA) Cushion of Credit Payments Program received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2184. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Dimethyl Ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 7711–4) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2185. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pinene Polymers; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 7710–3) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2186. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Red Cabbage Colot; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 7711–7) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2187. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacturing'' ((RIN2060–AM10) (FRL No. 7911–6)) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2188. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Iron and Steal Foundries'' ((RIN2060–AM85) (FRL No. 7911–8)) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2189. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Miscellaneous Coating Manufacturing'' ((RIN2060–AM72) (FRL No. 7911–1)) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2190. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Pharmaceuticals Production'' ((RIN2060–AM52) (FRL No. 7911–3)) received on May 11, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

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 (Rept. No. 109–68).

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. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1036. A bill to provide assistance for rural school districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 1037. A bill to require disclosure of financial relationships between brokers and mutual fund companies, and of certain brokerage commissions paid by mutual fund companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1038. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to enhance the ability to produce fruits and vegetables on covered commodity base acres; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of depreciation of refinery property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1040. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide for enhanced disclosure under an open end credit plan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1041. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and Maria Del Refugio Plascencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 142. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Trade Representative should bring a case before the World Trade Organization regarding the violations of intellectual property rights by the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 143. A resolution to authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to appear in legal proceedings in the name of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in connection with its investigation into the United Nations' ''Oil-For-Food'' Programme; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KERRY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DODD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PRYOR, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. AKAKA):

S. Con. Res. 33. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the policy of the United States at the 57th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 32

At the request of Mr. DAYTON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to enhance the benefits and protections for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are called or ordered to extend active duty, and for other purposes.

S. 117

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 117, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend loan forgiveness for certain loans to Head Start teachers.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for premiums on mortgage insurance.

S. 304

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 304, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain interstate conduct relating to exotic animals.

S. 337

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) 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. 365

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 365, a bill to amend the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic and foreign centers and programs for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the expensing of environmental remediation costs.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to protect members of the Armed Forces from unscrupulous practices regarding sales of insurance, financial, and investment products.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) 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. 515

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 515, a bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to increase the maximum Federal share of the costs of State programs under the National Guard Youth Challenge Program, and for other purposes.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to provide for increased planning and funding for health promotion programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor 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. 635

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the benefits under the medicare program for beneficiaries with kidney disease, and for other purposes.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) 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. 711

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance public and health professional awareness and understanding of lupus and to strengthen the Nation's research efforts to identify the causes and cure of lupus.

S. 770

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 770, a bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to reauthorize and improve that Act.

S. 787

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 787, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize the exclusion from gross income of parking and transportation fringe benefits and to provide for a common cost-of-living adjustment, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 843, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to combat autism through research, screening, intervention and education.

S. 859

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 859, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an income tax credit for the provision of homeownership and community development, and for other purposes.

S. 894

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 894 , a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 935

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 935, a bill to regulate .50 caliber sniper weapons designed for the taking of human life and the destruction of materiel, including armored vehicles and components of the Nation's critical infrastructure.

S. 956

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 956, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide assured punishment for violent crimes against children, and for other purposes.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 962, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued to finance certain energy projects, and for other purposes.

S. 991

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 991, a bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to limit the availability of benefits under an employer's nonqualified deferred compensation plans in the event that any of the employer's defined benefit pension plans are subjected to a distress or PBGC termination in connection with bankruptcy reorganization or a conversion to a cash balance plan, to provide appropriate funding restrictions in connection with the maintenance of nonqualified deferred compensation plans, and to provide for appropriate disclosure with respect to nonqualified deferred compensation plans.

S. 1013

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1013, a bill to improve the allocation of grants through the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 1018

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to provide that transit pass transportation fringe benefits be made available to all qualified Federal employees in the National Capital Region; to allow passenger carriers which are owned or leased by the Government to be used to transport Government employees between their place of employment and mass transit facilities, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, supra.

S.J. RES. 18

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 18, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the

Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr . LUGAR), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) , the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 18, supra.

S. CON. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 19, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the importance of life insurance and recognizing and supporting National Life Insurance Awareness Month.

S. RES. 140

At the request of Mr. MARTINEZ, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 140, a resolution expressing support for the historic meeting in Havana of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba on May 20, 2005, as well as to all those courageous individuals who continue to advance liberty and democracy for the Cuban people.

AMENDMENT NO. 648

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 648 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3, a bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 652

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 652 proposed to H.R. 3, a bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 654

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 654 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3, a bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 1037. A bill to require disclosure of financial relationships between brokers and mutual fund companies, and of certain brokerage commissions paid by mutual fund companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005. Mutual funds are vital investment vehicles for middle-income Americans that offer diversification and professional money management. Mutual funds are what average investors rely on for retirement, savings for children's college education, or other financial goals and dreams.

I was outraged by the widespread abuses in the industry. Ordinary investors were being harmed due to the greed of brokers, mutual fund companies, and institutional and large investors. That is why I introduced the Mutual Fund Transparency Act in November 2003 with my colleagues Senator Fitzgerald and Senator LIEBERMAN.

I want to thank the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, William Donaldson, for his courageous leadership. Chairman Donaldson has demonstrated a commitment to bring about reforms that better protect investors. I applaud the SEC's enforcement and regulatory efforts in addressing weaknesses and abuses in the mutual fund industry.

The SEC has adopted several reforms that mirror provisions found in my original Mutual Fund Transparency Act. In July 2004, the SEC adopted reforms requiring mutual funds, with certain exemptive rules, to have an independent chairman and ensure that 75 percent of their board members are independent.

Although the SEC has undertaken a number of impressive reforms, I have chosen to reintroduce a modified version of my original bill to further strengthen the independence of boards, make investors more aware of the true costs of their mutual funds, and prevent several key reforms from being rolled back. It is also important to legislatively address areas where the SEC needs additional statutory authority. Legislation is needed to ensure that the increased independence rule applied universally among mutual funds.

My bill includes a number of provisions intended to strengthen mutual fund boards. It will require that mutual fund boards have independent chairmen and that 75 percent of their directors be independent. My bill strengthens the definition of who is considered an independent director and requires independent directors to be approved by shareholders. These steps are necessary to strengthen the ability of mutual fund boards to detect and prevent abuses of investor trust.

My bill will also increase the transparency of the complex financial relationships between brokers and mutual funds in ways that are both meaningful and easy to understand for investors. Shelf-space payments and revenue-sharing agreements between mutual fund companies and brokers present conflicts of interest that must be addressed. Brokers have conflicts of interest, some of which are unavoidable, but these need to be disclosed to investors. Without such disclosure, investors cannot make informed financial decisions. Investors may believe that brokers are recommending funds based on the expectation for solid returns or low volatility, when the broker's recommendation may be influenced by hidden payments. This legislation will require brokers to disclose in writing the amount of compensation the broker will receive due to the transaction, instead of simply providing a prospectus. Currently, the prospectus fails to include the detailed relevant information that investors need to make informed decisions.

The SEC has requested comments on a proposal to require a confirmation notice, as well as increased point-of-sale disclosures, to provide investors with more information about broker conflicts in mutual fund transactions. The SEC is reviewing comments on its proposal, and studying other possibilities. I have included a point-of-sale disclosure requirement in my legislation that was absent in the prior bill. In my bill, investors would have to be provided with the amount of differential payments and average fees for comparable transactions. My legislation also requires that confirmation notices be provided for mutual fund transactions, which will include how their broker was compensated.

To further increase the transparency of the actual costs of the fund, brokerage commissions must be counted as an expense in filings with the SEC and included in the calculation of the expense ratio. Consumers often compare the expense ratios of funds when making investment decisions. However, the expense ratios fail to take into account the cost of commissions in the purchase and sale of securities. Therefore, investors are not provided with a complete and accurate idea of the expenses involved with owning that fund. Currently, brokerage commissions are disclosed to the SEC, but not to individual investors. Right now, brokerage commissions are only disclosed to the investor upon request. My bill puts teeth into brokerage commission disclosure provisions and ensures that commissions will be included in a document that investors have access to and can utilize.

The inclusion of brokerage commissions in the expense ratio creates a powerful incentive to reduce the use of soft dollars. Soft dollars can be used to lower expenses, since most purchases using soft dollars do not count as expenses and are not calculated into the expense ratio. There have been calls for the prohibition of soft dollars. This is a recommendation that needs to be further examined. My bill provides an alternative, which is an incentive for funds to limit the use of soft dollars by identifying them as expenses. If commissions are disclosed in this manner,

the use of soft dollars will be reflected in the higher commission fees and overall expenses. This makes it easier for investors to see the true cost of the fund and compare the expense ratios of funds.

Some may argue that this approach gives an incomplete picture and fails to account for spreads, market impact, and opportunity costs. However, the SEC has the authority to address the issue further if it can determine an effective way to quantify these additional factors. My bill does not impose additional reporting requirements that would be burdensome to brokers. It merely uses what is already reported and presents this information in a manner meaningful to investors.

Another important provision in my bill requires the SEC to conduct a study to assess financial literacy among mutual fund investors. This study is necessary because any additional disclosure requirements for mutual funds will not truly work unless investors are given the tools they need to make smart investment decisions.

Mr. President, my legislation will ensure that mutual fund boards are independent and that investors are provided with more relevant and meaningful disclosures from which they can make better informed choices. I look forward to continue working with my colleagues and the SEC to better protect investors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1037

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 ''Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BROKERS AND MUTUAL FUND COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) CONFIRMATION OF TRANSACTIONS FOR MUTUAL FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each broker shall disclose in writing to customers that purchase the shares of an open-end company registered under section 8 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–8)—

''(i) the amount of any compensation received or to be received by the broker in connection with such transaction from any sources; and

''(ii) such other information as the Commission determines appropriate.

''(B) REVENUE SHARING.—The term 'compensation' under subparagraph (A) shall include any direct or indirect payment made by an investment adviser (or any affiliate of an investment adviser) to a broker or dealer for the purpose of promoting the sales of securities of an open-end company.

''(C) TIMING OF DISCLOSURE.—The disclosure required under subparagraph (A) shall be made to a customer not later than as of the date of the completion of the transaction.

''(D) LIMITATION.—The disclosures required under subparagraph (A) may not be made exclusively in—

''(i) a registration statement or prospectus of an open-end company; or

''(ii) any other filing of an open-end company with the Commission.

''(E) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall promulgate such final rules as are necessary to carry out this paragraph not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005.

''(ii) FORM OF DISCLOSURE.—Disclosures under this paragraph shall be in such form as the Commission, by rule, shall require.

''(F) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'open-end company' has the same meaning as in section 5 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–5).''.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF BROKERAGE COMMISSIONS.—Section 30 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–29) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) DISCLOSURE OF BROKERAGE COMMISSIONS.—The Commission, by rule, shall require that brokerage commissions as an aggregate dollar amount and percentage of assets paid by an open-end company be included in any disclosure of the amount of fees and expenses that may be payable by the holder of the securities of such company for purposes of—

''(1) the registration statement of that open-end company; and

''(2) any other filing of that open-end company with the Commission, including the calculation of expense ratios.''.

SEC. 3. MUTUAL FUND GOVERNANCE.

(a) INDEPENDENT FUND BOARDS.—Section 10(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–10(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''shall have'' and inserting the following: ''shall—

''(1) have'';

(2) by striking ''60 per centum'' and inserting ''25 percent'';

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) have as chairman of its board of directors an interested person of such registered company; or

''(3) have as a member of its board of directors any person that is an interested person of such registered investment company—

''(A) who has served without being approved or elected by the shareholders of such registered investment company at least once every 5 years; and

''(B) unless such director has been found, on an annual basis, by a majority of the directors who are not interested persons, after reasonable inquiry by such directors, not to have any material business or familial relationship with the registered investment company, a significant service provider to the company, or any entity controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such service provider, that is likely to impair the independence of the director.''.

(b) ACTION BY INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS.—Section 10 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–10) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ACTION BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—No action taken by the board of directors of a registered investment company may require the vote of a director who is an interested person of such registered investment company.

''(j) INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the board of directors of a registered investment company who are not interested persons of such registered investment company shall establish a committee comprised solely of such members, which committee shall be responsible for—

''(A) selecting persons to be nominated for election to the board of directors; and

''(B) adopting qualification standards for the nomination of directors.

''(2) DISCLOSURE.—The standards developed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be disclosed in the registration statement of the registered investment company.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF INTERESTED PERSON.—Section 2(a)(19) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–2) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking ''two'' and inserting ''5''; and

(B) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

''(vii) any natural person who has served as an officer or director, or as an employee within the preceding 10 fiscal years, of an investment adviser or principal underwriter to such registered investment company, or of any entity controlling, controlled by, or under common control with such investment adviser or principal underwriter;

''(viii) any natural person who has served as an officer or director, or as an employee within the preceding 10 fiscal years, of any entity that has within the preceding 5 fiscal years acted as a significant service provider to such registered investment company, or of any entity controlling, controlled by, or under the common control with such service provider;

''(ix) any natural person who is a member of a class of persons that the Commission, by rule or regulation, determines is unlikely to exercise an appropriate degree of independence as a result of—

''(I) a material business relationship with the investment company or an affiliated person of such investment company;

''(II) a close familial relationship with any natural person who is an affiliated person of such investment company; or

''(III) any other reason determined by the Commission.'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking ''two'' and inserting ''5''; and

(B) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

''(vii) any natural person who is a member of a class of persons that the Commission, by rule or regulation, determines is unlikely to exercise an appropriate degree of independence as a result of—

''(I) a material business relationship with such investment adviser or principal underwriter or affiliated person of such investment adviser or principal underwriter;

''(II) a close familial relationship with any natural person who is an affiliated person of such investment adviser or principal underwriter; or

''(III) any other reason as determined by the Commission:''.

(d) DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANT SERVICE PROVIDER.—Section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–2(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(53) SIGNIFICANT SERVICE PROVIDER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue final rules defining the term 'significant service provider'.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The definition developed under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, the investment adviser and principal underwriter of a registered investment company for purposes of paragraph (19).''.

SEC. 4. FINANCIAL LITERACY AMONG MUTUAL FUND INVESTORS STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall conduct a study to identify—

(1) the existing level of financial literacy among investors that purchase shares of open-end companies, as that term is defined under section 5 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, that are registered under section 8 of that Act;

(2) the most useful and understandable relevant information that investors need to make sound financial decisions prior to purchasing such shares;

(3) methods to increase the transparency of expenses and potential conflicts of interest in transactions involving the shares of open-end companies;

(4) the existing private and public efforts to educate investors; and

(5) a strategy to increase the financial literacy of investors that results in a positive change in investor behavior.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall submit a report on the study required under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5. STUDY REGARDING MUTUAL FUND ADVERTISING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on mutual fund advertising to identify—

(1) existing and proposed regulatory requirements for open-end investment company advertisements;

(2) current marketing practices for the sale of open-end investment company shares, including the use of unsustainable past performance data, funds that have merged, and incubator funds;

(3) the impact of such advertising on consumers;

(4) recommendations to improve investor protections in mutual fund advertising and additional information necessary to ensure that investors can make informed financial decisions when purchasing shares.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the United States Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6. POINT-OF-SALE DISCLOSURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)), as amended by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(14) BROKER DISCLOSURES IN MUTUAL FUND TRANSACTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each broker shall disclose in writing to each person that purchases the shares of an investment company registered under section 8 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-8)—

''(i) the source and amount, in dollars and as a percentage of assets, of any compensation received or to be received by the broker in connection with such transaction from any sources;

''(ii) the amount, in dollars and as a percentage of assets, of compensation received in connection with transactions in shares of other investment company shares offered by the broker, if materially different from the amount under (i);

''(iii) comparative information that shows the average amount received by brokers in connection with comparable transactions, as determined by the Commission; and

''(iv) such other information as the Commission determines appropriate.

''(B) REVENUE SHARING.—The term 'compensation' under subparagraph (A) shall include any direct or indirect payment made by an investment adviser (or any affiliate of an investment adviser) to a broker or dealer for the purpose of promoting the sales of securities of a registered investment company.

''(C) TIMING OF DISCLOSURE.—The disclosures required under subparagraph (A) shall be made to permit the person purchasing the shares to evaluate such disclosures before deciding to engage in the transaction.

''(D) LIMITATION.—The disclosures required under subparagraph (A) may not be made exclusively in—

''(i) a registration statement or prospectus of a registered investment company; or

''(ii) any other filing of a registered investment company with the Commission.

''(E) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—The Commission shall promulgate such final rules as are necessary to carry out this paragraph not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005.''.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITIES ASSOCIATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) NATIONAL SECURITIES ASSOCIATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each national securities association registered pursuant to this section shall issue such rules as necessary not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005 to require that a broker that provides individualized investment advice to a person shall—

''(1) have a fiduciary duty to that person;

''(2) act solely in the best interests of that person; and

''(3) fully disclose all potential conflicts of interest and other information that is material to the relationship to that person prior to the time that the investment advice is first provided to the person and at least annually thereafter.''.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter in support of my legislation from Fund Democracy, the Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Action, and Consumers Union, as well as a letter of support from AARP, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 16, 2005.

Hon. DANIEL K. AKAKA,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR AKAKA: We are writing to express our enthusiastic support for your Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005. Your bill will benefit fund shareholders in three significant respects. First, it will strengthen the independence of fund board to help ensure that the gross abuses of trust committed by fund managers in connection with the recent mutual fund scandal will not be repeated. Second, the bill will require that fund shareholders be provided with full and understandable disclosure of brokers' fees and conflicts of interest, and that when brokers provide individualized investment advice they will be held to the same fiduciary standards to which all other investment advisers are held. Third, the bill will promote competition through increased price transparency, and thereby improve services and reduce costs for the almost 100 million Americans who have entrusted their financial security to mutual funds.

FUND GOVERNANCE

The mutual scandal that erupted in September 2003 and continues to be litigated to this day revealed ''a serious breakdown in management controls in more than just a few mutual fund complexes.'' As noted by the Securities and Exchange Commission:

''The breakdown in fund management and compliance controls evidenced by our enforcement cases raises troubling questions about the ability of many fund boards, as presently constituted, to effectively oversee the management of funds. The failure of a board to play its proper role can result, in addition to serious compliance breakdowns, in excessive fees and brokerage commissions, less than forthright disclosure, mispricing of securities, and inferior investment performance.''

The Act directly addresses the governance weaknesses revealed by the scandal by strengthening the independence of fund directors. It plugs loopholes that have allowed former executives of fund managers and other fund service providers, among others, to qualify as ''independent'' directors when their independence is clearly compromised by their former positions. The Act also ensures that the board's agenda will be set by an independent chairman, and not by the CEO of the fund's manager, as is common practice, and that independent directors will control board matters and the evaluation of independent nominees. The Act's requirement that independent directors seek shareholder approval at least every 5 years will enhance the accountability of independent directors to the shareholders whose interests they are supposed to serve.

Although the SEC recently adopted rules requiring independent fund chairmen and a 75% independent board, these rules will not prevent fund managers from terminating independent chairmen or reducing independent representation on the board to the statutory minimum of 40%. The SEC's rules apply only when the funds choose to rely on certain exemptive rules. If there is a conflict between the fund's independent directors and the fund manager, the fund manager can simply stop relying on the rules and seek to install its own executives in a majority of board positions. This is precisely what Don Yacktman did when the independent directors of his funds opposed him, and it will undoubtedly be repeated the next time that there is a similar confrontation. More importantly, independent directors know from the Yacktman experience that the protection given them by the SEC is limited, and they therefore will be less likely to stand up for shareholders than if—as you have proposed—the SEC's requirements were codified.

FIDUCIARY DUTIES AND FULL DISCLOSURE FOR ALL INVESTMENT ADVISERS

Recent regulatory investigations and enforcement actions have uncovered persistent and widespread sales abuses by brokers. Regulators have found that brokers have systematically overcharged investors for commissions, routinely made improper recommendations of B shares, accepted undisclosed directed brokerage payments in return for distribution services, and received revenue sharing payments that create incentives to favor funds that pay the highest compensation rather than funds that are the best investment option for their clients.

Last fall, the Commission promised that it would address the problems that have so long plagued brokers' sales practices, but the Commission's efforts have fallen far short of the mark. Its recent proposals fail to require full disclosure of brokers' compensation,

much less the disclosure of information that would enable investors to fully evaluate their brokers' conflicts of interests. The new disclosure requirements that you have proposed will ensure that brokers' conflicts of interest will be fully transparent to investors. Investors will be able to view the amount the broker is being paid for the fund being recommended compared with the (often lesser) amount the broker would receive for selling a different fund, which cannot help but direct investors' attention to the conflict of interest created by differential compensation structures. We especially applaud your proposal to ensure that all broker compensation, including revenue sharing payments, is disclosed in the point-of-sale document, which ensures that disclosure rules will not create an incentive for brokers to favor revenue sharing as a means of avoiding disclosure.

Remarkably, in the wake of a longstanding pattern of brokers' sales abuses, the Commission has recently repealed Congress's narrow exemption from advisory regulation for brokers who provide only ''solely incidental'' advice. The Commission's strained interpretation of ''solely incidental'' advice to include any advice provided ''in connection with and reasonably related to a broker's brokerage services''[3] has effectively stripped advisory clients of the protections of an entire statutory regime solely on the ground that the investment advice happens to be provided by a broker. The Commission's position flatly contradicts the text and purpose of the Investment Advisers Act, which, as the Supreme Court has stated: ''reflects a congressional recognition ''of 'the delicate fiduciary nature of an investment advisory relationship,' as well as a congressional intent to eliminate, or at least to expose, all conflicts of interest which might incline an investment adviser—consciously or unconsciously—to render advice which was not disinterested.''

Your proposal restores crucial components of Congress's carefully constructed regulatory scheme for the distinct and complementary regulation of brokerage and advisory services. It properly recognizes that a ''fiduciary, which Congress recognized the investment adviser to be,'' is also what consumers expect an investment adviser to be, as is generally the case when professional services are provided on a personalized basis. The Act also recognizes the importance of''expos[ing] all conflicts of interest which might incline an investment adviser—consciously or unconsciously—to render advice which was not disinterested'' by requiring full disclosure of such conflicts of interests and other material information at the time that the prospective client is deciding whether to enter into the relationship.

FEE DISCLOSURE AND PRICE COMPETITION

Your fee disclosure provisions will do double duty, by addressing conflicts of interest and brokers' sales abuses while also promoting competition, thereby improving services and driving down expenses. Requiring brokers to disclose the amount of differential payments and average fees for comparable transactions will provide the kind of price transparency that is a necessary predicate for price competition and the efficient operation of free markets. In addition, the requirement that funds disclose the amount of commissions they pay will ensure that the fund expense ratio includes all of the costs of the fund's operations and enable investors to make more informed investment decisions. The best regulator of fees is the market, but the market cannot operate efficiently when brokers and funds are permitted to hide the actual cost of the services they provide.

FINANCIAL LITERACY AND FUND ADVERTISEMENTS

Finally, we strongly agree that there is a need to further study of financial literacy, including especially information that fund investors need to make informed investment decisions and methods to increase the transparency of fees and potential conflicts of interest. Your proposed study of mutual fund advertisements is also timely, as the regulation of fund ads continues to permit misleading touting of out sized short-term performance and other abuses.

Mutual funds are Americans' most important lifeline to retirement security. The regulation of mutual funds, however, has not kept pace with their enormous growth. We applaud your continuing efforts to enhance investor protection, promote vigorous market competition and create wealth for America's mutual fund investors through effective disclosure and truly independent board oversight.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCER BULLARD,
Founder and President, Fund Democracy, Inc.
BARBARA ROPER,
Director of Investor Protection, Consumer Federation of America.
KEN MCELDOWNEY,
Executive Director, Consumer Action.
SALLY GREENBERG,
Senior Counsel, Consumers Union.

AARP,
E STREET, NW,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2005.

Hon. DANIEL K. AKAKA,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR AKAKA: AARP supports your continuing efforts to expand investor awareness of mutual fund costs, to promote fund competition by making those costs transparent and comparable, and to improve the independent oversight and governance functions of fund boards of directors. Building on legislation that you introduced in November of 2003, which AARP supported, we are also pleased to support the updated and upgraded legislation that you are introducing today, the ''Mutual Fund Transparency Act of 2005.''

We believe that there exists a growing need for legislative action that clarifies, reinforces, strengthens, and secures the corrective rule-making efforts undertaken by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) that were—in part—stimulated by your earlier legislative proposal. We look forward to working with you on these issues that are critical to the economic security of millions of Americans—particularly those of or near retirement age. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me, or have your staff call Roy Green of our Federal Affairs Department.

Sincerely,

DAVID CERTNER,
Director, Federal Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of depreciation of refinery property; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Gas Price Reduction through Increased Refining Capacity Act of 2005, S. 1039.

This bill provides tax incentives to encourage increases in oil refining capacity in the United States. By increasing domestic refining capacity, we will increase supply of refined oil products, thus decreasing the price of gasoline at the pump.

This bill is the second in a package of three bills I am proposing to promote long-term solutions to our Nation's energy needs.

Our nation needs clean, affordable sources of energy, and we should increase our energy security by focusing on those sources of energy that can be developed domestically.

Two weeks ago I introduced the CLEAR ACT, which provides market solutions to promote breakthroughs in the use of alternative fuels and technologies in our transportation sector.

The third bill, which I will introduce in the near future, will focus on increasing U.S. energy independence through the development of our nation's gigantic, untapped oil shale and tar sands reserves.

Both Republicans and Democrats recognize that increasing our domestic supplies of crude oil is not an effective solution unless we can increase our capacity to refine it. This is the genesis of the Gas Price Reduction Through Increased Refining Capacity Act.

Refining capacity in the United States cannot keep up with demand. In fact, there has not been a new refinery built in the United States since the 1976.

But that is only part of the story.

The fact is that the economics of refining are so tough that we have actually lost about 200 refineries since the last one was built. So now, our powerful Nation is down to only 149 overworked refineries.

Technological improvements at existing refineries have brought some increase to capacity, but these increases have fallen far short of demand. As a result, we now meet the gap in demand by importing more and more oil products that have already been refined, which makes us all the more dependent on foreign suppliers.

Every day, I hear from Utahns who are burdened by rapidly rising gas prices. Let me quote from just a portion of a letter from one of my constituents, Richard Decker of West Jordan, Utah:

''I am interested in knowing the progress or status of planning to protect Americans from the continually rising oil prices . . . I am just a normal guy with a tiny family. Given salaries, inflation, lack of fuel efficient automobiles at a decent price, I worry if I and others will be able to make a decent life here—not just in Utah but in America. Personally, I wish I had the option of a hydrogen-powered vehicle that would completely rid us of the dependence on foreign oil imports.

However, this isn't likely soon, so can we work on the gas prices? Do you have any suggestions? . . . Keep up the good work. Best Regards, Richard Decker''

My answer to Richard is that we hear him, and we are trying to respond.

We have a serious problem.

It is easy to point a finger at the energy companies for high gas prices, but the reality is that government rules and regulations combined with a complete lack of a national energy policy and unfriendly tax rules have kept our refining capacity far short of our need. There are no silver bullets that will bring price relief immediately, but we can act now to start meeting this need.

Last year, Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham asked the National Petroleum Council to make recommendations to improve our oil supply and to increase our nation's oil refining capacity. Among the Council's recommendations was a call to adjust the depreciation schedule for new refining equipment from 10 years to five years to make refineries consistent with other manufacturers in the U.S.

I believe that the 10-year depreciation schedule is unwarranted, and that it has contributed to a hostile economic environment for refineries. Leveling the playing field on depreciation is long overdue, and the Gas Price Reduction Act would accomplish that goal.

But it is also important that we see this new refining capacity as soon as possible. So, I have added a provision in my bill aimed at pushing refining companies to act quickly to increase capacity. For refiners that can commit to starting construction on new refining equipment before 2007 and have new facilities built by 2011, the bill would allow a complete write-off for their new equipment in the first year. This is a powerful incentive, and I believe it will capture the attention of decision-makers in the refining industry.

Again, the goal of the Gas Price Reduction Act is to get results as soon as possible, and I believe my legislation will make a difference. This bill will not bring immediate relief at the pump. But it will begin to put the brakes on escalating prices in the next few years and increase our nation's control over our energy future.

There are other good reasons to support this bill.

As part of my three-pronged approach to meeting our Nation's energy needs, it is in accord with the President's energy plan.

It does not provide a windfall to oil companies but puts refineries on an equal footing with other industries in the manufacturing sector, which already have a five-year depreciation.

It is important to note that S. 1039 does nothing to weaken our strong environmental laws and regulations; rather, it would lead to cleaner technologies as refineries upgrade equipment.

This bill is also an essential part of our strategy to increase domestic production. When we begin to realize the potential of our vast oil shale and tar sands reserves we will need domestic refining capacity to handle any increase in domestic crude oil production.

Finally, I must point out that, in the long run, this bill will not have any cost, since refineries are allowed to change the timing of the depreciation of their equipment, but not the amount.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in this important effort to increase our refining capacity, lower gas prices for our citizens, and provide for our Nation's security through increased energy independence.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1040. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide for enhanced disclosure under an open end credit plan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Credit Card Minimum Payment Notification Act.

Today, 144 million Americans utilize credit cards and charge more debt on those cards than ever before. In 1990, Americans charged $338 billion on credit cards. By 2003, that number had risen to $1.5 trillion.

Many Americans now own multiple credit cards. In 2003, 841 million bank-issued credit cards were in circulation in the U.S. That number becomes nearly 1.4 billion credit cards, when cards issued by stores and oil companies are factored in. That's an average of 5 credit cards per person.

The proliferation of credit cards can be traced, in part, to a dramatic increase in credit card solicitation. In 1993, credit card companies sent 1.52 billion solicitations to American homes; in 2001, they sent over 5 billion.

As one would expect, the increase in credit cards has also yielded an increase in credit card debt. Individuals get 6, 7, or 8 different credit cards, pay only the minimum payment required, and many end up drowning in debt. That happens in case after case.

Since 1990, the debt that Americans carry on credit cards has more than tripled, going from about $238 billion in 1990 to $755 billion in 2004.

As a result, the average American household now has about $7,300 of credit card debt.

As has been discussed much in this Congress, the number of personal bankruptcies has doubled since 1990. Many of these personal bankruptcies are people who utilize credit cards. These cards are enormously attractive. However, these individual credit card holders receive no information on the impact of compounding interest. They pay just the minimum payment. They pay it for 1 year, 2 years—they make additional purchases, they get another card, and another, and another.

Unfortunately, these individuals making the minimum payment are witnessing the ugly side of the ''Miracle of Compound Interest.'' After 2 or 3 years, many find that the interest on the debt is such that they can never repay these cards, and do not know what to do about it.

Statistics vary about the number of individuals who make only the minimum payments. One study determined that 35 million pay only the minimum on their credit cards. In a recent poll, 40 percent of respondents said that they pay the minimum or slightly more. What is certain is that many Americans pay only the minimum, and that paying only the minimum has harsh financial consequences.

I suspect that most people would be surprised to know how I much interest can pile up when paying the minimum. Take the average household, with $7,300 of credit card debt, and the average credit card interest rate, which in April, before the most recent Federal Reserve Board increase of the prime rate, was 16.75 percent. If only the 2 percent minimum payment is made, it will take them 44 years and $23,373.90 to pay off the card. And that is if the family doesn't spend another cent on their credit cards—an unlikely assumption. In other words, the family will need to pay over $16,000 in interest to repay just $7,300 of principal.

For individuals or families with more than average debt, the pitfalls are even greater. $20,000 of credit card debt at the average 16.75 percent interest rate will take 58 years and $65,415.28 to pay off if only the minimum payments are made.

And 16.25 is percent only the average interest rate. The prime rate, despite recent increases, remains relatively low—at 6 percent. However, interest rates around 20 percent are not uncommon. In fact, among the 10 banks that are the largest issuers of credit cards, the top interest rates on credit cards are between 23 and 31 percent—and that does not factor in various penalties and fees. When penalty interest rates are factored in, the highest rates are 41 percent. In 1990, the highest interest rate—even with penalties, was 22 percent, a little more than half of what they are today.

Even if we assume only a 20 percent interest rate, a family that has the average debt of $7,300 at a 20 percent interest rate and makes the minimum payments will need an incredible 76 years and $41,884 to pay off that initial $7,300 of debt. That's $34,584 in interest payments—more than 4 times the original debt. And these examples are far from extreme.

Moreover, these are not merely statistics, but are reflective of very real situations for many people. On March 6, the Washington Post ran a headline story on its front page, entitled ''Credit Card Penalties, Fees Bury Debtors.'' I would recommend this article to my colleagues, because it illustrates part of the problem—that credit card companies, aggressively marketing their products, end up charging outrageous interest and fees to their customers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD. The article highlighted the following stories:

Ohio resident, Ruth Owens tried for 6 years to pay off a $1,900 balance on her

Discover card, sending the credit company a total of $3,492 in monthly payments from 1997 to 2003. Yet her balance grew to $5,564.28.

Virginia resident Josephine McCarthy's Providian Visa bill increased to $5,357 in 2 years, even though McCarthy has used the card for only $218.16 in purchases and has made monthly payments totaling $3,058.

Special-education teacher Fatemeh Hosseini, from my state of California, worked a second job to keep up with the $2,000 in monthly payments she collectively sent to five banks to try to pay $25,000 in credit card debt. Even though she had not used the cards to buy anything more, her debt had nearly doubled to $49,574 by the time she filed for bankruptcy last June.

Unfortunately, these stories are not unique.

Part of the problem goes back to changes made in the credit card industry. For a long time, most banks required their customers to pay 5 percent of their credit card balance every month. That was before Andrew Kahr, a credit card industry consultant, got involved. Mr. Kahr realized that if customers were able to pay less, they would borrow more, and he convinced his clients that they should reduce the minimum payment to just 2 percent.

The PBS program ''Frontline'', ran a program in November of last year titled ''The Secret History of the Credit Card'' that examined the rapid growth of the credit card industry and included an interview with Mr. Kahr.

Mr. Kahr's innovation has been a windfall for the credit card industry. If consumers are paying a lower percentage of their balance as the minimum payment, the credit card companies will make more money over time. In fact, many in the industry refer to individuals who pay their credit card bills in full as ''deadbeats'', because they are less profitable than individuals who carry large balances, who are known as ''revolvers.''

And Mr. Kahr's own research showed that just making the minimum payment eased consumers' anxiety about carrying large amounts of credit card debt—they believe they are still being financially prudent.

The bill I am proposing speaks directly to those types of consumers. There will always be people who cannot afford to pay more than their minimum payments. But, there are also a large number of consumers who can afford to pay more but feel comfortable paying the minimum payment because they don't realize the consequences of doing so.

Now I am certainly not trying to demonize credit cards or the credit card industry. Credit cards are an important part of everyday life. However, I do think that people should understand the dangers of paying only their monthly minimums. In this way individuals will be able to act responsibly.

It's not necessarily that people don't understand the basics of interest. Most of us just don't realize how fast it compounds or how important it is to do the math to find out what it means to pay a minimum requirement.

The bottom line is that for many consumers, the 2 percent minimum payment is a financial trap.

The Credit Card Minimum Payment Notification Act is designed to ensure that people are not caught in this trap through lack of information. The bill tracks the language of the amendment originally proposed to the Bankruptcy bill that was co-sponsored by Senator KYL, Senator BROWNBACK, and myself.

Let me tell you exactly what this bill would do. It would require credit card companies to add two items to each consumer's monthly credit card statement: 1. A notice warning credit card holders that making only the minimum payment each month will increase the interest they pay and the amount of time it takes to repay their debt; and 2. Examples of the amount of time and money required to repay a credit card debt if only minimum payments are made; OR if the consumer makes only minimum payments for six-consecutive months, the amount of time and money required to repay the individual's specific credit card debt, under the terms of their credit card agreement.

The bill would also require that a toll free number be included on statements that consumers can call to get an estimate of the time and money required to repay their balance, if only minimum payments are made.

And, if the consumer makes only minimum payments for six consecutive months, they will receive a toll free number to an accredited credit counseling service.

The disclosure requirements in this bill would only apply if the I consumer has a minimum payment that is less than 10 percent of the debt on the credit card, or if their balance is greater than $500. Otherwise, none of these disclosures would be required on their statement.

The language of this bill comes from a California law, the ''California Credit Card Payment Warning Act,'' passed in 2001. Unfortunately, in 2002, this California law was struck down in U.S. District Court as being preempted by the 1968 Truth in Lending Act. The Truth in Lending Act was enacted in part because Congress found that, ''The informed use of credit results from an awareness of the cost of thereof by consumers.'' Consequently, this bill would amend the Truth in Lending Act, and would also further its core purpose.

These disclosures allow consumers to know exactly what it means for them to carry a balance and only make minimum payments, so they can make informed decisions on credit card use and repayment.

The disclosure required by this bill is straightforward how much it will cost to pay off the debt if only minimum payments are made, and how long it will take to do it. As for expense, my staff tells me that on the website Cardweb.com, there is a free interest calculator that does these calculations in under a second. Moreover, I am told that banks make these calculations internally to determine credit risk. The expense would be minimal.

Percentage rates and balances are constantly changing and each month, the credit card companies are able to assess the minimum payment, late fees, over-the-limit fees and finance charges for millions of accounts.

If the credit card companies can put in their bills what the minimum monthly payment is, they can certainly figure out how to disclose to their customers how much it might cost them if they stick to that minimum payment.

The credit card industry is the most profitable sector of banking, and last year it made $30 billion in profits. MBNA's profits alone last year were one-and-a-half times that of McDonald's. Citibank was more profitable than Microsoft and Walmart. I don't think they should have any trouble implementing the requirements of this bill.

I believe that this is extraordinarily important and that it will minimize bankruptcies. With companies charging very substantial interest rates, they have an obligation to let the credit card holder know what those minimum payments really mean. I have people close to me I have watched, with 6 or 7 credit cards, and it is impossible for them, over the next 10 or 15 years, to pay off the debt if they continue making just minimum payments.

We now have a bankruptcy bill that has passed into law. I continue to believe that a bill requiring a limited but meaningful disclosure by credit cards companies is a necessary accompaniment. I think you will have people who are more cautious, which I believe is good for the bankruptcy courts in terms of reducing their caseloads, and also good for American consumers.

The credit card debt problem facing our Nation is significant. I believe that this bill is an important step in providing individuals with the information needed to act responsibly, and it does so with a minimal burden on the industry.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 2005]

CREDIT CARD PENALTIES, FEES BURY DEBTORS; SENATE NEARS ACTION ON BANKRUPTCY CURBS

(By Kathleen Day and Caroline E. Mayer)

For more than two years, special-education teacher Fatemeh Hosseini worked a second job to keep up with the $2,000 in monthly payments she collectively sent to five banks to try to pay $25,000 in credit card debt.

Even though she had not used the cards to buy anything more, her debt had nearly doubled to $49,574 by the time the Sunnyvale,

Calif., resident filed for bankruptcy last June. That is because Hosseini's payments sometimes were tardy, triggering late fees ranging from $25 to $50 and doubling interest rates to nearly 30 percent. When the additional costs pushed her balance over her credit limit, the credit card companies added more penalties.

''I was really trying hard to make minimum payments,'' said Hosseini, whose financial problems began in the late 1990s when her husband left her and their three children. ''All of my salary was going to the credit card companies, but there was no change in the balances because of that interest and those penalties.''

Punitive charges—penalty fees and sharply higher interest rates after a payment is late—compound the problems of many financially strapped consumers, sometimes making it impossible for them to dig their way out of debt and pushing them into bankruptcy.

The Senate is to vote as soon as this week on a bill that would make it harder for individuals to wipe out debt through bankruptcy. The Senate last week voted down several amendments intended to curb excessive fees and other practices that critics of the industry say are abusive. House leaders say they will act soon after that, and President Bush has said he supports the bill.

Bankruptcy experts say that too often, by the time an individual has filed for bankruptcy or is hauled into court by creditors, he or she has repaid an amount equal to their original credit card debt plus double-digit interest, but still owes hundreds or thousands of dollars because of penalties.

''How is it that the person who wants to do right ends up so worse off?'' Cleveland Municipal Judge Robert J. Triozzi said last fall when he ruled against Discover in the company's breach-of-contract suit against another struggling credit cardholder, Ruth M. Owens.

Owens tried for six years to payoff a $1,900 balance on her Discover card, sending the credit company a total of $3,492 in monthly payments from 1997 to 2003. Yet her balance grew to $5,564.28, even though, like Hosseini, she never used the card to buy anything more. Of that total, over-limit penalty fees alone were $1,158.

Triozzi denied Discover's claim, calling its attempt to collect more money from Owens ''unconscionable.''

The bankruptcy measure now being debated in Congress has been sought for nearly eight years by the credit card industry. Twice in that time, versions of it have passed both the House and Senate. Once, President Bill Clinton refused to sign it, saying it was unfair, and once the House reversed its vote after Democrats attached an amendment that would prevent individuals such as antiabortion protesters from using bankruptcy as a shield against court-imposed fines.

Credit card companies and most congressional Republicans say current law needs to be changed to prevent abuse and make more people repay at least part of their debt. Consumer-advocacy groups and many Democrats say people who seek bankruptcy protection do so mostly because they have fallen on hard times through illness, divorce or job loss. They also argue that current law has strong provisions that judges can use to weed out those who abuse the system.

Opponents also argue that the legislation is unfair because it ignores loopholes that would allow rich debtors to shield millions of dollars during bankruptcy through expensive homes and complex trusts, while ignoring the need for more disclosure to cardholders about rates and fees and curbs on what they say is irresponsible behavior by the credit card industry. The Republican majority, along with a few Democrats, has voted down dozens of proposed amendments to the bill, including one that would make it easier for the elderly to protect their homes in bankruptcy and another that would require credit card companies to tell customers how much extra interest they would pay over time by making only minimum payments.

No one knows how many consumers get caught in the spiral of ''negative amoritization,'' which is what regulators call it when a consumer makes payments but balances continue to grow because of penalty costs. The problem is widespread enough to worry federal bank regulators, who say nearly all major credit card issuers engage in the practice.

Two years ago regulators adopted a policy that will require credit card companies to set monthly minimum payments high enough to cover penalties and interest and lower some of the customer's original debt, known as principal, so that if a consumer makes no new charges and makes monthly minimum payments, his or her balance will begin to decline.

Banks agreed to the new rules after, in the words of one top federal regulator, ''some arm-twisting.'' But bank executives persuaded regulators to allow the higher minimum payments to be phased in over several years, through 2006, arguing that many customers are so much in debt that even slight increases too soon could push many into financial disaster.

Credit card companies declined to comment on specific cases or customers for this article, but banking industry officials, speaking generally, said there is a good reason for the fees they charge.

''It's to encourage people to pay their bills the way they said they would in their contract, to encourage good financial management,'' said Nessa Feddis, senior federal counsel for the American Bankers Association. ''There has to be some onus on the cardholder, some responsibility to manage their finances.''

High fees ''may be extreme cases, but they are not the trend, not the norm,'' Feddis said.

''Banks are pretty flexible,'' she said. ''If you are a good customer and have an occasional mishap, they'll waive the fees, because there's so much competition and it's too easy to go someplace else.'' Banks are also willing to work out settlements with people in financial difficulty, she said, because ''there are still a lot of options even for people who've been in trouble.''

Many bankruptcy lawyers disagree. James S.K. ''Ike'' Shulman, Hosseini's lawyer, said credit card companies hounded her and did not live up to several promises to work with her to cut mounting fees.

Regulators say it is appropriate for lenders to charge higher-risk debtors a higher interest rate, but that negative amortization and other practices go too far, posing risks to the banking system by threatening borrowers' ability to repay their debts and by being unfair to individuals.

U.S. Bankruptcy Judge David H. Adams of Norfolk, who is also the president of the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, said many debtors who get in over their heads ''are spending money, buying things they shouldn't be buying.'' Even so, he said, ''once you add all these fees on, the amount of principal being paid is negligible. The fees and interest and other charges are so high, they may never be able to pay it off.''

Judges say there is little they can do by the time cases get to bankruptcy court. Under the law, ''the credit card company is legally entitled to collect every dollar without a distinction'' whether the balance is from fees, interest or principal, said retired U.S. bankruptcy judge Ronald Barliant, who presided in Chicago. The only question for the courts is whether the debt is accurate, judges and lawyers say.

John Rao, staff attorney of the National Consumer Law Center, one of many consumer groups fighting the bankruptcy bill, says the plight consumers face was illustrated last year in a bankruptcy case filed in Northern Virginia.

Manassas resident Josephine McCarthy's Providian Visa bill increased to $5,357 from $4,888 in two years, even though McCarthy has used the card for only $218.16 in purchases and has made monthly payments totaling $3,058. Those payments, noted U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Stephen S. Mitchell in Alexandria, all went to ''pay finance charges (at a whopping 29.99%), late charges, over-limit fees, bad check fees and phone payment fees.'' Mitchell allowed the claim ''because the debtor admitted owing it.'' McCarthy, through her lawyer, declined to be interviewed.

Alan Elias, a Providian Financial Corp. spokesman, said: 'When consumers sign up for a credit card, they should understand that it's a loan, no different than their mortgage payment or their car payment, and it needs to be repaid. And just like a mortgage payment and a car payment, if you are late you are assessed a fee.'' The 29.99 percent interest rate, he said, is the default rate charged to consumers ''who don't meet their obligation to pay their bills on time'' and is clearly disclosed on account applications.

Feddis, of the banker's association, said the nature of debt means that interest will often end up being more than the original principal. ''Anytime you have a loan that's going to extend for any period of time, the interest is going to accumulate. Look at a 30–year-mortgage. The interest is much, much more than the principal.''

Samuel J. Gerdano, executive director of the American Bankruptcy Institute, a nonpartisan research group, said that focusing on late fees is ''refusing to look at the elephant in the room, and that's the massive levels of consumer debt which is not being paid. People are living right up to the edge,'' failing to save so when they lose a second job or overtime, face medical expense or their family breaks up, they have no money to cope.

''Late fees aren't the cause of debt,'' he said.

Credit card use continues to grow, with an average of 6.3 bank credit cards and 6.3 store credit cards for every household, according to Cardweb.com Inc., which monitors the industry. Fifteen years ago, the averages were 3.4 bank credit cards and 4.1 retail credit cards per household.

Despite, or perhaps because of, the large increase in cards, there is a ''fee feeding frenzy,'' among credit card issuers, said Robert McKinley, Cardweb's president and chief executive. ''The whole mentality has really changed over the last several years,'' with the industry imposing fees and increasing interest rates if a single payment is late.

Penalty interest rates usually are about 30 percent, with some as high as 40 percent, while late fees now often are $39 a month, and over-limit fees, about $35, McKinley said. ''If you drag that out for a year, it could be very damaging,'' he said. ''Late and over-limit fees alone can easily rack up $900 in fees, and a 30 percent interest rate on a $3,000 balance can add another $1 ,000, so you could go from $2,000 to $5,000 in just one year if you fail to make payments.''

According to R.K. Hammer Investment Bankers, a California credit card consulting firm, banks collected $14.8 billion in penalty fees last year, or 10.9 percent of revenue, up

from $10.7 billion, or 9 percent of revenue, in 2002, the first year the firm began to track penalty fees.

The way the fees are now imposed, ''people would be better off if they stopped paying'' once they get in over their heads, said T. Bentley Leonard, a North Carolina bankruptcy attorney. Once you stop paying, creditors write off the debt and sell it to a debt collector. ''They may harass you, but your balance doesn't keep rising. That's the irony.''

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1041. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and Maria Del Refugio Plascencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am offering today private relief legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and his wife, Maria del Refugio Plascencia, Mexican nationals living in San Bruno, CA.

I have decided to offer legislation on their behalf because I believe that, without it, this hardworking couple and their four United States citizen children would endure an immense and unfair hardship. Indeed, without this legislation, this family may not remain a family for much longer.

In the seventeen years that the Plascencias have been here, they have worked to adjust their status through the appropriate legal channels, only to have their efforts thwarted by inattentive legal counsel.

Repeatedly, the Plascencia's lawyer refused to return their calls or otherwise communicate with them in any way, thereby leaving them in the dark. He also failed to forward crucial immigration documents, or even notify the Plascencias that he had them. Because of the poor representation they received, Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia only became aware that they had been ordered to leave the country fifteen days prior to their deportation. Although the family was stunned and devastated by this discovery, they acted quickly to fire their attorney for gross incompetence, secure competent counsel, and file the appropriate paperwork to delay their deportation to determine if any other legal action could be taken.

For several reasons, it would be tragic for this family to be removed from the United States.

First, since arriving in the United States in 1988, Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia have proven themselves to be a responsible and civic-minded couple who share our American values of hard work, dedication to family and devotion to community.

Second, Mr. Plascencia has been gainfully employed at Vince's Shellfish for the past 13 years, where his dedication and willingness to learn have propelled him from part-time work to a managerial position. He now oversees the market's entire packing operation and several employees. The President of Vince's Shellfish, in one of the several dozen letters I have received in support of Mr. Plascencia, referred to him as ''a valuable and respected employee'' who ''handles himself in a very professional manner'' and serves as ''a role model'' to other employees. Others who have written to me praising Mr. Plascencia's job performance have referred to him as ''gifted,'' ''trusted,'' ''honest'' and ''reliable.''

Third, like her husband, Mrs. Plascencia has distinguished herself as a medical assistant at a Kaiser Permanente hospital in the Bay Area. Not satisfied with working as a maid at a local hotel, Mrs. Plascencia went to school, earned her high school equivalency degree, improved her skills and became a medical assistant.

For four years, Mrs. Plascencia was working in Kaiser Permanente's Oncology Department, where she attended to cancer patients. Her colleagues, many of whom have written to me in support of her, commend her ''unending enthusiasm'' and have described her work as ''responsible,'' ''efficient,'' and ''compassionate.'' In fact, Kaiser Permanente's Director of Internal Medicine, Nurse Rose Carino, wrote to say that Mrs. Plascencia is ''an asset to the community and exemplifies the virtues we Americans extol: hardworking, devoted to her family, trustworthy and loyal, [and] involved in her community. She and her family are a solid example of the type of immigrant that America should welcome wholeheartedly.'' Nurse Carino went on to write that Mrs. Plascencia is ''an excellent employee and role model for her colleagues. She works in a very demanding unit, Oncology, and is valued and depended on by the physicians she works with.'' The physicians themselves confirm this. For example, Dr. Laurie Weisberg, the Chief of Oncology at Kaiser Permanente, writes that Mrs. Plascencia ''is truly an asset to our unit and is one of the main reasons that it functions effectively.''

Together, Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia have used their professional successes to realize many of the goals dreamed of by all Americans. They saved up and bought a home. They own a car. They have good health care benefits and they each have begun saving for retirement. They want to send their children to college and give them an even better life.

This private relief bill is important because it would preserve these achievements and ensure that Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia will be able to make substantive contributions to the community in the future. It is important, also, because of the positive impact it will have on the couple's children, each of whom is a United States citizen and each of whom is well on their way to becoming productive members of the Bay Area community.

Christina, 13, is the Plascencia's oldest child, and an honor student with a 3.0 grade-point average at Parkside Intermediate School in San Bruno.

Erika, 9, and Alfredo, Jr., 7, are enrolled at Belle Air Elementary, where they have worked hard at their studies and received praise and good grades from their teachers. In fact, last year, the principal of Erika's school recognized her as the ''Most Artistic'' student in her class. Recently, Erika's teacher, Mrs. Nascon, remarked on a report card, ''Erika is a bright spot in my classroom.''

The Plascencia's youngest child is 2-year-old Daisy.

Removing Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia from the United States would be most tragic for their children. Children who were born in the United States and who through no fault of their own have been thrust into a situation that has the potential to alter their lives dramatically.

It would be especially tragic for the Plascencia's older children—Christina, Erika and Alfredo—to have to leave the United States. They are old enough to understand that they are leaving their schools, their teachers, their friends and their home. They would leave everything that is familiar to them. Their parents would find themselves in Mexico without a job and without a house. The children would have to acclimate to a different culture, language and way of life.

The only other option would be for Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia to leave their children here with relatives. This separation is a choice which no parents should have to make.

Many of the words I have used to describe Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia are not my own. They are the words of the Americans who live and work with the Plascencias day in and day out and who find them to embody the American spirit. I have sponsored this private relief bill, and ask my colleagues to support it, because I believe that this is a spirit that we must nurture wherever we can find it. Forcing the Plascencias to leave the United States would extinguish that spirit.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the private relief bill and the numerous letters of support my office has received from members of the San Bruno community be the printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1041

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALFREDO PLASCENCIA LOPEZ AND MARIA DEL REFUGIO PLASCENCIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and Maria Del Refugio Plascencia shall each be eligible for the issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of that Act or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and Maria Del Refugio Plascencia enter the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c),

Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and Maria Del Refugio Plascencia shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of immigrant visas or the application for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of immigrant visas or permanent residence to Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and Maria Del Refugio Plascencia, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by 2, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the aliens' birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the aliens' birth under section 202(e) of that Act.

VINCE'S SHELLFISH CO., INC.,
San Bruno, CA, January 12, 2005.

Sen. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate, San Francisco, CA.

DEAR SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN: I am writing on behalf of Maria and Alfredo Plascencia from San Bruno, California. Alfredo has worked for me at Vince's Shellfish Co. Inc. for the past 13 years. Alfredo is well respected here at Vinces. Alfredo is a very reliable, dependable individual who has worked his way up and is now a foreman who is in charge of our packing department. Alfredo is responsible for 10 employees at this time.

On a personal basis, Alfredo is a fine father. He is trying desperately to keep his family together. It has been a 15-year struggle for Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia to create a better life in America for their four U.S. born children. If Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia were to face deportation it would be devastating for his four children.

At this time I support the private bill that is to be presented before the Senate at the end of this month. The Plascencia family will greatly benefit from its passing.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER N. SVEDISC,
President.

THE PERMANENTE
MEDICAL GROUP, INC.,
South San Francisco, CA., January 13, 2005.

Re Alfredo Plascencia Lopez and Maria del Refugio Plascencia

Sen. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
San Francisco, CA.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to you in representation of the Oncology department staff at Kaiser Permanente So. San Francisco. We are shocked to hear the events regarding Maria and Alfredo's United States residency status and we are convinced that it could not be due to any omissions on their part. We have the pleasure and good fortune of working with Maria for over four years and she has always distinguished herself for her intelligence, and good judgment. She is truly an asset to our unit and is one of the main reasons that it functions effectively and to the betterment of our patients. This letter is a plea to ask you to reconsider the deportation of this young couple. Their four children, who are all United States citizens, do not need to suffer this ordeal, which seems to be a horrible nightmare. They deserve to stay in America, as these are the kind of citizens that we should welcome with open arms. Maria and Alfredo save and spend their money wisely. They have been able to save enough to buy a home for their family in our community. We can't even imagine their loss, as well as ours, if Maria and Alfredo are required to leave the United States. They both love our country and they support it with their heart and soul.

Maria seems to have an unending energy and enthusiasm volunteering numerous hours at her church, the community, as well as working full time in a fast paced medical environment, caring for her four children and attending college to continue her education to become a registered nurse. Maria and Alfredo are raising four exceptional children who are excelling in school and extracurricular activities. It would cause an immeasurable hardship on these children if their parents are not allowed to stay in the United States. Therefore, we ask you please allow them to stay so that their children can continue with their education and their lives. The effect on their children would be emotionally and mentally severe and it would seem unfair to all to allow this situation to happen to people who deserve to be in this country.

We will like for our plea to be heard by the members of the Senate and for them to consider the acceptance of the private bill on behalf of this family. Please consider the high regard that Maria and Alfredo have earned with their fellow workers when making the determination regarding of their residency status.

Sincerely,

Laurie Weisberg, M.D. Chief of Oncology, Edmond Schmulbach, M.D. Oncology Specialist, William Huang, M.D. Oncology Specialist, Kelly Sutter, RNNP Oncology, Jodie L. Beyer, pharm. D. Oncology pharmacist, Cynthia Galicia, RN Oncology Infusion Dept., Clarita Difuntorum, RN, Oncology Infusion Dept., Gail Walker, RN Oncology Infusion Dept., Fran Luna, RN Oncology Infusion Dept., Marita Tumaneng, RN Oncology Infusion Dept., Barbara Modica, MA Oncology Dept., Jenifer Ogolin, MA Oncology Dept., Kathie Ankers, MA Gastroenterology Dept., and Tracy Thurman, MA Gastroenterology Dept.

SAN BRUNO PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT,
BELLE AIR SCHOOL,
San Bruno, CA, January 14, 2005.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: I am writing in behalf of the Plascencia Family. I have known this family for over ten years as the Principal of Belle Air Elementary School. I have the utmost respect for the parents and their family values. The children are wonderful. They are well taken care of and are well adjusted. I am so worried that if they are separated from their parents the affect of the separation will cause reprievable damage to their well being. I have personally counseled the children during the drama of the possible deportment of their parents. I saw the deep sadness and worry that the stress caused. I know that parents wanted a better life for their children and have worked very hard to actualize that. To take the parents and or move this family would be tragic. There are so many undeserving people who will stay in the United States that should leave and be sent back to their countries. But this family is not one. They are a picture of the American dream. They work hard, support their family, church and community. Their children have grown to be proud American citizens. The oldest daughter Christy is an honor student and a cheerleader at Parkside Middle School and a graduate of Belle Air. Christy's brother and sister, Alfredo and Erica, are both on our school's student council. They too, are very bright students.

Please do not let an injustice of deportment happen to this family. Please assist them and keep them a family unit. We have so many children hurt and scared already in the world. Please do not add these children and this family to the numbers. This family and these children are what help keep American values and traditions alive. I came from an immigrant family and have made it my mission to give back to others by working in education and that is why I am personally writing this letter because I know what family, hard work, and love can do to produce productive adults and citizens.

Please find it in your heart, to help this family.

If you need to speak with me personally feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

ANGELA M. ADDIEGO,
Belle Air School, Principal.

MENSAJEROS DE CRISTO, COMUNIDAD
DE ORACIÓN Y EVANGELIZACIÓN,
ALL SOULS PARISH,
San Francisco, CA, January 13, 2005.

Sen. DIANNE FEINSTIEN,
San Francisco, CA.

This letter represents the community and is in regards to the situation of Maria and Alfredo Plascencia. We would like to make you aware of a few facts and information that may have possible bearing on Mr. and Mrs. Placencia's situation.

They have both been productive and valued members, of long standing, of our community and in our church.

Maria and Alfredo have been active members of All Souls Parish since 1997, Where they are currently serving as counselor of Mensajeros de Cristo. They have shown high moral standard through the years.

They are well thought of and respected by the congregation.

Please take this information into consideration when evaluating their status of Staying in this country.

Should you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

HUGO LARA,
Mensajeros de Cristo, Coordinator.

JANUARY 13, 2005.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
San Francisco, CA.

This letter is just to let you know that, I know Maria and Alfredo Plascencia since March 1999. When he joined the Charismatic Renewal of the Archdioceses of San Francisco, though the prayer group Mensajeros de Cristo from the parish of All Souls in South San Francisco.

Maria and Alfredo are people with great moral principles, good citizens, and good examples of their community. They are very active members of the above prayer group.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

ISABEL TOVAR,
Hispanic Director, Charismatic Renewal, Archdioceses of San Francisco.

CITY OF SAN BRUNO,
January 12, 2005.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
San Francisco, CA.

HON. SENATOR FEINSTEIN: We are writing to you regarding, Alfredo and Maria Plascencia, citizens of the City of San Bruno, who are about to be deported in the very near future.

Mr. and Mrs. Plascencia, in the sixteen years they have resided in this country and

raised their children, have proven to be hard working and law-abiding people trying to provide a better place for their family. While we are certainly aware of the laws of this country we believe that this is a time when we should do everything possible to allow legal residency so this family can stay in this country.

We urge you to afford the Plascencia family whatever consideration possible.

Sincerely yours,

LARRY FRANZELA,
Mayor.
JIM RUANE,
Vice Mayor.
CHRIS PALLAS,
Councilmember.
IRENE O'CONNELL,
Councilmember.
KEN IBARRA,
Councilmember.

ST. BRUNO'S CHURCH,
San Bruno, CA, January 13, 2005.

Sen. DIANE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

The purpose of this letter is to present my observations on Alfredo Placencia Lopez and Maria Placencia's character and work ethic. I first came to know them in our Church when they came to worship on a Sunday. This happened around January 1998.

And so far, the last 7 years both Alfredo and Maria have been two of our outstanding parishioners at St. Bruno's Church. They come to Sunday Mass and worship, and have been involved in many ministries and services here in our Church at St. Bruno's. Alfredo has been especially a minister of hospitality, always welcoming people to church and participation in the life of the community, helping to provide a spirit of acceptance and concern among our people and providing bread and refreshments for some gatherings. Alfredo has also reached out to the homeless for whom we have a shelter in our Parish and especially providing them with food. Maria has been especially involved as a teacher, faithfully giving to our children the fundamentals of our Faith, of the Gospel and of a Christian moral life. She has founded a Children's Choir and leads them with our Special Music for Sunday worship. They have four children all of whom have been baptized at St. Bruno's Church and come to our School of Religion and our Church.

Alfredo and Maria have been most generous with their time, their talents and their money, sharing all these with the members of our Church Community. They have also frequently donated food to the Church and to the Pastor. I have found them to be really good Christian people, most generous, considerate, kind, honest and reliable. If they would have to leave the United States, it will be most difficult for them and for their children who have been growing in a Christian environment and are doing so well; it would be a tremendous loss. We too here in our Church would find it difficult without them. For they are a great asset to this country and to our Church and to many people.

We appreciate whatever you can do for them to help them get their legal papers of residence in the United States.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

RENÉ GOMEZ,
Pastor of St. Bruno's Church.

SAN BRUNO, CA,
January 13, 2005.

Re Alfredo Placencia Lopez and/or Maria Del Refugio Placencia.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: My name is Elisa Alvarez. Alfredo and Maria Placencia and Family are my neighbors and friends, I have known them since 1999. They live on 3rd Ave. and I live on 4th. Since I have known them I saw that they are a very close and spiritual family. I enjoyed their company because they have been a great example of how a close family they are and how spiritual they are. They are great parents and they love and are very close with the rest of their family. They always go every where together as a family, you never see them without each other. They always get together with the rest of their relatives they are very close family. They invited me one night to a prayer group and even offered to pick me up and take me and bring me home when I was going through some hard times. This experience was so moving, and it help me and my whole life changed from that day on. I have became very spiritual thanks to the Alfredo and Maria. I met them at St. Bruno's Church. They always do voluntary work at the church they both do so much for our parish and are always willing to help anyone who needs it.

If Alfredo and Maria are separated from their children and family it will be very hard for their children to be with out their parents or I know if they all go to Mexico it will be very hard for this family to survive there. I hope you can help them by not separating this family, they are hard workers and I'm sure they would never be a burden for this country. This is a very nice young family, you don't see families like this one these days. I hope everything can be done so Alfredo and Maria can get their permanent residency and their lives can get back to normal and . they don't have to suffer from this bad roller coaster.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Sincerely,

ELISA ALVAREZ.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 142—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE SHOULD BRING A CASE BEFORE THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION REGARDING THE VIOLATIONS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. DORGAN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 142

Whereas at the Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade (JCCT) meeting in April 2004, the People's Republic of China committed to undertake a significant reduction of infringements on intellectual property rights;

Whereas on April 29, 2005, the United States Trade Representative concluded that, "China has not resolved critical deficiencies in (intellectual property rights) protection and enforcement and, as a result, infringements remain at epidemic levels";

Whereas the United States Trade Representative found that "China's inadequate intellectual property rights enforcement is resulting in infringement levels at 90 percent or above for virtually every form of intellectual property,";

Whereas United States Trade Representative further concluded that "there has not been a significant reduction in (intellectual property rights) infringements throughout China," notwithstanding China's commitment in April 2004 to achieve such a reduction;

Whereas, according to the United States Chamber of Commerce, China's violations of intellectual property rights are costing United States industry an estimated $200,000,000,000 per year; and

Whereas the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) (described in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act) is intended to provide a mechanism for the enforcement of intellectual property rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Trade Representative should immediately initiate a case against the People's Republic of China through the World Trade Organization dispute settlement process.

SENATE RESOLUTION 143—TO AUTHORIZE THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO APPEAR IN LEGAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE NAME OF THE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH ITS INVESTIGATION INTO THE UNITED NATIONS' "OIL-FOR-FOOD" PROGRAMME

Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 143

Whereas, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations is conducting an inquiry into the United Nations' "Oil-for-Food" Programme;

Whereas, the Subcommittee has need to obtain access to evidence from an individual formerly associated with the Independent Inquiry Committee, a committee formed by the United Nations to investigate claims relating to the Programme;

Whereas, in the course of the Subcommittee's efforts to obtain access to such evidence, legal issues may arise requiring the Subcommittee to appear in the courts of the United States;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(c), 706(a), and 713(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(c), 288e(a), and 288l(a), the Senate may direct its Counsel to appear as amicus curiae or to intervene in the name of a subcommittee of the Senate in any legal action in which the powers and responsibilities of Congress under the Constitution are placed in issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized, when directed by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, or by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, acting jointly, to appear in the name of the Subcommittee as amicus curiae, intervenor, applicant or respondent in United Nations v. Robert Parton or any related action or proceeding.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 57TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr.

McCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KERRY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DODD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PRYOR, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 33

Whereas whales have very low reproductive rates, making many whale populations extremely vulnerable to pressure from commercial whaling;

Whereas whales migrate throughout the world's oceans and international cooperation is required to successfully conserve and protect whale stocks;

Whereas in 1946 a significant number of the nations of the world adopted the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, which established the International Whaling Commission to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks;

Whereas in 2003 the Commission established a Conservation Committee, open to all members of the Commission, for the purpose of facilitating efficient and effective coordination and development of conservation recommendations and activities, which are fully consistent with the conservation objectives stated in the 1946 Convention;

Whereas the Commission adopted a moratorium on commercial whaling in 1982 in order to conserve and promote the recovery of whale stocks, many of which had been hunted to near extinction by the commercial whaling' industry;

Whereas the rights of indigenous people to whale for subsistence purposes has been specifically recognized under the 1946 Convention;

Whereas the Commission has desigllated the Indian Ocean and part of the ocean around Antarctica as whale sanctuaries to further enhance the recovery of whale stocks;

Whereas many nations of the world have designated waters under their jurisdiction as whale sanctuaries where commercial whaling is prohibited, and additional regional whale sanctuaries have been proposed by nations that are members of the Commission;

Whereas two member nations that lodged objections to the Commission's moratorium on commercial whaling when it was adopted continue to hold such objections, a third member nation asserted a reservation to the moratorium on rejoining the Commission, and one member nation is currently conducting commercial whaling operations in spite of the moratorium and the protests of other nations;

Whereas the Commission has adopted several resolutions at recent meetings asking member nations to halt commercial whaling activities conducted under reservation to the moratorium and to refrain from issuing special permits for research involving the killing of whales;

Whereas one member nation of the Commission has taken a reservation to the Commission's Southern Ocean Sanctuary and also continues to conduct unnecessary lethal scientific whaling in the Southern Ocean and in the North Pacific Ocean;

Whereas one member nation has recently begun to conduct unnecessary lethal scientific whaling in the Atlantic;

Whereas whale meat and blubber is being sold commercially from whales killed pursuant to such unnecessary lethal scientific whaling, further undermining the moratorium on commercial whaling;

Whereas the Commission's Scientific Committee has repeatedly expressed serious concerns about the scientific need for such lethal research and recognizes the importance of demonstrating and expanding the use of non-lethal scientific research methods;

Whereas more than 8,700 whales have been killed in lethal scientific whaling programs since the adoption of the commercial whaling moratorium and the lethal take of whales under scientific permits has increased both in quantity and species, with species now including minke, Bryde's, sei, and sperm whales, and media reports indicate a new plan may be offered that could expand such whaling to fin and humpback whales;

Whereas engaging in commercial whaling under reservation and lethal scientific whaling undermines the conservation program of the Commission;

Whereas discussions are taking place within the Commission on a Revised Management Scheme (RMS) that would regulate any possible future commercial whaling;

Whereas any decision to lift the moratorium against commercial whaling must be taken independently from negotiations and adoption of an RMS;

Whereas any RMS must include or be conditioned on the concurrent adoption of provisions similar to those in other international agreements related to fisheries and marine mammals, including transparent and neutral observer mechanisms, and effective compliance and dispute settlement mechanisms;

Whereas to be effective, if an RMS is adopted, any future commercial whaling must take place pursuant to the RMS, and no reservations allowing commercial whaling outside of the RMS should be permitted; and

Whereas any decision to lift the moratorium against commercial whaling must be conditioned on the immediate cessation of lethal scientific whaling: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) at the 57th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission the United States should—

(A) remain firmly opposed to commercial whaling and any linking of adoption of a Revised Management Scheme (RMS) to the lifting of the commercial whaling moratorium;

(B) initiate and support efforts to ensure that all activities conducted under reservations to the Commission's moratorium or sanctuaries are ceased;

(C) seek to ensure that any RMS includes, or is conditioned on the concurrent adoption of provisions similar to those in other international agreements related to fisheries and marine mammals, including transparent and neutral observer mechanisms, and effective compliance and dispute settlement mechanisms;

(D) insist that any future commercial whaling must take place pursuant to the RMS, that no reservations allowing commercial whaling outside of the RMS should be permitted, and that lethal scientific whaling must immediately cease upon the commencement of any commercial whaling;

(E) uphold the rights of indigenous people to whale for subsistence purposes, and firmly reject any attempts to compromise such rights or to equate commercial whaling with such rights;

(F) initiate or support efforts to end the lethal taking of whales for scientific purposes, seek support for expanding the use of non-lethal research methods, and seek to end the sale of whale meat and blubber from whales killed for unnecessary lethal scientific research;

(G) support proposals for the permanent protection of whale populations through the establishment of whale sanctuaries and other zones of protection in which commercial whaling is prohibited;

(H) support efforts to expand data collection on whale populations, monitor and reduce whale bycatch and other incidental impacts, and otherwise expand whale conservation efforts;

(I) support the adoption of an active program of work by the Conservation Committee to address the full range of threats to whales, and otherwise expand whale conservation efforts;

(J) call upon the Contracting Parties to the Convention to submit to the Commission for discussion within the Conservation Committee national approaches, including laws, regulations and other initiatives, that further the conservation of cetaceans; and

(2) the United States should make full use of all appropriate diplomatic mechanisms, Federal law, relevant international laws and agreements, and other appropriate mechanisms to implement the goals set forth in paragraph (1).

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, I am pleased to join the chair of the Subcommittee, Senator SNOWE, in submitting a resolution regarding the policy of the United States at the upcoming 57th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). I wish to also thank my colleagues Mr. McCAIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. BOXER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. KERRY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN for co-sponsoring as well.

Recognizing that whales are highly migratory and therefore require international cooperation for their preservation, the IWC was formed in 1946 under the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. In 1982, due to the severe impacts of whaling on the populations of large whale species, the IWC adopted an indefinite moratorium on all commercial whaling.

Despite the IWC moratorium on commercial whaling, significant whaling has continued. In particular, Japan and Iceland have been using a provision in the Convention—which allows countries to issue themselves permits for ''scientific whaling''—to kill whales in the name of science, and later sell the meat commercially. More than 8700 whales have been killed in lethal scientific whaling programs since the adoption of the commercial whaling moratorium, and press reports indicate that a new plan may be offered that would expand such whaling to fin and humpback whales. The IWC Scientific Committee has repeatedly stated that such lethal takes are not necessary for scientific research.

In this resolution we call on the U.S. delegation to remain firmly opposed to commercial whaling. We urge the U.S. to initiate or support efforts to oppose the unnecessary lethal taking of whales for scientific purposes and to seek to end the sale of meat and blubber from whales killed for scientific research in order to remove this perverse incentive.

This resolution comes at a time when discussions are underway in the IWC to establish a framework, or ''revised management scheme'' for any future commercial whaling, should it ever occur. The resolution calls for the U.S. delegation to the IWC to insist that any RMS negotiations remain separate from discussions on whether to lift the moratorium on commercial whaling, and that any such RMS include provisions on accountability, transparency, and compliance that are part of all effective international agreements. It further calls on the U.S. delegation to insist, as part of the RMS language, that lethal scientific whaling immediately cease upon the commencement of any commercial whaling. The resolution also firmly recognizes the rights of indigenous people to whale for subsistence purposes, and calls on the U.S. delegation to firmly reject any attempts to compromise such rights or to equate commercial whaling with such rights.

In order to ensure future abundance and health of whale populations, we call on the U.S. to support the work of the Conservation Committee, and to otherwise expand whale conservation efforts. The resolution calls for the U.S. delegation to support the permanent protection of whale populations through the establishment of whale sanctuaries in which commercial whaling is prohibited. Finally, the resolution directs the U.S. to make full use of all appropriate mechanisms to change the behavior of other nations which are undermining the protection of these magnificent creatures.

I would like to again thank chairwoman SNOWE for collaborating with me on this important effort, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on this issue.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution that is both timely and vital to the future of the world's large whale populations. In little more than a month, representatives from around the world will gather in South Korea for the 57th annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission. These representatives will consider proposals to weaken or lift the moratorium on commercial whaling and expand whaling operations around the globe. It is more critical than ever that the United States remains firmly opposed to any proposals to resume commercial whaling and maintain its leadership role in shaping global whale conservation policies through the Commission.

The Commission's early attempts to regulate commercial whaling did not stop the precipitous decline of whale populations around the world. This management failure exposed a dramatic lack of knowledge and understanding of whales and their environment. In response to dwindling whale populations, the Commission declared a global moratorium on commercial whaling in 1982. The United States was a leader in the efforts to establish this moratorium, and in the intervening decades we have continued our outspoken opposition to commercial whaling.

My colleagues and I are submitting this resolution to give needed support to the U.S. negotiators as they strive to preserve vital whale conservation measures through the International Whaling Commission. Pro-whaling countries have made clear, through numerous media outlets, that they plan to work to lift the moratorium at this year's meeting, a move that threatens to undo years of international efforts to recover whale populations. As a Nation we must stand firmly against lifting of the moratorium and the resumption of commercial whaling. But we cannot stop there. As we continue our international efforts for effective, global whale conservation we must work to close loopholes in, and end abuses of, Commission regulations. This resolution calls for the closing of a scientific whaling loophole that some countries are exploiting to allow whaling, not just in the open ocean, but in designated whale sanctuaries. Lethal scientific whaling is an outdated concept that serves no useful purpose; even the Commission's own Scientific Committee has called for the cessation of this practice. In addition to the scientific whaling provision, some countries choose to take reservations to the moratorium under which they continue to expand commercial whaling activities year after year. These unilateral actions weaken the Commission and undermine international whale conservation efforts; therefore, they must be brought to an end.

We must consider the future as we strive to ensure the sustainability of the world's whale populations. At this year's meeting, the Commission may address the critical issue of a Revised Management Scheme, or RMS, to govern whale conservation in future years. As we consider possible management systems, it is imperative that we build any RMS on a solid foundation of scientific knowledge and sustainability. If our Nation is to support any RMS, we must ensure that it addresses the need for additional research and ensure that all whaling outside the scheme ceases immediately. Any RMS that we are party to must also include provisions that we find in other international fisheries agreements, such as transparency in decision making, objective observers, and effective compliance mechanisms.

I thank my colleagues who have already signed on as co-sponsors of this resolution for their continuing commitment to marine conservation: Senators CANTWELL, LEVIN, KENNEDY, MCCAIN, LIEBERMAN, KERRY, COLLINS, BIDEN, JEFFORDS, DODD, LAUTENBERG, REED, WYDEN, BOXER, FEINSTEIN, PRYOR, and AKAKA. Their dedication to responsible protection and management of our whale populations helps ensure the healthy functioning of marine ecosystems for generations to come.

Whales constitute a vital component of the world's marine ecosystems. Whales are some of the largest and most intelligent mammals on Earth, and conserving them requires us to uphold strong international agreements and an unwavering commitment to science-based management. Supporting whale conservation is more critical now than ever, and I urge my colleagues to support swift passage of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 761. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 605 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill H.R. 3, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 761. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 605 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill H.R. 3, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 29, line 1, strike ''Control and'' and insert ''Inventory, control, and''.

On page 35, strike lines 15 through 21 and insert the following:

(C) PARK ROADS AND PARKWAYS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For park roads and parkways under section 204 of that title—

(I) $320,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; and

(II) $330,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

(ii) MINIMUM ALLOCATION TO CERTAIN STATES.—A State more than 50 percent of the acreage of which is within the National Park System shall receive not less than 3 percent of any funds appropriated under this subparagraph, to be used for park transportation projects.

(iii) MODIFICATION OF AUTHORIZATION.—Any amount authorized to be appropriated under section 2001(a)(1)(A) to carry out surface transportation research shall be reduced by—

(I) for fiscal year 2005, $29,025,031; and

(II) for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009, $29,638,742.

On page 140, strike lines 11 through 18, and insert the following:

''(10)(A) Recommending federally-assisted projects to implement or accommodate the use of a device capable of—

''(i) automatically capturing images of, measuring the speed of, and relating to, multiple vehicles in multiple lanes simultaneously; and

''(ii) correlating measured speeds to capture images of specific identified vehicles traveling in excess of posted speed limits in road work zones and construction areas.

''(B) Recommending appropriate measures to protect public security and privacy, including—

''(i) notice to drivers of the use of the devices described in subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) with respect to the information generated by the devices described in subparagraph (A)—

''(I) limitations on the number of, and authorization process relating to, individuals that may access the information;

''(II) limitations on the use, disclosure, and retention of the information; and

''(III) any measures necessary to ensure that the information is accessed only by an individual that is authorized to access the information.

''(11) Ensuring that any recommendation made under any of paragraphs (7) through (10) provides for an exemption for applicability to a State, with respect to a project or class of projects—

''(A) to the extent that a State notifies the Secretary in writing that safety is not expected to be adversely affected by nonapplication of the recommendation to the project or class of projects; or

''(B) in any case in which the State has in effect a law that prohibits a project or class of projects (including a device or activity to be installed or carried out under such a project).''.

On page 143, after the matter following line 25, add the following:

SEC. 14___. PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there has been considerable progress over the past 25 years in reducing the number and rate of alcohol-related highway fatalities;

(2) the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration projects that fatalities in alcohol-related crashes declined in 2004 for the second year in a row;

(3) in spite of this progress, an estimated 16,654 Americans died in 2004, in alcohol-related crashes;

(4) these fatalities comprise 39 percent of the annual total of highway fatalities;

(5) about 250,000 are injured each year in alcohol-related crashes;

(6) the past 2 years of decreasing alcohol-related fatalities follows a 3-year increase;

(7) drunk driving is the Nation's most frequently committed violent crime;

(8) the annual cost of alcohol-related crashes is over $100,000,000,000, including $9,000,000,000 in costs to employers;

(9) a Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving in 1982 and 1983 helped to lead to substantial progress on this issue; and

(10) these facts point to the need to renew the national commitment to preventing these deaths and injuries.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, in an effort to further change the culture of alcohol impaired driving on our Nation's highways, the President should consider establishing a Presidential Commission on Alcohol-Impaired Driving—

(1) comprised of—

(A) representatives of State and local governments, including state legislators;

(B) law enforcement;

(C) traffic safety experts, including researchers;

(D) victims of alcohol-related crashes;

(E) affected industries, including the alcohol, insurance, and auto industries;

(F) the business community;

(G) labor;

(H) the medical community;

(I) public health; and

(J) Members of Congress; and

(2) that not later than September 30, 2006, would—

(A) conduct a full examination of alcohol-impaired driving issues; and

(B) make recommendations for a broad range of policy and program changes that would serve to further reduce the level of deaths and injuries caused by drunk driving.

SEC. 14___. SENSE OF THE SENATE IN SUPPORT OF INCREASED PUBLIC AWARENESS OF BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION LEVELS AND THE DANGERS OF DRINKING AND DRIVING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in 2003—

(A) 17,013 Americans died in alcohol-related traffic crashes;

(B) 40 percent of the persons killed in traffic crashes died in alcohol-related crashes; and

(C) drivers with blood alcohol concentration levels over 0.15 were involved in 58 percent of alcohol-related traffic fatalities;

(2) research shows that 77 percent of Americans think they have received enough information about drinking and driving and the way in which alcohol affects individual blood alcohol concentration levels; and

(3) only 28 percent of the American public can correctly identify the legal limit of blood alcohol concentration of the State in which they reside.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration should work with State and local governments and independent organizations to increase public awareness of—

(1) State legal limits on blood alcohol concentration levels; and

(2) the dangers of drinking and driving.

SEC. 14___. GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL DRIVER TRAINING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall establish a program for making grants to commercial driver training schools and programs for the purpose of providing financial assistance to entry level drivers of commercial vehicles (as defined in section 31301 of title 49, United States Code).

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost for which a grant is made under this section shall be 80 percent.

(c) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the purpose of carrying out this section $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

On page 296, strike lines 13 through 18 and insert the following:

SEC. 1621. FEDERAL PROCUREMENT OF RECYCLED COOLANT.

On page 297, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 1622. CONSERVE BY BICYCLING PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PROGRAM.—The term ''program'' means the Conserve by Bicycling Program established by subsection (b).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Transportation.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department of Transportation a program to be known as the ''Conserve by Bicycling Program''.

(c) PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall establish not more than 10 pilot projects that are—

(A) dispersed geographically throughout the United States; and

(B) designed to conserve energy resources by encouraging the use of bicycles in place of motor vehicles.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A pilot project described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) use education and marketing to convert motor vehicle trips to bicycle trips;

(B) document project results and energy savings (in estimated units of energy conserved);

(C) facilitate partnerships among interested parties in at least 2 of the fields of—

(i) transportation;

(ii) law enforcement;

(iii) education;

(iv) public health;

(v) environment; and

(vi) energy;

(D) maximize bicycle facility investments;

(E) demonstrate methods that may be used in other regions of the United States; and

(F) facilitate the continuation of ongoing programs that are sustained by local resources.

(3) COST SHARING.—At least 20 percent of the cost of each pilot project described in paragraph (1) shall be provided from State or local sources.

(d) ENERGY AND BICYCLING RESEARCH STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences for, and the National Academy of Sciences shall conduct and submit to Congress a report on, a study on the feasibility of converting motor vehicle trips to bicycle trips.

(2) COMPONENTS.—The study shall—

(A) document the results or progress of the pilot projects under subsection (b);

(B) determine the type and duration of motor vehicle trips that people in the United States may feasibly make by bicycle, taking into consideration factors such as—

(i) weather;

(ii) land use and traffic patterns;

(iii) the carrying capacity of bicycles; and

(iv) bicycle infrastructure;

(C) determine any energy savings that would result from the conversion of motor vehicle trips to bicycle trips;

(D) include a cost-benefit analysis of bicycle infrastructure investments; and

(E) include a description of any factors that would encourage more motor vehicle trips to be replaced with bicycle trips.

On page 318, strike lines 13 through 23 and insert the following:

SEC. 1803. REVISION OF REGULATIONS.

Section 112(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) QUALIFIED PROJECTS.—A qualified project referred to in subparagraph (A) is a project under this chapter (including intermodal projects) for which the Secretary has approved the use of design-build contracting under criteria specified in regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

''(D) REGULATORY PROCESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Safe, Affordable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005, the Secretary shall promulgate revised regulations under section 1307(c) of the Transportation Equity Act for 21st Century (23 U.S.C. 112 note; 112 Stat. 230) that—

''(i) do not preclude State transportation departments or local transportation agencies from—

''(I) issuing requests for proposals;

''(II) proceeding with awards of design-build contracts; or

''(III) issuing notices to proceed with preliminary design work under design-build contracts; prior to compliance with section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332);

''(ii) require that the State transportation department or local transportation agency receive concurrence from the Secretary before carrying out an activity under clause (i); and

''(iii) preclude the design-build contractor from proceeding with final design or construction of any permanent improvement

prior to completion of the process under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).''.

On page 352, line 5, strike ''and''.

On page 352, line 9, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

On page 352, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

''(iii) not less than 40 percent of the amount made available under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year for the seismic retrofit of bridges for multilane, suspension bridges that—

''(I) were open to traffic prior to 1940; and

''(II) are located in high-seismic zones.''.

On page 357, line 5, strike ''and''.

On page 357, line 8, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

On page 357, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

''(3) support the planning, development, and construction of high priority corridors identified by section 1105(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240; 105 Stat. 2032).

On page 357, strike lines 12 through 14 and insert the following:

''(c) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall make allocations under this program for—

''(1) multistate highway and multimodal planning studies and construction; and

''(2) coordinated planning, development, and construction of high priority corridors identified by section 1105(c) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–240; 105 Stat. 2032).

On page 404, line 11, strike ''and transit''.

On page 410, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1830. US–95 PROJECT, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

Unless an agreement is reached between the Federal Highway Administration, the State of Nevada, and the Sierra Club, the State of Nevada may continue to completion construction of the project entitled ''US–95 Project in Las Vegas, Nevada'', as approved by the Federal Highway Administration on November 18, 1999, and selected in the record of decision dated January 28, 2000, on June 30, 2005.

On page 418, line 16, before the semicolon, insert '', including alternative materials used in highway drainage applications''.

Beginning on page 557, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 564, line 13, and insert the following:

TITLE III—TRANSPORTATION DISCRETIONARY SPENDING GUARANTEE AND BUDGET OFFSETS

SEC. 3101. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON OVERALL FEDERAL BUDGET.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) comprehensive statutory budget enforcement measures, the jurisdiction of which lies with the Senate Budget Committee and Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, should—

(A) be enacted this year; and

(B) address all areas of the Federal budget, including discretionary spending, direct spending, and revenues; and

(2) special allocations for transportation should be included in that context.

SEC. 3102. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CATEGORIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) HIGHWAY CATEGORY.—Section 250(c)(4)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(4)(B)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century'' and inserting ''Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) 69–8158–0–7–401 (Motor Carrier Safety Grants).

''(vi) 69–8159–0–7–401 (Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs).''.

(2) MASS TRANSIT CATEGORY.—Section 250(c)(4) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(4)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) MASS TRANSIT CATEGORY.—The term 'mass transit category' means the following budget accounts, or portions of the accounts, that are subject to the obligation limitations on contract authority provided in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 or for which appropriations are provided in accordance with authorizations contained in that Act:

''(i) 69–1120–0–1–401 (Administrative Expenses).

''(ii) 69–1134–0–1–401 (Capital Investment Grants).

''(iii) 69–8191–0–7–401 (Discretionary Grants).

''(iv) 69–1129–0–1–401 (Formula Grants).

''(v) 69–8303–0–7–401 (Formula Grants and Research).

''(vi) 69–1127–0–1–401 (Interstate Transfer Grants—Transit).

''(vii) 69–1125–0–1–401 (Job Access and Reverse Commute).

''(viii) 69–1122–0–1–401 (Miscellaneous Expired Accounts).

''(ix) 69–1139–0–1–401 (Major Capital Investment Grants).

''(x) 69–1121–0–1–401 (Research, Training and Human Resources).

''(xi) 69–8350–0–7–401 (Trust Fund Share of Expenses).

''(xii) 69–1137–0–1–401 (Transit Planning and Research).

''(xiii) 69–1136–0–1–401 (University Transportation Research).

''(xiv) 69–1128–0–1–401 (Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority).''.

(b) HIGHWAY FUNDING REVENUE ALIGNMENT.—Section 251(b)(1)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009'' after ''submits the budget'';

(B) by inserting ''the obligation limitation and outlay limit for'' after ''adjustments to''; and

(C) by striking ''provided in clause (ii)(I)(cc).'' and inserting the following: ''follows:

''(I) OMB shall take the actual level of highway receipts for the year before the current year and subtract the sum of the estimated level of highway receipts in clause (iii), plus any amount previously calculated under clauses (i)(II) and (ii) for that year.

''(II) OMB shall take the current estimate of highway receipts for the current year and subtract the estimated level of highway receipts in clause (iii) for that year.

''(III) OMB shall—

''(aa) take the sum of the amounts calculated under subclauses (I) and (II) and add that amount to the obligation limitation set forth in section 3103 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 for the highway category for the budget year, and calculate the outlay change resulting from that change in obligations relative to that amount for the budget year and each outyear using current estimates; and

''(bb) after making the calculation under item (aa), adjust the obligation limitation set forth in section 3103 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 for the budget year by adding the amount calculated under subclauses (I) and (II).'';

(2) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) When the President submits the supplementary budget estimates for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009 under section 1106 of title 31, United States Code, OMB's Mid-Session Review shall include adjustments to the obligation limitation and outlay limit for the highway category for the budget year and each outyear as follows:

''(I) OMB shall take the most recent estimate of highway receipts for the current year (based on OMB's Mid-Session Review) and subtract the estimated level of highway receipts in clause (iii) plus any amount previously calculated and included in the President's Budget under clause (i)(II) for that year.

''(II) OMB shall—

''(aa) take the amount calculated under subclause (I) and add that amount to the amount of obligations set forth in section 3103 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 for the highway category for the budget year, and calculate the outlay change resulting from that change in obligations relative to that amount for the budget year and each outyear using current estimates; and

''(bb) after making the calculation under item (aa), adjust the amount of obligations set forth in section 3103 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005 for the budget year by adding the amount calculated under subclause (I).''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) The estimated level of highway receipts for the purpose of this subparagraph are—

''(I) for fiscal year 2005, $34,163,000,000;

''(II) for fiscal year 2006, $36,972,000,000;

''(III) for fiscal year 2007, $38,241,000,000;

''(IV) for fiscal year 2008, $39,432,000,000; and

''(V) for fiscal year 2009, $40,557,000,000.

''(iv) In this subparagraph, the term ''highway receipts'' means the governmental receipts and interest credited to the highway account of the Highway Trust Fund.''.

(c) CONTINUATION OF SEPARATE SPENDING CATEGORIES.—For the purpose of section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), the discretionary spending limits for the highway category and the mass transit category shall be—

(1) for fiscal year 2005—

(A) $33,657,000,000 for the highway category; and

(B) $6,844,000,000 for the mass transit category;

(2) for fiscal year 2006—

(A) $37,086,000,000 for the highway category; and

(B) $5,989,000,000 for the mass transit category;

(3) for fiscal year 2007—

(A) $40,192,000,000 for the highway category; and

(B) $7,493,000,000 for the mass transit category;

(4) for fiscal year 2008—

(A) $41,831,000,000 for the highway category; and

(B) $8,479,000,000 for the mass transit category; and

(5) for fiscal year 2009—

(A) $42,883,000,000 for the highway category; and

(B) $9,131,000,000 for the mass transit category.

(d) ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, or 2003,'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009,''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''2002 and 2003'' and inserting ''2008 and 2009''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''1999'' and inserting ''2005'';

(ii) by striking ''2000 through 2003'' and inserting ''2006 through 2009''; and

(iii) by striking ''section 3103 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century'' and inserting ''section 6102 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''2000, 2001, 2002, or 2003'' and inserting ''2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009''.

SEC. 3103. LEVEL OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS.

(a) HIGHWAY CATEGORY.—For the purpose of section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)), the level of obligation limitations for the highway category is—

(1) for fiscal year 2005, $35,154,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2006, $40,110,000,000;

(3) for fiscal year 2007, $40,564,000,000;

(4) for fiscal year 2008, $42,544,000,000; and

(5) for fiscal year 2009, $43,281,000,000.

(b) MASS TRANSIT CATEGORY.—For the purpose of section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)), the level of obligation limitations for the mass transit category is—

(1) for fiscal year 2005, $7,609,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2006, $8,902,000,000;

(3) for fiscal year 2007, $9,367,000,000;

(4) for fiscal year 2008, $10,171,000,000; and

(5) for fiscal year 2009, $10,502,000,000.

For the purpose of this subsection, the term ''obligation limitations'' means the sum of budget authority and obligation limitations.

On page 566, strike lines 2 and 3 and insert the following:

''(C) blast furnace slag aggregate;

''(D) silica fume; and

''(E) any other waste material or byprod-

On page 582, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 5204. VOLUMETRIC EXCISE TAX CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE FUELS.

(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4081(a)(2)(A) (relating to rates of tax), as amended by section 5611 of this Act, is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (ii),

(B) by striking the period at the end of clause (iii), and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(iv) in the case of P Series Fuels, 18.3 cents per gallon,

''(v) in the case of compressed natural gas and hydrogen, 18.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline, and

''(vi) in the case of liquefied natural gas, any liquid fuel (other than ethanol and methanol) derived from coal (including peat), and liquid hydrocarbons derived from biomass (as defined in section 29(c)(3)), 24.3 cents per gallon.''.

(2) TREATMENT OF ALTERNATIVE FUEL AS TAXABLE FUEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 4083(a)(1) (defining taxable fuel) is amended—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B),

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting '', and'', and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) alternative fuel.''.

(B) DEFINITION.—Section 4083(a) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—The term 'alternative fuel' means—

''(A) compressed or liquefied natural gas,

''(B) P Series Fuels (as defined by the Secretary of Energy under section 13211(2) of title 42, United States Code,

''(C) hydrogen,

''(D) any liquid fuel (other than ethanol and methanol) derived from coal (including peat), and

''(E) liquid hydrocarbons derived from biomass (as defined in section 29(c)(3)).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4041(a), as amended by section 5101 of this Act, is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

''(2) SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed a tax on any alternative fuel (other than gas oil or fuel oil) and liquefied petroleum gas—

''(i) sold by any person to an owner, lessee, or other operator of a motor vehicle or motorboat for use as a fuel in such motor vehicle or motorboat, or

''(ii) used by any person as a fuel in a motor vehicle or motorboat unless there was a taxable sale of such fuel under clause (i).

''(B) EXEMPTION FOR PREVIOUSLY TAXED FUEL.—No tax shall be imposed by this paragraph on the sale or use of any alternative fuel or liquefied petroleum gas if tax was imposed on such alternative fuel or liquefied petroleum gas under section 4081 and the tax thereon was not credited or refunded.

''(C) RATE OF TAX.—Except as otherwise provided, the rate of the tax imposed by this paragraph shall be the rate of tax specified in clause (iv), (v), or (vi) of section 4081(a)(2)(A) on the alternative fuel which is in effect at the time of such sale or use. In the case of liquefied petroleum gas, the rate of the tax imposed by this paragraph shall be 13.6 cents per gallon (3.2 cents per gallon in the case of any sale or use after September 30, 2011).

''(D) BUS USES.—No tax shall be imposed by this paragraph on any sale for use, or use, described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 6427(b)(2) (relating to school bus and intracity transportation).''.

(b) CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL MIXTURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6426(a) (relating to allowance of credits) is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) the alternative fuel credit, plus

''(4) the alternative fuel mixture credit.''.

(2) ALTERNATIVE FUEL AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL MIXTURE CREDIT.—Section 6426 (relating to credit for alcohol fuel and biodiesel mixtures) is amended by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (f) and (g) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) ALTERNATIVE FUEL CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the alternative fuel credit is the product of 50 cents and the number of gallons of an alternative fuel or gasoline gallon equivalents of a nonliquid alternative fuel sold by the taxpayer for use as a motor fuel in a highway vehicle.

''(2) ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'alternative fuel'—

''(A) has the meaning given such term by subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (E) of section 4083(a)(4),

''(B) includes any liquid fuel derived from coal (including peat) through the Fischer-Tropsch process, and

''(C) does not include ethanol, methanol, or biodiesel.

''(3) GASOLINE GALLON EQUIVALENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'gasoline gallon equivalent' means, with respect to any nonliquid alternative fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 124,800 (higher heating value).

''(4) TERMINATION.—This subsection shall not apply to any sale, use, or removal for any period after September 30, 2009.

''(e) ALTERNATIVE FUEL MIXTURE CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the alternative fuel mixture credit is the product of 50 cents and the number of gallons of alternative fuel used by the taxpayer in producing any alternative fuel mixture for sale or use in a trade or business of the taxpayer.

''(2) ALTERNATIVE FUEL MIXTURE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'alternative fuel mixture' means a mixture of alternative fuel and taxable fuel (as defined in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 4083(a)(1)) which—

''(A) is sold by the taxpayer producing such mixture to any person for use as fuel in a highway vehicle, or

''(B) is used as a fuel in a highway vehicle by the taxpayer producing such mixture.

''(3) TERMINATION.—This subsection shall not apply to any sale, use, or removal for any period after September 30, 2009.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The section heading for section 6426 is amended by striking ''ALCOHOL FUEL AND BIODIESEL'' and inserting ''CERTAIN ALTERNATIVE FUEL''.

(B) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by striking ''alcohol fuel and biodiesel'' in the item relating to section 6426 and inserting ''certain alternative fuel''.

(C) Section 6427(a) is amended by striking ''paragraph (2) or (3) of section 4041(a) or section 4041(c)'' and inserting ''section 4041(a)(2) or 4041(c)''.

(D) Section 6427(e) is amended—

(i) by inserting ''or the alternative fuel mixture credit'' after ''biodiesel mixture credit'' in paragraph (1),

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) ALTERNATIVE FUEL.—If any person produces an alternative fuel described in section 6426 in such person's trade or business, the Secretary shall pay (without interest) to such person an amount equal to the alternative fuel credit with respect to such fuel.'',

(iii) by striking ''under paragraph (1) with respect to any mixture'' in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by clause (ii)) and inserting ''under paragraph (1) or (2) with respect to any mixture or alternative fuel'',

(iv) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (4)(A) (as redesignated by clause (ii)),

(v) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4)(B) (as so redesignated),

(vi) by adding at the end of paragraph (4) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) any alternative fuel or alternative fuel mixture (as defined in section 6426 (d)(2) or (e)(3)) sold or used after September 30, 2009.'', and

(vii) by striking ''OR BIODIESEL USED TO PRODUCE ALCOHOL FUEL AND BIODIESEL MIXTURES'' in the heading and inserting '', BIODIESEL, OR ALTERNATIVE FUEL''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any sale, use, or removal for any period after September 30, 2006.

On page 583, line 14, insert ''received on or after October 1, 2005, and before October 1, 2011,'' after ''taxes''.

On page 585, strike lines 12 and 13, and insert the following:

graphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''TRUST FUND''.

On page 585, line 21, strike ''Sports'' and insert ''Sport''.

On page 628, strike line 23, and insert the following:

and inserting ''$155 (in the case of any calendar year after 2009, the dollar amount specified in subparagraph (B) for such year)'', and

On page 630, line 7, insert ''shall propose options for implementing exemptions for classes of vehicles whose nonpropulsive fuel use exceeds 50 percent,'' after ''taxes,''.

On page 631, line 7, insert '', except that the Secretary shall report and take action under subsection (a)(1) not later than July 1, 2006'' before the period at the end.

Beginning on page 2, line 8, of Modified Amendment No. 670, strike all through page 3, line 9, and insert the following:

''(b) LIMITATION.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any alternative fuel vehicle refueling property shall not exceed—

''(1) $30,000 in the case of a property of a character subject to an allowance for depreciation, and

''(2) $1,000 in any other case.

''(c) QUALIFIED ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term 'qualified alternative fuel vehicle refueling property' has the meaning given to such term by section 179A(d), but only with respect to any fuel at least 85 percent of the volume of which consists of ethanol, natural gas, compressed natural gas, liquefied natural gas, and hydrogen.

''(2) RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.—In the case of any property installed on property which is used as the principal residence (within the meaning of section 121) of the taxpayer, paragraph (1) of section 179A(d) shall not apply.

On page 635, before line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 5310. DIESEL FUEL TAX EVASION REPORT.

Not later than 360 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue shall report to the Committees on Finance and Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the availability of new technologies that can be employed to enhance collections of the excise tax on diesel fuel and the plans of the Internal Revenue Service to employ such technologies.

On page 698, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 5516. LIMITATION OF EMPLOYER DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 274(e) (relating to expenses treated as compensation) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) EXPENSES TREATED AS COMPENSATION.—Expenses for goods, services, and facilities, to the extent that the expenses do not exceed the amount of the expenses which are treated by the taxpayer, with respect to the recipient of the entertainment, amusement, or recreation, as compensation to an employee on the taxpayer's return of tax under this chapter and as wages to such employee for purposes of chapter 24 (relating to withholding of income tax at source on wages).''.

(b) PERSONS NOT EMPLOYEES.—Paragraph (9) of section 274(e) is amended by striking ''to the extent that the expenses are includible in the gross income'' and inserting ''to the extent that the expenses do not exceed the amount of the expenses which are includible in the gross income''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to expenses incurred after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5517. INCREASE IN PENALTY FOR BAD CHECKS AND MONEY ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6657 (relating to bad checks) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$750'' and inserting ''$1,250'', and

(2) by striking ''$15'' and inserting ''$25''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply to checks or money orders received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5518. ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE DEDUCTION ON MINING EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS UNDER THE MINIMUM TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 57(a)(1) (relating to depletion) is amended by striking ''for the taxable year)'' and inserting ''for the taxable year and determined without regard to so much of the basis as is attributable to mining exploration and development costs described in section 616 or 617 for which a deduction is allowable for any taxable year under this part).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment this Act.

On page 722, line 2, insert ''for use as a fuel'' after ''liquid''.

On page 722, line 5, insert ''for use as a fuel'' after ''liquid''.

On page 722, line 15, insert ''AS A FUEL'' after ''USED''.

On page 944, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 6044. COMMUTER RAIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Transit Administration shall approve final design for the project authorized under section 3030(c)(1)(A)(xliv) of the Federal Transit Act of 1998 and section 1214(g) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (16 U.S.C. 668dd note) in the absence of an access agreement with the owner of the railroad right of way.

(b) TIMELY RESOLUTION OF ISSUES.—The Secretary shall timely resolve any issues delaying the completion of the project authorized under section 1214(g) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (16 U.S.C. 668dd note) and section 3030(c)(1)(A)(xliv) of the Federal Transit Act of 1998.

On page 1021, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 7130. CERTIFICATION OF VEHICLE EMISSION PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

(a) REGISTRATION OF MOTOR CARRIERS.—Section 13902(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code (as amended by section 7117(b)), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) a requirement that a motor carrier certify that, beginning on January 1, 2007, any vehicle operated by the motor carrier will comply with the heavy duty vehicle and engine emissions performance standards and related regulations established by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under section 202(a)(3) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521(a)(3));''.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make recommendations to Congress on methods of ensuring that trucks built before January 1, 2007, that are operating in the United States comply with any emissions performance standard under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) that was applicable to the truck on the date on which the engine of the truck was manufactured.

On page 1069, after line 10, add the following:

SEC. 7155. SCHOOL BUS ENDORSEMENT KNOWLEDGE TEST REQUIREMENT.

The Secretary shall recognize any driver who passes a test approved by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration as meeting the knowledge test requirement for a school bus endorsement under section 383.123 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

On page 1091, line 17, strike ''$1,000,000,000'' and insert ''$1,000,000''.

On page 1111, line 17, strike ''or'' after the semicolon and insert ''and''.

On page 1224, strike lines 6 through 10 and insert the following:

SEC. 7402. DEFINITIONS; APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.

(a) TERMS USED IN THIS CHAPTER.—In this chapter, the terms ''carrier'', ''household goods'', ''motor carrier'', ''Secretary'', and ''transportation'' have the meaning given such terms in section 13102 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) ''HOUSEHOLD GOODS MOTOR CARRIER'' IN PART B OF SUBTITLE IV OF TITLE 49.—Section 13102 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (24) as paragraphs (13) through (25) and by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

''(12) HOUSEHOLD GOODS MOTOR CARRIER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'household goods motor carrier' means a motor carrier described in subparagraph (B) that, in the ordinary course of its business of providing transportation of household goods, offers some or all of the following additional services:

''(i) Binding and nonbinding estimates.

''(ii) Inventorying.

''(iii) Protective packing and unpacking of individual items at personal residences.

''(iv) Loading and unloading at personal residences.

''(B) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—A motor carrier is described in this subparagraph if its operations require it to register as a household goods motor carrier under—

''(i) section 13902 of this title; and

''(ii) regulations prescribed by the Secretary consistent with Federal agency determinations and decisions that were in effect on the date of enactment of the Household Goods Mover Oversight Enforcement and Reform Act of 2005.

''(C) LIMITED SERVICE EXCLUSION.—The term 'household goods motor carrier' does not include a motor carrier solely because it provides transportation of household goods entirely packed in, and unpacked from, 1 or more containers or trailers by the individual shipper.''.

(c) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The provisions of title 49, United States Code, or of this chapter, relating to the transportation of household goods apply only to a household goods motor carrier (as defined in section 13102(12) of title 49, United States Code).

On page 1234, beginning with line 8, strike through line 6 on page 1235 and insert the following:

''(b) NOTICE AND CONSENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The State shall serve written notice to the Secretary or the Board, as the case may be, of any civil action under subsection (a) prior to initiating such civil action. The notice shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate such civil action.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary or the Board—

''(A) shall review the initiation of the action by the State if—

''(i) the carrier or broker (as such terms are defined in section 13102 of this title) is not registered with the Department of Transportation;

''(ii) the license of a carrier or broker for failure to file proof of required bodily injury or cargo liability insurance is pending, or the license has been revoked for any other reason by the Department of Transportation;

''(iii) the carrier is not rated or has received a conditional or unsatisfactory safety rating by the Department of Transportation; or

''(iv) the carrier or broker has been licensed with the Department of Transportation for less than 5 years; and

''(B) may review if the carrier or broker fails to meet criteria developed by the Secretary that are consistent with this section.

''(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of any criteria developed by the Secretary under paragraph (2)(B).

''(5) 60-DAY DEADLINE.—The Secretary or the Board shall be considered to have consented to any such action if the Secretary or the Board has taken no action with respect to the notice within 60 calendar days after the date on which the Secretary or the Board received notice under paragraph (1).

''(c) AUTHORITY TO INTERVENE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving the notice required by subsection (b), the Secretary or Board may intervene in such civil action and upon intervening—

''(A) be heard on all matters arising in such civil action;

''(B) file petitions for appeal of a decision in such civil action; and

''(C) be substituted, upon the filing of a motion with the court, for the State as parens patriae in the action.

''(2) SUBSTITUTION.—If the Secretary or the Board files a motion under paragraph (1)(C), the court shall—

''(A) grant the motion without further hearing or procedure;

''(B) substitute the Secretary or the Board, as appropriate, for the State as plaintiff; and

''(C) if requested by the Secretary or the Board, dismiss the State as a party to the action.

''(d) CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing any civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this section shall—

''(1) convey a right to initiate or maintain a class action lawsuit in the enforcement of a Federal law or regulation; or

''(2) prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of such State to conduct investigations or to administer oaths or affirmations or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

On page 1247, beginning on line 23, strike ''For fiscal years 2006 through 2020,'' and insert ''For fiscal years 2005 through 2019,''.

On page 1249, beginning on line 7, strike ''For a fiscal year after fiscal year 2005,'' and insert ''For fiscal year 2005 and each subsequent fiscal year,''.

On page 1249, beginning on line 24, strike ''for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2005,'' and insert ''for fiscal year 2005 and each subsequent fiscal year,''.

On page 1252, beginning on line 18, strike ''For each fiscal year after fiscal year 2005,'' and insert ''For fiscal year 2005 and each subsequent fiscal year,''.

On page 1281, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 76___. FEDERAL SCHOOL BUS DRIVER QUALIFICATIONS.

The effective date of section 383.123 of volume 49, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), shall be September 30, 2006.

Beginning on page 1281, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 1291, line 19.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, May 18, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on Taking Lands into Trust.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, May 25, 2005, at 10 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution to acknowledge a long history of official depredations and ill-conceived policies by the United States Government regarding Indian tribes and offer an apology to all Native Peoples on behalf of the United States.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224–2251.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Saxby Chambliss:									
Switzerland	Franc		615.00						615.000
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Total			979.00						979.00

SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, Apr. 4, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2004

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Scott B. Gudes:									
Venezuela	Dollar		400.00						400.00
Costa Rica	Dollar		400.00						400.00
United States	Dollar				2,035.00				2,035.00
Rebecca M. Davies:									
Spain	Euros		738.75						738.75
United Kingdom	Pound		1,223.75						1,223.75
United States	Dollar				5,496.40				5,496.40
Tim Rieser:									
Nepal	Dollar		150.00				60.00		210.00
Sri Lanka	Dollar		240.00				90.00		330.00
United States	Dollar				4,327.00				4,327.00]
Total			3,152.50		11,858.40		150.00		15,160.90

THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Apr. 14, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas P. Hawkins:									
Philippines	Peso		732.00						732.00
Indonesia	Rupiah		532.00						532.00
Singapore	Dollar		444.15						444.15
Cambodia	Riel		406.00						406.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		822.00						822.00
United States	Dollar				6,657.74				6,657.74
Pakistan	Rupee		313.00						313.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		270.00						270.00
Italy	Lira		1,530.00		860.00				2,390.00
Paul C. Grove:									
Pakistan	Rupee		313.00						313.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		270.00						270.00
Italy	Lira		1,530.00		860.00				2,390.00
Mark Lippert:									
Philippines	Peso		732.00						732.00
Indonesia	Rupiah		532.00						532.00
Singapore	Dollar		444.15						444.15
Cambodia	Riel		406.00						406.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		822.00						822.00
United States	Dollar				7,015.92				7,015.92
Senator Sam Brownback:									
Sri Lanka	Rupee		669.00						669.00
India	Rupee		368.00						368.00
United States	Dollar				7,640.38				7,640.38
Landon Fulmer:									
Sri Lanka	Rupee		824.00						824.00
India	Rupee		590.00						590.00
United States	Dollar				7,873.16				7,873.16
Dennis Ward:									
Qatar	Dollar		148.00						148.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		503.25						503.25
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
United States	Dollar				6,544.05				6,544.05
Sean Knowles:									
Qatar	Dollar		148.00						148.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		503.25						503.25
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
United States	Dollar				6,514.05				6,514.05
Italy	Euro		743.00						743.00
United States	Dollar				7,419.37				7,419.37
Barry G. Wright:									
Qatar	Dollar		148.00						148.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		503.25						503.25
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
United States	Dollar				6,660.05				6,660.05
Christiana Evans:									
Qatar	Dollar		148.00						148.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		503.25						503.25
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
United States	Dollar				6,454.05		45.00		6,499.05
Senator Christopher Bond:									
Singapore	Dollar		538.00						538.00
Malaysia	Ringgit		358.00						358.00
Indonesia	Rupiah		532.00						532.00
United States	Dollar				6,658.00				6,658.00
John R. Bartling:									
Singapore	Dollar		538.00						538.00
Malaysia	Ringgit		358.00						358.00
Indonesia	Rupiah		532.00						532.00
United States	Dollar				6,658.00				6,658.00
Jason Ian Eaton:									
Singapore	Dollar		538.00						538.00
Malaysia	Ringgit		358.00						358.00
Indonesia	Rupiah		532.00						532.00
United States	Dollar				6,616.00				6,616.00
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
Switzerland	Franc		615.00						615.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Senator Wayne Allard:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		150.00						150.00
Jayson Roehl:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		150.00						150.00
Paul Carliner:									
New Zealand	Dollar		900.00						900.00
United States	Dollar				8,570,00				8,570.00
Total			25,512.30		93,000.77		45.00		118,558.07

THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Apr. 20, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Lynn F. Rusten:									
United States	Dollar				5,944.70				5,944.70
Russia	Dollar		1,340.00						1,340.00
Madelyn R. Creedon:									
United States	Dollar				5,839.00				5,839.00
Russia	Dollar		1,487.00						1,487.00
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Qatar	Rial		100.00						100.00
Kuwait	Dinar		930.00						930.00
United States	Dollar				5,914.89				5,914.89
Arch Galloway II:									
Qatar	Rial		90.00						90.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kuwait	Dinar		940.00						940.00
United States	Dollar				5,914.89				5,914.89
Ambrose R. Hock:									
Qatar	Rial		46.00						46.00
Kuwait	Dinar		981.00						981.00
United States	Dollar				5,914.89				5,914.89
William C. Greenwalt:									
United States	Dollar				6,087.33				6,087.33
United Kingdom	Pound		1,149.60		134.47				1,284.07
Peter K. Levine:									
United States	Dollar				6,087.33				6,087.33
United Kingdom	Pound		1,136.34		134.47		32.30		1,303.01
Senator Jack Reed:									
United States	Dollar				10,862.50				10,862.50
Qatar	Dollar						7.00		7.00
Kuwait	Dollar		263.00				7.00		270.00
Elizabeth King:									
United States	Dollar				10,967.50				10,967.50
Qatar	Dollar		128.54						128.54
Kuwait	Dollar		249.00				8.00		257.00
Lucian L. Niemeyer:									
United States	Dollar				6,454.00				6,454.00
Qatar	Dollar		8.00						8.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		10.50						10.50
United Arab Emirates	Dollar		52.18						52.18
Kuwait	Dollar		655.00						655.00
Michael J. McCord:									
United States	Dollar				6,454.00				6,454.00
Qatar	Dollar		13.00						13.00
United Arab Emirates	Dollar		38.00						38.00
Kuwait	Dollar		646.00						646.00
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Germany	Euro		373.88				15.15		389.03
John Bonsell:									
Germany	Euro		201.12				10.10		211.12
Ryan Thompson:									
Germany	Euro		148.50				10.00		158.50
Senator John McCain:									
Switzerland	Franc		102.21						102.21
Richard H. Fontaine:									
Switzerland	Franc		585.00						585.00
Senator Lindsey O. Graham:									
Kuwait	Dollar		810.00				233.00		1,043.00
Pakistan	Rupee		179.00				207.75		386.75
Afghanistan	Dollar						90.00		90.00
Tunisia	Dinar		84.00				142.50		226.50
Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton:									
Kuwait	Dollar		1,139.00						1,139.00
Pakistan	Rupee		419.75						419.75
Huma Abedin:									
Kuwait	Dollar		899.50						899.50
Pakistan	Rupee		240.75						240.75
Richard H. Fontaine:									
Kuwait	Dollar		1,180.00						1,180.00
Pakistan	Rupee		228.50						228.50
Afghanistan	Dollar		100.00						100.00
Tunisia	Dinar		251.50						251.50
Senator Susan M. Collins:									
Kuwait	Dollar		1,043.00						1,043.00
Pakistan	Rupee		239.75						239.75
Afghanistan	Dollar		90.00						90.00
Tunisia	Dinar		282.50						282.50
Senator John McCain:									
Kuwait	Dollar		998.00						998.00
Pakistan	Rupee		279.00						279.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		90.00						90.00
Tunisia	Dinar		260.00						260.00
Senator Joseph Lieberman:									
Germany	Dollar		581.50						581.50
Frederick M. Downey:									
Germany	Dollar		781.50						781.50
Andrew Shapiro:									
Germany	Dollar		153.00						153.00
United States	Dollar				5,797.26				5,797.26
Richard H. Fontaine:									
Germany	Dollar		250.00						250.00
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Arch Galloway II:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		140.00						140.00
Robert M. Soofer:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		117.00						117.00
Senator John Cornyn:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		150.00						150.00
Russell J. Thomasson:									
Marshall Islands	Dollar		110.00						110.00
Senator John Thune:									
Germany	Euro		352.32						352.32
Matthew Zabel:									
Germany	Euro		352.32						352.32
Total			23,422,22		82,507.23		891.14		106,820.59

JOHN W. WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 15, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2004

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Charles W. Alsup:									
Colombia	Peso		469.00				65.00		534.00
Ecuador	Dollar		43.00				40.00		83.00
Paraguay	Guarani		113.25				20.00		133.25
Brazil	Real		114.00				35.00		149.00
United States	Dollar				4,698.27				4,698.27
Evelyn N. Farkas:									
United States	Dollar				4,698.27				4,698.27
Colombia	Peso		520.00						520.00
Ecuador	Dollar		43.00						43.00
Paraguay	Guarani		105.70						105.70
Brazil	Real		114.00						114.00
Senator Carl Levin:									
Kuwait	Dollar		688.00						688.00
Belgium	Euro		521.70						521.70
United Kingdom	Pound		135.00						135.00
Total			2,866.65		9,396.54		160.00		12,423.19

JOHN W. WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Apr. 12, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard Shelby:									
Switzerland	Franc		618.00						618.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Kathleen L. Casey:									
Switzerland	Franc		618.00						618.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Louis Tucker:									
Switzerland	Franc		618.00						618.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Walter E. Fischer:									
United States	Dollar				7,722.00				7,722.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		404.00						404.00
Bahrain	Dinar		298.00						298.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		76.00						76.00
Israel	Shekel		1,017.00						1,017.00
John V. O'Hara:									
United States	Dollar				7,722.00				7,722.00
United Arab Emirates:	Dirham		404.00						404.00
Bahrain	Dinar		263.00						263.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		73.00						73.00
Israel	Shekel		817.00						817.00
Steven R. Kroll:									
United States	Dollar				7,722.00				7,722.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		404.00						404.00
Bahrain	Dinar		313.00						313.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		185.00						185.00
Steven R. Kroll:									
Israel	Shekel		1,017.00						1,017.00
Robin Landauer:									
United States	Dollar				5,507.00				5,507.00
China	Dollar				382.00				382.00
China	Yuan		894.00						894.00
Theodore Dahlstrom:									
United States	Dollar				6,422.00				6,422.00
China	Dollar				382.00				382.00
China	Yuan		894.00						894.00
Bryan N. Corbett:									
United States	Dollar				6,627.00				6,627.00
United Kingdom	Pound		964.00						964.00
France	Euro		924.00						924.00
Belgium	Euro		790.00						790.00
Mark F. Oesterle:									
United States	Dollar				6,627.00				6,627.00
United Kingdom	Pound		964.00						964.00
France	Euro		924.00						924.00
Belgium	Euro		790.00						790.00
Steven Patterson:									
United States	Dollar				6,627.00				6,627.00
United Kingdom	Pound		964.00						964.00
France	Euro		924.00						924.00
Belgium	Euro		790.00						790.00
Maurice Perkins:									
United States	Dollar				6,627.00				6,627.00
United Kingdom	Pound		964.00						964.00
France	Euro		924.00						924.00
Berlgium	Euro		790.00						790.00
Dean V. Shahinian:									
United States	Dollar				6,627.00				6,627.00
United Kingdom	Pound		964.00						964.00
France	Euro		924.00						924.00
Belgium	Euro		790.00						790.00
Total			23,395.00		68,994.00				92,389.00

RICHARD C. SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Apr. 20, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Susan G. Keenom:									
Switzerland	Franc		615.00						615.00
Framce	Euro		364.00						364.00
Jean Toal Eisen:									
New Zealand	Dollar		591.30						591.30
United States	Dollar				1,900.60				1,900.60
Floyd DesChamps:									
New Zealand	Dollar		840.00						840.00
United States	Dollar				8,382.77				8,382.77
Chris Socha:									
Kuwait	Dinar		491.00						491.00
Germany	Euro		16.44						16.44
Wesley Denton:									
Kuwait	Dinar		490.59						490.59
Germany	Euro		16.44						16.44
Senator Jim DeMint:									
Kuwait	Dinar		491.00				30.30		521.30
Germany	Euro		41.61				13.09		54.70
Matthew Paxton:									
Belgium	Euro		1,316.94						1,316.94
United States	Dollar				5,906.87				5,906.87
Total			5,274.32		16,190.24		43.39		21,507.95

TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
Apr. 20, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jeff Bingaman:									
India	Rupee		2,256.07						2,256.07
United States	Dollar				6,394.81				6,394.81
Robert Simon:									
India	Rupee		2,608.94						2,608.94
United States	Dollar				6,394.81				6,394.81
Stephen D. Ward:									
India	Rupee		2,555.57						2,555.57
United States	Dollar				6,394.81				6,394.81
Allen Stayman:									
Micronesia/Marshall	Dollar		1,431.79						1,431.79
United States	Dollar				4,599.60				4,599.60
Joshua Johnson:									
Micronesia/Marshall	Dollar		1,665.78						1,665.78
United States	Dollar				7,440.50				7,440.50
Colin T. Hayes:									
Canada	Dollar		615.00						615.00
United States	Dollar				872.32				872.32
Clint Williamson:									
Canada	Dollar		570.00						570.00
United States	Dollar				872.32				872.32
Total			11,703.15		32,969.17				44,672.32

PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Apr. 18, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Gordon Smith:									
Switzerland	Franc		615.00						615.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Robert F. Epplin:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,083.00						1,083.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Paul Matulic:									
Switzerland	Franc		615.00						615.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Robert F. Epplin:									
Jordan	Dinar		508.00						508.00
Egypt	Pound		867.00						867.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		991.70						991.70
Senator Gordon Smith:									
Jordan	Dinar		508.00						508.00
Egypt	Pound		867.00						867.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		991.70						991.70
Total			8,138.40						8,138.40

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Oct. 14, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator George Allen:									
Jordan	Dinar		254.00						254.00
Israel	Shekel		339.00						339.00
United States	Dollar				6,067.76				6,067.76
Senator Joseph Biden:									
Switzerland	Franc		615.00						615.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Senator Lincoln Chafee:									
Venezuela	Bolivar		266.03						266.03
Paraguay	Guarini		295.10				793.89		1,088.99
Argentina	Peso		300.01						300.01
Peru	Neuvo Sol		574.00						574.00
Ecuador	Dollar		130.27				725.41		855.68
Senator Christopher Dodd:									
Venezuela	Bolivar		283.00						283.00
Paraguay	Guarini		375.00				793.89		1,168.89
Argentina	Peso		308.00						308.00
Peru	Neuvo Sol		773.00						773.00
Ecuador	Dollar		235.80				725.41		961.21
Senator Christopher Dodd:									
Switzerland	Franc		510.00						510.00
United States	Dollar				2,141.19				2,141.19
Senator Russell Feingold:									
Algeria	Dinar		205.00						205.00
Chad	Franc		148.00						148.00
Mali	Franc		301.00						301.00
United States	Dollar				7,096.88				7,096.88
Senator Russell Feingold:									
Kuwait	Dinar		1,060.50						1,060.50
Pakistan	Rupee		238.75				534.12		772.87
Afghanistan	Afghani		34.00						34.00
Tunisia	Dinar		191.50						191.50
Senator John Kerry:									
Jordan	Dinar		548.00						548.00
Kuwait	Dinar		348.00						348.00
Syria	Pound		206.00						206.00
Israel	Shekel		961.00						961.00
Egypt	Pound		286.00						286.00
Germany	Euro		402.00						402.00
United Kingdom	Pound		482.00						482.00
France	Euro		462.00						462.00
United States	Dollar				7,055.64				7,055.64
Senator Mel Martinez:									
Israel	Shekel		909.90						909.90
Turkey	Lira		483.60						483.60
Senator Lisa Murkowski:									
Israel	Shekel		909.90						909.90
Turkey	Lira		483.60						483.60
Senator Bill Nelson:									
Venezuela	Bolivar		160.00						160.00
Paraguay	Guarini		208.00		156.00		793.89		1,157.89
Argentina	Peso		256.00						256.00
Peru	Neuvo Sol		124.00						124.00
Jonah Blank:									
Indonesia	Rupiah		3,000.00						3,000.00
United States	Dollar				12,791.72				12,791.72
Deborah Brayton:									
Venezuela	Bolivar		283.00						283.00
Paraguay	Guarini		375.00				793.89		1,168.89
Argentina	Peso		308.00						308.00
Peru	Neuvo Sol		773.00						773.00
Ecuador	Dollar		235.00				725.41		960.41
Paul Foldi:									
Haiti	Gourde		560.00						560.00
United States	Dollar				1,176.15				1,176.15
Heather Flynn:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,180.00						1,180.00
Zambia	Kwacha		588.00						588.00
United States	Dollar				9,294.00				9,294.00
Michelle Gavin:									
Algeria	Dinar		233.00						233.00
Chad	Franc		148.00						148.00
Mali	Franc		372.00						372.00
United States	Dollar				7,096.88				7,096.88
Frank Jannuzi:									
China	Yuan		1,401.00						1,401.00
Japan	Yen		1,594.00						1,594.00
Thailand	Baht		1,160.00						1,160.00
United States	Dollar				9,188.00				9,188.00
Norm Kurz:									
Israel	Shekel		678.00						678.00
Keith Luse:									
Indonesia	Rupiah		2,915.26						2,915.26
Vietnam	Dong		563.68		536.00				1,099.68
United States	Dollar				6,334.34				6,334.34
Bill Martin:									
Israel	Shekel		396.00						396.00
Dan McLaughlin:									
Venezuela	Bolivar		283.00						283.00
Paraguay	Guarini		375.00				793.89		1,168.89
Argentina	Peso		311.00						311.00
Peru	Neuvo Sol		773.00						773.00
Ecuador	Dollar		236.00				725.41		961.41
Janice O'Connell:									
Venezuela	Bolivar		283.00						283.00
Paraguay	Guarini		375.00				798.89		1,173.89
Argentina	Peso		308.00						308.00
Peru	Neuvo Sol		773.00						773.00
Ecuador	Dollar		235.80				725.41		961.21
United States	Dollar				470.50				470.50
Jonathan Pearl:									
Venezuela	Bolivar		283.00						283.00
Paraguay	Guarini		375.00				793.89		1,168.89
Argentina	Peso		308.00						308.00
Peru	Neuvo Sol		773.00						773.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ecuador	Dollar		235.80				725.41		961.21
Nilmini Rubin:									
Sri Lanka	Rupee		1,528,00						1,528.00
United States	Dollar				9,309.01				9,309.01
Kim Savit:									
Israel	Shekel		622.31						622.31
Jennifer Simon:									
Haiti	Gourde		702.00						702.00
United States	Dollar				1,176.15				1,176.15
Nancy Stetson:									
Jordan	Dinar		722.00						722.00
Kuwait	Dinar		354.00						354.00
Syria	Pound		216.00						216.00
Israel	Shekel		980.00						980.00
Egypt	Pound		289.00						289.00
Germany	Euro		298.00						298.00
United Kingdom	Pound		482.00						482.00
France	Euro		462.00						462.00
United States	Dollar				5,862.54				5,862.54
Puneet Talwar:									
Israel	Shekel		678.00						678.00
Switzerland	Franc		615.00						615.00
France	Euro		364.00						364.00
Greece	Euro		1,127.00						1,127.00
United States	Dollar				5,991.23				5,991.23
Paul Unger:									
Jordan	Dinar		254.00						254.00
Israel	Shekel		319.00						319.00
United States	Dollar				6,067.76				6,067.76
David Wade:									
Jordan	Dinar		762.00						762.00
Kuwait	Dinar		355.00						355.00
Syria	Pound		230.00						230.00
Israel	Shekel		977.00						977.00
Egypt	Pound		340.00						340.00
Germany	Euro		390.00						390.00
United Kingdom	Pound		430.00						430.00
France	Euro		400.00						400.00
United States	Dollar				5,862.54				5,862.54
Total			51,391.50		103,674.29		10,675.12		165,740.91

RICHARD G. LUGAR,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 21, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2004

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lincoln Chafee:									
Bahrain	Dinar						1,040.00		1,040.00
Senator Chuck Hagel:									
Bahrain	Dinar						1,040.00		1,040.00
Deborah Brayton:									
Bahrain	Dinar						1,040.00		1,040.00
Andrew Parasiliti:									
Bahrain	Dinar						1,040.00		1,040.00
Patrick Garvey:									
Kuwait	Dinar		3,152.00				333.99		3,485.99
United States	Dollar				7,103.00				7,103.00
Kim Savit:									
Kuwait	Dinar						333.99		333.99
Total			3,152.00		7,103.00		4,827.98		15,082.98

RICHARD G. LUGAR,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 21, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jennifer Tyree:									
United States	Dollar				1,513.39				1,513.39
Ireland	Euro		480.00						480.00
United Kingdom	Pound		710.00						710.00
Belgium	Euro		1,503.18						1,503.18
Deborah Parkinson:									
United States	Dollar				1,513.39				1,513.39
Ireland	Euro		446.35						446.35
United Kingdom	Pound		809.84						809.84
Belgium	Euro		1,356.04						1,356.04
Senator Daniel K. Akaka:									
Vietnam	Dong		1,117.00						1,117.00
Richard Kessler:									
Vietnam	Dong		1,117.00						1,117.00
Leeland Erickson:									
United States	Dollar				1,000.67				1,000.67
Switzerland	Franc		1,789.60						1,789.60
Steven Groves:									
United States	Dollar				1,000.67				1,000.67

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Switzerland	Franc		1,789.60						1,789.60
Laura Stuber:									
United States	Dollar				1,000.67				1,000.67
Switzerland	Franc		178.60						178.60
Steven Groves:									
United States	Dollar				3,426.07				3,426.07
United Kingdom	Pound		1,000.00						1,000.00
Kevin Landy:									
United States	Dollar				3,036.00				3,036.00
Thailand	Baht		737.00						737.00
Total			13,034.21		12,490.86				25,525.07

SUSAN M. COLLINS,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, Apr. 15. 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jon Kyl:									
Israel	shekel		869.68						869.68
Turkey	lira		169.60						169.60
Brandon Wales:									
Israel	shekel		718.00						718.00
Turkey	lira		138.60						138.60
Total			1,895.88						1,895.88

ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Apr. 18, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2004

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Neil MacBride:									
United States	Dollar				2,084.70				2,084.70
Germany	Euro		717.62		0.00				717.62
Poland	Zloty		587.10		0.00				587.10
Italy	Euro		906.82		0.00				906.82
J. Edward Pagano:									
United States	Dollar				2,085.70				2,085.70
Germany	Euro		704.00		0.00				704.00
Poland	Zloty		600.00		0.00				600.00
Italy	Euro		895.00		0.00				895.00
John Gillies:									
United States	Dollar				5,665.43				5,665.43
Germany	Euro		675.13		0.00				675.13
Poland	Zloty		493.47		0.00				493.47
Italy	Euro		770.00		0.00				770.00
Stephen Higgins:									
United States	Dollar				5,732.82				5,732.82
Germany	Euro		588.86		0.00				588.86
Poland	Zloty		499.24		0.00				499.24
Italy	Euro		844.60		0.00				844.60
Total			8,281.84		15,568.65				23,850.49

ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Apr. 18, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Matthew Walker:									
United States	Dollar				6,422.02				6,422.02
China	Yuan		894.00						894.00
Total			894.00		6,422.02				7,316.02

OLYMPIA J. SNOWE,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, Apr. 22, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Nancy St. Louis:									
			1,053.00						1,053.00
	Dollar				4,289.15				4,289.15
Adam Harris:									
			1,053.00						1,053.00
	Dollar				4,289.15				4,289.15
Elizabeth O'Reilly:									
			873.00						873.00
	Dollar				4,289.15				4,289.15
Rebecca Farley:									
			1,053.00						1,053.00
	Dollar				4,289.15				4,289.15
Randall Bookout:									
			2,877.00						2,877.00
	Dollar				6,994.00				6,994.00
Melvin Dubee:									
			1,656.00						1,656.00
	Dollar				7,362.39				7,362.39
Jacqueline Russell:									
			1,430.00						1,430.00
	Dollar				6,597.00				6,597.00
Total			9,995.00		38,109.99				48,104.99

PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Apr. 11, 2005.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON CODEL FRIST FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 4 TO JAN. 14, 2005

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Bill Frist:									
United States	Dollar				5,905.23				5,905.23
Sri Lanka	Dollar		413.00						413.00
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
India	Rupee		390.00						390.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
Senator Mitch McConnell:									
Kuwait	Dollar		388.00						388.00
India	Rupee		290.00						290.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		221.00						221.00
Belgium	Euro		295.00						295.00
Senator Mike DeWine:									
Kuwait	Dollar		680.00						680.00
India	Rupee		389.86						389.86
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
Senator Mary Landrieu:									
United States	Dollar				9,325.00				9,325.00
Sri Lanka	Dollar		413.00						413.00
Kuwait	Dinar		788.00						788.00
Senator Norm Coleman:									
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
India	Rupee		590.00						590.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
Mark Esper:									
United States	Dollar				5,905.23				5,905.23
Sri Lanka	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
India	Rupee		530.00						530.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
Paul Grove:									
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
India	Rupee		440.00						440.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
John Klemmer:									
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
India	Rupee		490.00						490.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
Robert Stevenson:									
United States	Dollar				5,905.23				5,905.23
Sri Lanka	Dollar		300.00						300.00
Robert Stevenson:									
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
India	Rupee		564.00						564.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
Sally Walsh:									
Kuwait	Dollar		788.00						788.00
India	Rupee		590.00						590.00
Pakistan	Rupee		263.00						263.00
Bahrain	Dollar		321.00						321.00
Belgium	Euro		395.00						395.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Sri Lanka	Dollar						1,839.63		1,839.63

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON CODEL FRIST FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 4 TO JAN. 14, 2005—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kuwait	Dollar						7,085.35		7,085.35
Iraq	Dollar						1,425.04		1,426.04
India	Rupee						7,714.79		7,714.79
Pakistan	Rupee						3,636.11		3,636.11
Afghanistan	Dollar						1,601.05		1,601.05
Bahrain	Dollar						5,468.05		5,468.05
Belgium	Euro						9,371.07		9,371.07
Total			27,588.09		21,135.46		38,142.09		86,865.64

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State, and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

BILL FRIST,
Chairman, Committee on Codel Frist, Feb. 28, 2005.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 109–1 AND TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 109–2

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, as in executive session I ask unanimous consent the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following conventions transmitted to the Senate on May 16, 2005, by the President of the United States: Convention Concerning Migratory Fish Stock in the Pacific Ocean (Treaty Document 109–1); and Convention Strengthening the Inter-American Tuna Commission (Treaty Document 109–2).

I further ask the conventions be considered as having been read the first time; that they be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The messages of the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, with Annexes (the ''WCPF Convention''), which was adopted at Honolulu on September 5, 2000, by the Multilateral High Level Conference on the Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. The United States signed the Convention on that date. I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the WCPF Convention.

The WCPF Convention sets forth legal obligations and establishes cooperative mechanisms that are needed in order to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of highly migratory fish stocks (such as tuna, swordfish, and marlin) that range across extensive areas of the high seas as well as through waters under the fisheries jurisdiction of numerous coastal States. These constitute resources of worldwide importance, with the fisheries for tuna in the Western and Central Pacific being the largest and most valuable in the world. Implementation of the WCPF Convention will offer the opportunity to conserve and manage these resources responsibly before they become subject to the pressures of overfishing and over-capacity that are so evident elsewhere in the world's oceans.

The WCPF Convention builds upon the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the 1995 United Nations Agreement on the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. The WCPF Convention gives effect to the provisions of these two instruments, which recognize cooperation to conserve highly migratory fish stocks as essential, and require those with direct interests in them coastal States with authority to manage fishing in waters under their jurisdiction and nations whose vessels fish for these stocks to engage in such cooperation through regional fishery management organizations.

The WCPF Convention balances in an equitable fashion the interests of coastal States, notably the island States that comprise the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), in protecting important fishery resources off their shores, and the interests of distant water fishing States, notably Asian fishing nations and entities (Japan, Republic of Korea, China, and Taiwan), whose fishing vessels range far from their own shores.

The United States, which played an instrumental role in achieving this balance, has direct and important interests in the WCPF Convention and its early and effective implementation. The United States is both a major distant water fishing nation (with the fourth-largest catch in the region) and an important coastal State with significant Exclusive Economic Zone waters in the region (including the waters around Hawaii, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands).

United States fishing concerns, including the U.S. tuna industry, U.S. conservation organizations, and U.S. consumers, as well as those residents of Hawaii and the U.S. Flag Pacific island areas of Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands, all have a crucial stake in the health of the oceans and their resources as promoted by the WCPF Convention.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the WCPF Convention and give its advice and consent to its ratification.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 16, 2005.*

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Convention for the Strengthening of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission established by the 1949 Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Costa Rica, with Annexes, (the ''Antigua Convention''), which was adopted on June 27, 2003, in Antigua, Guatemala, by the Parties to the 1949 Convention. The United States signed the Antigua Convention on November 14, 2003. I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the Antigua Convention, with an enclosure.

The Antigua Convention sets forth the legal obligations and establishes the cooperative mechanisms necessary for the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the highly migratory fish stocks (such as tuna and swordfish) of the Eastern Pacific Ocean that range across extensive areas of the high seas as well as through waters under the fisheries jurisdiction of numerous coastal States. Once in force, the Antigua Convention will replace the original 1949 Convention establishing the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). Revisions to the 1949 Convention will strengthen the mandate of the IATTC to reflect changes in the law governing living marine resources since the adoption of the original Convention more than 50 years ago.

The highly migratory fish stocks governed by the Antigua Convention constitute an important economic resource for the countries of the region and vital components of the marine ecosystem of the Eastern Pacific Ocean requiring careful conservation and management. Early entry into force

and implementation of the Antigua Convention will offer the opportunity to strengthen conservation and management of these resources in important ways, including through enhanced efforts to ensure compliance and enforcement of agreed conservation and management measures.

The Antigua Convention draws upon relevant provisions of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (the ''LOS Convention'') and the 1995 United Nations Agreement on the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (the ''U.N. Fish Stocks Agreement''). The Antigua Convention gives effect to the provisions of the LOS Convention and U.N. Fish Stocks Agreement that recognize as essential, and require cooperation to conserve highly migratory fish stocks through regional fishery management organizations, by those with direct interests in them—coastal States with authority to manage fishing in waters under their jurisdiction and those nations and entities whose vessels fish for these stocks.

The United States, which played an instrumental role in negotiation of the revised Convention, has direct and important interests in the Antigua Convention and its early and effective implementation. United States fishing concerns, including the U.S. tuna industry, U.S. conservation organizations, and U.S. consumers, as well as those people who reside in those U.S. States bordering the Convention Area, have crucial stakes in the health of the oceans and their resources as promoted by the Antigua Convention.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Antigua Convention and give its advice and consent to ratification.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 16, 2005*.

SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 143, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 143) to authorize Senate Legal Counsel to appear in legal proceedings in the name of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in connection with its investigation into the United Nations' ''Oil-For-Food'' Programme.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for representation in a civil action pending in Federal District Court in the District of Columbia. In this case, the United Nations is seeking to prevent an individual from complying with subpoenas for testimony and documents issued by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and other congressional committees in connection with their inquiries into allegations of fraud and corruption in the United Nations Oil for Food Program. The individual at issue, Mr. Robert Parton, is an investigator formerly associated with the Independent Inquiry Committee, an entity formed by the United Nations to conduct its own investigation into the program. The United Nations contends that its privileges and immunities, and its contracts with Mr. Parton, bar him from complying with the subcommittee's subpoenas.

Mr. President, subcommittee staff has been discussing for some time with United Nations and IIC counsel their concerns regarding United Nations privileges and how any such privileges might be accommodated consistent with the investigative needs of the subcommittee. The subcommittee does not desire adversely to affect the IIC's ongoing investigation of the Oil-for-Food Program. However, the subcommittee believes that it is possible for Mr. Parton to provide information needed by the subcommittee in the fulfillment of its responsibilities without doing so.

In the event, however, that the subcommittee's negotiations with the United Nations and the IIC do not resolve this matter, the enclosed resolution authorizes the Senate legal counsel, when directed by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, or by the chairman and ranking minority member, acting jointly, to appear in the name of the subcommittee as amicus curiae, intervenor, applicant or respondent in United Nations v. Robert Parton or any related action or proceeding.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 143) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 143

Whereas, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations is conducting an inquiry into the United Nations' ''Oil-for-Food'' Programme;

Whereas, the Subcommittee has need to obtain access to evidence from an individual formerly associated with the Independent Inquiry Committee, a committee formed by the United Nations to investigate claims relating to the Programme;

Whereas, in the course of the Subcommittee's efforts to obtain access to such evidence, legal issues may arise requiring the Subcommittee to appear in the courts of the United States;

Whereas, pursuant to section 703(c), 706(a), and 713(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(c), 288e(a), and 288*l*(a), the Senate may direct its Counsel to appear as amicus curiae or to intervene in the name of a subcommittee of the Senate in any legal actions in which the powers and responsibilities of Congress under the Constitution are placed in issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized, when directed by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, or by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, acting jointly, to appear in the name of the Subcommittee as amicus curiae, intervenor, applicant or respondent in United Nations v. Robert Parton or any other related action or proceeding.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2005

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:45 a.m. on Tuesday, May 17. 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 begin a period of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the final 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee; provided that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 3, the highway bill. I further ask consent that there then be 30 minutes equally divided between the chairman and ranking member or designees prior to beginning the series of votes in relation to the pending amendments as under the original order.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 for the weekly party luncheons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Tomorrow, following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the highway bill. Under a previous order, following the final 30 minutes for closing remarks, the Senate will proceed to a series of stacked votes on the pending amendments to the bill. Following the disposition of those amendments, the Senate will immediately vote on passage of the bill. Therefore, Senators should expect multiple rollcall votes beginning at approximately 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, culminating in passage of the highway bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:29 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 17, 2005, at 9:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16, 2005:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DANIEL R. STANLEY, OF KANSAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE POWELL A. MOORE.

ERIC S. EDELMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY, VICE DOUGLAS JAY FEITH.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SANDRA L. PACK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE TERESA M. RESSEL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PAUL A. TRIVELLI, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

ANN LOUISE WAGNER, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO LUXEMBOURG.

VICTORIA NULAND, OF CONNECTICUT, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICES, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

TERENCE PATRICK MCCULLEY, OF OREGON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALI.

LARRY MILES DINGER, OF IOWA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE FIJI ISLANDS, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NAURU, THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, TUVALU, AND THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MICHAEL E. HESS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE ROGER P. WINTER, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE, AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 8033 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. TEED M. MOSELEY, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JULIA A. KRAUS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DONALD M. BRADSHAW, 0000
COL. JAMES K. GILMAN, 0000
COL. DAVID A. RUBENSTEIN, 0000
COL. PHILIP VOLPE, 0000

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JANICE B. GARDNER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY. (NEW POSITION)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 2005

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the many police and peace officers across this country who have made the ultimate sacrifice to keep our families and our communities safe, and to lend my support to H. Con. Res. 135, which authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

During this year's service, on May 15, our nation will honor one more fallen hero from Minnesota's Capital City. Last week my community was stunned and saddened by the death of St. Paul Police Sgt. Gerald Vick, who was killed in an act of senseless violence in the line of duty. Sgt. Vick knew well the dangers of his job, yet he exemplified the great bravery and selfless commitment of our city's finest.

After graduating from St. Paul's police academy in 1989, Sgt. Vick's career had "upward mobility," written all over it, according to the city's former chief of police. His personnel file was filled with approving letters from the chief. Sgt. Vick went above and beyond to protect our community and keep it a safe and healthy place to raise a family, After being promoted to sergeant in 1999 where he could have taken a much safer desk job, he only wanted to get back on the streets to the part of the job he love the most—working with the community.

Twice Sgt. Vick was awarded the St. Paul Police Department's highest honor, the Medal of Valor. The first time was in 1990 when he saved an infant from a burning building, then again in 1997 when he shot and killed an armed robbery suspect who pulled a gun on him. Sgt. Vick served for 16 years on the Saint Paul police force and was a true public servant. Jerry died on May 6, 2005 protecting the community—the job he loved so much. He will be deeply missed by his family, his friends, and his fellow officers.

I wish to express my sincere condolences as well as my thoughts and prayers to all those who loved and worked with Sgt. Gerald Vick.

SUSAN EDGERTON PRAISED FOR SERVICE TO VETERANS

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to publicly recognize and express the gratitude of many in Congress and the veterans' community to Susan Edgerton, Democratic Staff Director for the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Susan is leaving the Committee staff after more than 8 years of service, and what she has accomplished in that relatively brief time has literally touched every comer of the body of law covering veterans' health care services. Her achievements have had profound impact on both the VA health care system and the lives of those who enter the doors of its facilities. Prominent among her accomplishments are a heightened focus on mental health, long-term care and specialized services for veterans, access to emergency care and chiropractic care for veterans, comprehensive services for homeless veterans, and improved pay for VA physicians, nurses and dentists. She has been a principal player in assisting Members of Congress in the struggle to acquire adequate VA health care funding.

Before joining the Committee staff, Susan was the Program Director of Health Policy for Paralyzed Veterans of America here in Washington. She is a graduate of the University of Virginia and received a Masters of Science in Public Health in Health Policy and Administration from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

She has used that education well. Like the majority of successful public servants, Susan has quietly and diligently toiled behind the scenes to improve the lot of those she serves. With great compassion and impressive political and legislative acumen, Susan has made her mark in and on this body, garnering tremendous respect and trust on both sides of the aisle, and also from her colleagues in the Senate and throughout the veterans' affairs community. She has been an extraordinary asset to me, to my staff, and most important, to the noble mission of caring for veterans and their families. I will miss her, and so will a great number of others in this chamber and beyond.

I know my colleagues will join with me in wishing Susan Edgerton well in her next and all future endeavors, and in thanking her for a job exceptionally well done.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LIONS CLUB OF WEBSTER GROVES, MO

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the Lions Club of Webster Groves, Missouri, in this, the year of its 80th anniversary. Since its establishment on March 12, 1925, the Lions Club has demonstrated a deep concern and commitment to the well-being of the community.

For the past 29 years, the Lions Club has held a summertime "Carnival & Barbecue." Since 1960, it has been an integral part of the July 4th celebration in Webster Groves known as "Community Days." The Webster Lions provide amusement rides, midway booths, and delicious barbecued food over 4 days of family fun and wholesome festivities.

In recent years, the Lions Club has expanded its community involvement by donating their time and resources to support events such as "Make a Difference Day," the Fire Department's "Open House," the Police Department's "Public Safety Day," the "Opening Day" of the Youth Baseball and Softball Season, and an annual "Diabetes Screening & Information Day. "

The generosity of the Lions Club can be seen throughout the community with the construction of new tennis courts, wading pools, scoreboards, and bathrooms in parks. Some of these items, including the 1939 Flagpole in Ruhe Park, have been symbols of the fine community of Webster Groves for generations.

Furthermore, the Lions Club motto of "we serve" has reached beyond the tangible. More than 50 organizations and programs, including the Webster-Rock Hill Ministries, Webster Groves Historical Society, various college scholarships, and Meals on Wheels, all receive annual financial contributions, the sum of which has exceeded $2 million.

Today, the Lions Club of Webster Groves remain an integral part of the community.

Whether fostering civic improvement or donating time, money and effort, they are to be commended. I am honored to stand here today in recognition of the past 80 years of servIce.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF MS. MARCELLE FORTIER CITRON

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great achievements and selfless service of Ms. Marcelle Fortier Citron of Lafayette, Louisiana. Ms. Citron has been helping the people of Acadiana for over fifty years. She began her service work in 1950, when she served as the co-chair for the Hospital Dental Clinic for Under-Privileged Children. During the 1950s she helped establish the Lafayette Day Nurseries, where underprivileged mothers could leave their children when they had to go to work. In 1962, Ms. Citron helped found the Pink Ladies and Candy Stripers for the Lafayette Sanitarium at the Lafayette General Hospital. She then served as the organization's president for three and a half years.

In 1982, Ms. Citron became a board member of the Faith House Battered Women's Shelter. She served on the board for nine years, including two as president. Frequently, Ms. Citron would provide shelter in her own home for the women and the families that

sought refuge at Faith House. During her time with the Faith House, it was recognized as one of the top five model shelters in the country by the Homeless in America Project. Even today Ms. Citron remains in touch with many of those she helped through the Faith House and often provides them with necessities.

In the late 1980s, Ms. Citron founded two non-profit organizations that have done immeasurable good for Acadiana. Foodnet was created in 1987. Foodnet provides food and necessities for lower income residents in Acadiana's eight parishes. During its eighteen years of existence, Foodnet has collected over 30,000 tons of food for the thirty food distribution agencies it supports. In 1989 Ms. Citron also founded Project RX, a program which provides free prescription drugs for those in financial distress. Today, this organization helps hundreds of needy obtain important and critical medications.

In recognition of her service, Ms. Citron has received numerous service awards. In 1990 she was named Outstanding Woman by the Business and Professional Women Association. She was then named Rotarian of the Year in 1991. Ms. Citron has also been awarded the Lafayette Civic Cup. Though she has received so much deserved notice of her great service, Ms. Citron nonetheless prefers to remain in the background of her organizations. She works not for public recognition but rather solely for the public good. I applaud Ms. Citron's work and commend the shining example of personal charity and kindness she sets for Acadiana.

CHINA'S ANTI-SECESSION TARGETING DEMOCRATIC TAIWAN

HON. STEVAN PEARCE

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, China's unelected Parliament passed its Anti-Secession Law targeted at Taiwan. Later that month, Taiwanese citizens took to the streets protesting the law, while senior U.S. administration officials and U.S. Congress repeatedly and on many occasions expressed their grave concern regarding the passage of the Chinese legislation. The European Union has also decided not to lift its arms embargo against China at this time.

Clearly, the Chinese anti-secession legislation has impeded cross-strait dialogue, threatened peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and, more importantly, allowed the world to see the true nature of the Chinese Communist Party. It is a party that hasn't changed much from the days of the Tiananmen massacre in 1989.

Indeed, despite China's recent economic growth and prosperity, China remains authoritarian. The Chinese Communist Party is the supreme source of power. Human rights violations are widespread, stemming from the authorities' intolerance of dissent, fear of unrest, and the absence of laws protecting basic freedoms. Abuses include torture and mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, and arbitrary and lengthy incommunicado detention. Prison conditions are harsh. The government has placed severe restrictions on freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, religion and privacy. In many cases, the judicial system denies criminal defendants basic legal safeguards and due process. Thousands of people are detained or serving sentences for "counterrevolutionary crimes" or "crimes against the state," including those arrested for issuing petitions or open letters calling for reforms and greater democracy.

For the sake of peace and stability in the Asian-Pacific region, especially in the Taiwan Strait, I therefore urge President Hu Jin-tao to rescind the Anti-Secession Law and improve China's dismal human rights record. As a start, China should censure its bloody Tiananmen crackdown, reverse its verdict on June 4th and release the more than 250 political prisoners jailed for their involvement in the 1989 pro-democracy movement.

China's Anti-Secession Law and human rights abuses need to be recognized by the world for what they are: antiquated measures to impose China's rule on its neighbor and its own people. If China wants to be recognized as a world power, it must act responsibly in a peaceful solution to the Taiwan issue and correcting human rights at home.

RECOGNIZING THE SPRINGVILLE-GRIFFITH INSTITUTE AND SPRINGFIELD-GRIFFITH INSTITUTE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT ON 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS M. REYNOLDS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize the Springville-Griffith Institute and Springville-Griffith Institute Central School District on the occasion of its 175th Anniversary. As a proud graduate of Springville-Griffith Institute, I know firsthand the dedication that the teachers, administrators and staff bring to providing a top-notch education for their students.

Springville Academy was organized in 1825. After Dewitt Clinton penned the school's incorporation in 1827, it opened its doors in 1830, making it the first high school in Erie County. The original school building was a modest one, with most of the funds used to build the school coming from community donations.

From the time of its inception, Springville Academy became an educational cornerstone of both Springville and Western New York, drawing students from all across the region. By 1849, there were 110 boys and 100 girls attending the school. In 1867, the school became known as the Griffith Institute in recognition of a scholarship gift from Archibald Griffith. As the years passed, the school and its student population grew, as did its reputation for providing a quality education. Today, the district boasts an enrollment of over 2,300 students.

Over the past 175 years, the Springville-Griffith Institute has touched the lives of thousands of students, their families, our community and our nation. Notable graduates of the school include: author and statesmen Clark E. Carr, who suggested that his close friend, President Abraham Lincoln, be invited to speak at Gettysburg; Ralph B. Waite, who brought the world "painless dentistry" through the introduction of Novocain; and Glen S. "Pop" Warner, the man who introduced protective padding, numbered plays and jerseys, and who pioneered the forward pass, spiral, forever changing the game of football.

Schools are cornerstones of our communities, and nowhere is that more true than in Springville, New York. Throughout its history, the Griffith Institute's staff—past and present—have helped shape and positively influence thousands of local students, and continue to do so today. We in Western New York appreciate all that the Springville-Griffith Institute has done to educate generations of children, and we hope for many more successful years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this Congress join me in celebrating the 175h Anniversary of the Springville Academy, Griffith Institute, and Springville-Griffith Institute Central School District.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1268, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF ACT, 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2005

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, every member of this House supports providing our troops, their families and the veterans who have returned from service in Iraq and Afghanistan. The on-going wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as other active military and intelligence operations in other countries require planning, budgeting and congressional oversight to ensure the best and most effective use of taxpayer dollars in order to keep our troops and all Americans safe and protected.

Unfortunately, the Conference Agreement on the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriation, H.R. 1268, is a testament to poor planning, the complete absence of competent budgeting and, worst of all, the exploitation by this Congress of the needs of our troops to pass a grab bag of political pork and exploitive public policy. To add insult to injury, every dollar in this $82 billion bill is borrowed and will be added to our nation's debt—eventually paid for by future generations.

My vote against this bill is a reflection of the inept, incompetent and deliberately misleading policies of the Bush Administration and the Republican controlled Congress. At every point in this war in Iraq, from pre-emptive war to the on-going occupation, there has been a shameless disregard for honesty and a complete failure of meaningful, constructive congressional oversight. With, almost 1,700 lives lost, thousands wounded, some $212 billion spent in Iraq and at least $65 billion spent in Afghanistan to date, Americans should expect Congress to be engaged and conducting vigorous oversight, not playing political games.

Where is the courage, or at least the outrage, among members of this House to stand up and say enough is enough. Let us pass an appropriations bill to provide the courageous U.S. servicemen and women risking their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan with the tools to protect themselves, achieve their mission and

come home safely. Let us have the courage and discipline to dump the extraneous billions and the excessively extraneous policy add-ons. Instead, Congress has passed a pork-barrel bill that, for example, restores $592 million in funding to construct a new U.S. embassy in Baghdad that is not an emergency, could not be constructed during the on-going insecurity and was previously defeated in a vote in the House by a wide margin.

Our nation is now in its third year with almost 160,000 troops occupying both Iraq and Afghanistan. Why was the $78 billion for military operations included in this emergency supplemental appropriation not included in the regular $400 billion FY2005 defense budget passed only months ago. That would have raised defense spending to almost $500 billion, but at least it would have honestly met our obligations to our troops. But foresight and proper planning are not the strengths of this White House and by budgeting properly it would have stripped the Republicans in Congress of a convenient legislative vehicle, a "must pass" bill as they refer to it, by which to supporting our troops is cover for attaching pork projects and politically motivated policies.

This bill, regardless of the margin by which it has passed Congress, is a shameful example of politicians exploiting the needs of a nation at war and the warriors who are fighting this war to advance a narrow, ideological and exclusive political agenda. Since there is no money for Iraq in the 2006 federal budget we can expect another "emergency wartime supplemental" again in the near future and with it the same abusive process.

Among the most egregious and offensive provisions of this bill is the attachment of disgraceful provision call the "REAL ID." The provision adds a de facto national identification card to be paid for by state and local taxpayers. It is another multi-billion dollar unfunded mandate on taxpayers, as well as another example of Republican excess and complete disregard for competent policy making. The REAL ID will make it easier for the immigration officials to send persons fleeing political or religious persecution back to their persecutors and it builds a wall along portions of the U.S.-Mexico border with complete disregard for all laws, including environmental regulations. Furthermore, because the legislation calls for national driver license standards to be implemented by states, it all but guarantees that more untrained and tested drivers will be driving on our streets, roads and freeways. This is not an anti-terrorism provision, it is simply more political grandstanding at the expense of the American taxpayer and hard working families.

There are some good aspects of this bill which I do support strongly. In addition to the needed funding for our troops, there is critical foreign assistance which I support. This includes funds for victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami, humanitarian assistance to the victims of the genocide in Darfur, funds to support the African Union peacekeeping operation in Sudan, economic development for the Palestinian people, international food aid and other bilateral assistance to critical allies. These are proper and needed uses of America's wealth to create stability, security and save lives around the world.

We are at a critical time in our nation's history. The current levels of deficit spending to sustain the wars, occupations and reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq, almost $300 billion to date, plus the long-term needs of veterans, is not sustainable and is fiscally dangerous.

My strong and unwavering support for America's fighting men and women, as well as for our veterans remains steadfast. My opposition to this legislation is a demonstration of my lack of confidence in the Iraq policy and my disgust with the irresponsible fiscal policies of this White House and Republican controlled Congress. The needs and priorities of the American people must come before the short-sighted political advantages of the majority party. The priorities in Washington must change and I will continue to fight to put our troops and our families first, not use them as a political excuse.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY'S INAUGURATION

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in recognition of the fiftieth anniversary of the first inauguration of the late Richard J. Daley, former mayor of Chicago and one of America's all-time greatest mayors. His legacy was honored at a symposium last week at the University of Illinois at Chicago, UIC, followed by a gala reception and benefit for that fine school.

This event, attended by the mayor's family, friends and many other Chicagoans was addressed by public servants and members of the media who knew and worked with the mayor. Remembered as a man of strong conviction and dedication to his family, faith and the city, Mayor Daley left an indelible mark as Chicago's longest-serving chief executive.

As many participants made clear at the symposium, evidence of Mayor Daley's stamp on Chicago can be seen clearly today. From its vibrant downtown to its freeways and mass transit to O'Hare International Airport, Mayor Daley forever transformed Chicago into the "city that works." He appreciated the importance of the city's great cultural institutions and core businesses, building strong partnerships that have enabled Chicago to avoid the pitfalls affecting many other industrial cities. His visionary founding of UIC as an urban college for the children of immigrants and working families was perhaps his greatest achievement, making it a most appropriate place for the Daley Library, Archives and student scholarships in the name of the late mayor and his beloved wife, Eleanor.

Through times of great social upheaval and racial tension, the mayor never wavered from his vision of politics and government as "a people business." He maintained his commitment to public education and economic opportunity for all people, working closely with national leaders like Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson toward these goals, which passage of the landmark Civil Rights and Voting Rights laws.

In return for his dedicated service and in recognition of his great love for Chicago, its residents elected and re-elected him an unprecedented six times.

Still, Mayor Daley made the time to be a loving husband and devoted father to seven children. His eldest son, Richard M. Daley, has succeeded him as mayor, and has built his own legacy as a great leader and urban visionary. Together, the two Mayor Daleys have provided the city of Chicago with outstanding leadership and direction and along with the entire Daley family have shown a sense of commitment to public service that is inspiring. I am proud that, 50 years after the first Mayor Daley's inauguration, Chicago is among the world's greatest and most vibrant cities. May it remain so for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO EDITH SCHAFFER LEDERBERG

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, Senior Volunteer Services in Broward County, Florida will honor Edith Schaffer Lederberg, of the Area Agency on Aging, Area Agency, for her longstanding commitment to Broward County's elder population at its 40th anniversary luncheon on Thursday, May 19. This event provides an excellent opportunity to thank Edith for her dedication and leadership. The Area Agency plans, develops, coordinates, and evaluates programs; funds services; and is the prime advocate for residents of Broward County, Florida, who are 60 years of age or older.

Serving as the executive director of the Area Agency for the past 19 years, Edith has been responsible for overseeing an annual Federal and State budget of more than $24 million. Under her guidance, the Area Agency has been proactive in responding to the critical needs of our community. In response to a vital need for transportation to aid elderly and younger disabled Broward residents' in their efforts to travel to work or medical appointments, Edith was determined to become a provider. She wanted to ensure that these services would be delivered by caring and capable coordinators.; Her endeavor became a reality in 1996, with the Area Agency as a committed provider. Because of Edith's foresight, the Area Agency has developed pioneer programs such as the Noble McArtor Adult Day Care Center—the first such facility in the United States to target the needs of the gay and lesbian population.

Most recently, in a concerted effort to raise funds for aging services throughout Florida, Edith drafted legislation to support aging services within communities. Mr. Speaker, these are but a few examples of Edith Lederberg's countless accomplishments. She works tirelessly each day to ensure that the seniors in our community have the resources they need and deserve in order to maintain their dignity and wellbeing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress for the opportunity to salute this great Floridian and great American.

TRIBUTE TO KCPT PRESIDENT/CEO WILLIAM REED

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. CLEAVER and I join today to pay tribute to William T. Reed, the President and CEO of KCPT, Kansas City's public broadcasting station, who has announced his retirement effective June 30, 2005. He steps down after 13 years as head of Kansas City Public Television.

Bill Reed joined KCPT in 1992 and emphasized education, local programming and outreach. The station received numerous awards from PBS, the National Educational Telecommunication Association NETA, and community organizations for its local programming and services, including 21 regional Emmy awards and one national Emmy for the documentary, ''Be Good Smile Pretty''. Four of the station's signature program series, ''Ruckus'', ''Rare Visions'', ''Roadside Revelations'' and ''Kansas City Week in Review'', began under Reed's leadership. He also introduced viewers to the beautiful writings of Kansas City Star columnist Charles Gusewelle, who this spring will produce his fourth documentary for KCPT, called ''Stories Under the Stone''. Reed's collaboration with Gusewelle also launched KCPT's home video library venture. Later this year, children and their parents also will benefit from the development of an interactive reading program called ''Bark Park Place''.

Bill Reed made partnerships and collaborations an important part of the station's business plan. In 2003, KCPT was named Best Place to Work for Community Partnerships by the Kansas City Business Journal. Many of those partnerships, like Chalkwaves, a digital instructional media service for elementary and secondary schools now used across the country, changed the education landscape. Additionally, the Kansas City Regional Access Consortium for Higher Education, KC REACHE, a distance education effort partnering KCPT with nine area colleges and universities, began under Reed's stewardship long before distance learning was commonplace. Other successful partnerships include Network KC, an in-depth news partnership with the Kansas City Star, KCUR–FM, KPRS–FM and UMKC's Back Channel, a student production for the web; and Speaking of Women's Health, a partnership with Shawnee Mission Medical Center to conduct a yearly health symposium for 1,700 women. The TV Dinner and the KCPT Holiday Auction were also created, and a partnership developed with the Gamma Phi Beta Sorority for the Antiques, Garden and Home Design Show to raise additional funds for the station.

From 1997 to 2001, KCPT successfully conducted a capital campaign that raised $10 million to renovate its facilities on 31st Street and to purchase digital television equipment. The station was among the first stations to go on the air with digital television and was cited by PBS as one of seven Digital Pioneers in public television.

Reed began his public broadcasting career in 1967 as General Manager of KIXE, the public television station in Redding, California. He joined the Public Broadcasting Service, PBS, in Washington, DC, in 1974, where he was promoted to Senior Vice President in 1978 and worked until 1991. While at PBS, Reed led the planning and implementation of PBS Home Video and the PBS Adult Learning Service and the development of PBS VIDEO—a service for educational institutions. After leaving PBS, he also served as a consultant to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, CPB. Reed served the boards of a number on local and national organizations: the Public Broadcasting Service Board of Directors from 1972 to 1974; the Association of America's Public Television Stations', APTS, Board of Trustees from 1995 to 2001; and American Public Television, APT, Board of Directors from 1997 to 2003. He was elected as the National Educational Telecommunications Association's, NETA, first chairman in 1997. Reed served as President of the Jackson County Historical Society from 1996 to 1998, President of the Public Television Association of Missouri, PTAM, from 1994 to 1998 and 2002 to present, and Chairman of the Kansas Public Broadcasting Council, KPBC, from 1997 to 1998. Reed also served on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's, CPB, Digital Television Task Force from 1998 to the present, and was a member of Video Advisory Committee to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education from 1993 to 2000.

In 1991, the Pacific Mountain Network Board honored Reed with its Governor's Award for Distinguished Service to Public Television. He also served as a private sector representative in telecommunications for the U.S. Department of State to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 1989–London; as Chairman of the Broadcast Panel for U.S.-U.S.S.R. Bilateral Information Talks, 1988–Moscow; and as President of the Western Educational Network, 1972.

Bill Reed was born in Los Angeles, California. He received his B.A. in History and, following a year of graduate studies, his General Secondary Teaching Credential from the University of the Pacific in Stockton, California. From 1963 to 1965, he served in the U.S. Army, including one year in Vietnam, where he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal with Three Oak Leaf Clusters and the Army Commendation Medal for Valor.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Reed and his wife, Mary Ann, will continue to live in Kansas City after his retirement. A nationwide search is underway for his replacement and his shoes will be very difficult to fill. Mr. CLEAVER and I commend Bill Reed for his many accomplishments on behalf of the Kansas City community during his tenure at KCPT and wish him and Mary Ann all the best in the years to come.

IN HONOR OF PRESIDENT CHEN'S ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to the people of Taiwan on the occasion of their president's first anniversary in office this May 20th. Taiwan President Chen Shui-bian was re-elected to a second four year term in 2004.

During the last five years, President Chen has been deft in navigating the dangerous shoals between the demands of his people seeking independence and Chinese threats to attack Taiwan. In recent weeks and months, China passed the anti-secession law, codifying the use of force if Taiwan moves toward independence and lavishly entertained two Taiwan opposition parties leaders.

At the moment, there is a ''China fever'' sweeping Taiwan. Many Taiwanese are lured by China's promise of trade benefits and are willing to make political concessions to China. However, President Chen has been steadfast in demanding that the best welfare for the people of Taiwan must be safeguarded in any negotiations with China.

I believe it is time for us to speak up for President Chen and the Taiwanese people. We treasure our affiliations and relations with Taiwan as we admire Taiwan's political and economic achievements of the last two decades. It is often too easy to forget that all these accomplishments came through decades of hard work. Taiwan today is a beacon of democracy and an island of prosperity to many developing countries, including China.

The Taiwanese people, as we know, do treasure their democratic way of life and their independence. And the person who has their best interests at heart is President Chen Shui-bian. I rise today to support President Chen's handling of Taiwan's relations with China. President Chen is right in pointing out the differences between democratic Taiwan and autocratic China and the importance of conducting direct talks by elected leaders in Taiwan and China.

In the meantime, I urge Chinese leaders to withdraw their missiles deployed on the other side of the Taiwan Strait and accept President Chen's suggestion of setting up a stable mechanism for cross-strait interaction, leading to permanent peace and development in the Taiwan Strait.

Again my best wishes to the Taiwanese people on their president's first anniversary.

THE RETIREMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL RICHARD S. COLT

HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 2005 there was a military retirement ceremony for Major General Richard S. Colt, the Commanding General of the 77th Regional Readiness Command at Fort Totten, New York. He has served his country honorably for nearly forty years. While no statement could adequately recognize his achievements, Major General Colt's accomplishments in service of his country deserve our greatest admiration and thanks.

Major General Colt received his commission as a Second Lieutenant in the Military Intelligence Branch in 1967 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps Program at Fordham University, in New York City. After completing the Infantry Basic Course at Fort Benning, Georgia, he served on active duty with the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam from May 1968 until May 1969.

In November 1969, Major General Colt was honorably discharged from active duty, and in

June 1978 he joined the New York Army National Guard where he served until September 1985. At that time, Major General Colt transferred to the United States Army Reserve where he served as: Deputy Commander, 94th Regional Support Command; Chief of Staff, 77th Regional Support Command; Commander of the 301st Area Support Group at Fort Totten, New York; Deputy Chief of Staff for Training and Chief of Unit Training, Headquarters, 77th Army Reserve Command; and Commander of the 5th Battalion, 5th Field Artillery at Fort Tilden, New York. On June 20, 2001, he was assigned as the Commanding General of the 77th Regional Support Command, which was restructured and renamed to the 77th Regional Readiness Command in July 2003.

In addition to completing the Infantry Officer Basic Course, Major General Colt has completed the Field Artillery Officer, Military Intelligence Officer, and Quartermaster Officer Advance Courses, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College and the Army War College. He holds a BA in English from Fordham University, an MBA in Organizational Behavior, and a PMC in Information Systems from Iona College.

General Colt has received countless military awards for his service: the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Commendation Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Achievement Medal, Vietnam Service Medal with two service stars, the Republic of Vietnam Honor Medal First Class, the Vietnam Campaign Medal, the Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Palm Unit Citation Badge, a Meritorious Unit Commendation Medal, and the Combat Infantryman Badge.

Since July 25, 1967, Major General Colt has served the United States. He is a living example of honor, duty, courage, and service. I wish him well in his retirement.

IN HONOR OF THE 2005 STEWARD OF THE LAND AWARD RECIPIENT, STEVE SINTON

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Steve Sinton of Shandon, California, who will receive the American Farmland Trust's 2005 Steward of the Land Award on May 17. This is an impressive accomplishment as Steve is just the ninth American farmer to win this award, which is given to recognize exemplary leadership exhibited in environmental stewardship and the protection of farmland.

Steve is a fifth-generation Californian and a fourth-generation rancher whose family has been grazing cattle in San Luis Obispo County for over 125 years. He graduated locally from Shandon High School, and then went on to earn his Bachelor of Arts from Stanford University and his Juris Doctor from the University of Colorado. He began his professional career working as an attorney for the California Department of Water Resources in Sacramento before returning to his family's cattle ranch in 1978. Steve and his wife Jane have two children, Julie and Dan, who are both pursuing their own careers, but have also become fifth-generation cattle ranchers.

I have personally known of Steve's leadership and commitment to conservation for many years. In fact, over 20 years ago, I worked with the Sinton family to protect land in San Luis Obispo County. Today, Steve oversees his family's ranches, the Canyon Ranch in Shandon and the Avenales Ranch near Pozo, and manages his family's vineyard on Shell Creek Road. To promote the sustainability of his ranch and vineyard while also protecting the environment, he has employed a variety of original methods, including the use of a unique trellising method to balance the canopy to fruit ratio on the vineyard. Steve has also participated in experiments with cover crops and erosion control.

In addition to his hard work on the ranch and in the vineyard, Steve has also been a national leader in the effort to promote conservation and sustainable agriculture. He was a founding member and the founding chairman of the California Rangeland Trust, which is a statewide agricultural land trust formed in 1998 that has used conservation easements to keep 173,000 acres on cattle ranches undeveloped. Steve also has been active in the San Luis Obispo, the California, and the National Cattlemen's Associations, and has served as the Vice-Chairman of the Land Use Committee of the California Cattlemen's Association. Steve also has used his talent and expertise to benefit the San Luis Obispo County agricultural community through his involvement with the Central Coast Vineyard Team and the San Luis Obispo County Water Advisory Committee. Accordingly, I would like to congratulate him and wish him well as he continues in his various endeavors.

HONORING JOHN G. LAYTHAM, WASHINGTON RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION DUKE ZEIBERT AWARD

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John G. Laytham on winning the Washington Restaurant Association's Duke Zeibert Award. This special honor is truly well-deserved.

John Laytham has worked tirelessly for over 41 years for Clyde's Restaurant Group and has helped shaped their success in the Washington, DC Metropolitan area. He first started to work at Clyde's Restaurant to earn extra income while attending Georgetown University. He held nearly every position, and in 1968 he was asked to be partner. In 1970 he and his partner purchased the Old Ebbitt Grill, the oldest saloon in Washington, and today the most popular restaurant in the city.

The success of Clyde's restaurant group can be attributed to Mr. Laytham's dedication, keen sense of detail, and good judgment of style. Since the purchase of Old Ebbitt Grill the company has expanded to include 11 restaurants. Currently, Mr. Laytham is working to expand that number. He is simultaneously overseeing the construction of a restaurant in the Penn Quarter and a restaurant in Loudon County Virginia.

In 1992, Mr. Laytham launched the Clyde's School/Work program in partnership with the D.C. public school system. His love for the restaurant industry and concern for the well being of the District's youth helped him infuse the two interests allowing students to learn valuable work skills while obtaining a diploma. This mentoring program was started in hopes of eventually creating a high profile charter school, and with the help of other industry leaders the Marriott Hospitality Public Charter High School was formed.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Mr. Laytham for his extensive service to the District of Columbia and the restaurant industry. His contributions and efforts are much appreciated and greatly admired. I call upon my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Laytham on his award and in wishing him the best of luck in all future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the legislative day of May 4, 2005 the House had procedural vote on H.R. 366, the Vocational and Technical Education Act. On House rollcall vote #153, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

HONOR OUR WOUNDED AND FALLEN HEROES

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today to urge support of my legislation that recognizes and honors the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces.

The first bill is H.R. 2369, "Honor our Fallen Prisoners of War Act". Currently, prisoners of war who die during their imprisonment of wounds inflicted in war are eligible for posthumous Purple Heart recognition. However, those who die of starvation, beatings, freezing or other causes are not eligible for the Purple Heart!

This is not right! There should be no false distinction indicating more courage or more sacrifice by some who died and less by others. All POWs who died in service to our Nation should be eligible for Purple Heart recognition. H.R. 2369 will allow all members of our Armed Forces who die while a Prisoner of War, regardless of the cause of death, to be awarded the Purple Heart posthumously. This will apply to all wars, past and present.

I am indebted to Rick and Brenda Morgan Tavares of Campo, California and to Wilbert "Shorty" Estabrook of Murrieta, California who brought this issue to my attention. Shorty survived the Tiger Camp death march during the Korean War and was imprisoned for over three years. Brenda's uncle, Corporal Melvin Morgan, died of starvation and beatings in 1950 at the age of 20 in Korea.

Today, I am also introducing H.R. 2370, the ''In Memory Medal for Forgotten Veterans Act''. There are two groups of veterans who I believe need recognition beyond what they are currently receiving. The first are veterans who have died as a result of their service in the Vietnam War but who do not meet the criteria for inclusion on The Wall of the Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, DC.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund has a program called ''In Memory'' which has raised money for a plaque that has been placed near The Wall. The plaque honors ''those who served in the Vietnam War and later died as a result of their service.'' No names are on the plaque, but all names are kept in a ''In Memory Book'' at a kiosk near The Wall, and families can order a copy.

My bill adds to this fine recognition by presenting the families of these veterans with a medal, to be known as the ''Jesus Chuchi Salgado Medal'' to be issued by the Secretary of Defense. Chuchi Salgado was an outstanding individual, living in my Congressional district, whose exposure to Agent Orange ultimately led to his death. I would like to recognize his wife, Carla Salgado, as well as and Dan Santillan, who live in my Congressional District in California. Dan suggested the appropriateness of this bill.

The second group of veterans deserving of the ''Jesus Chuchi Salgado'' medal are those who were exposed to chemical agents, ionizing radiation, or chemical and herbicide agents during their service in the Armed Forces. The medal would be presented to veterans who are still living or to their families if they have died. Thomas Barnes of Whittier, California requested that action be taken to commemorate and honor such veterans.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring and passing H.R. 2369 and H.R. 2370. It is critical that we honor and remember those who have fought so gallantly for our freedom!

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEXAS POLICE OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY THIS YEAR

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to recognize the extraordinary I contributions of the following Texas Police Officers killed this year in the line of duty:

Sergeant John Maki, Celeste Policy Department; Deputy Constable Frank ''Scotty'' Claborn, Harris County Constable's Office; Police Officer John Logan, Huntington Police Department; Police Officer Frank M. Cantu, Houston Police Department; Trooper Kurt David Knapp, Department of Public Safety; Police Officer Darren Glen Mdelin, Grapevine Police Department; Sergeant Gregory Hunter, Grand Prairie Police Department; Police Officer Nathan Laurie, River Oaks Police Department; Sergeant Mike Lane, Beaumont Police Department; Police Officer Angel Barcena, El Paso Police Department; Police Officer Christopher Jerome Sobieski, Prairie View Police Department; Deputy Sheriff Dirk Knearem, Chambers County Sheriff's Department; Lieutenant Rover ''Bob'' Haley, Comanche County Sheriff s Department; and Police Officer Amy Donovan, Austin Police Department.

Each of these Officers provided their community with tireless, courageous, and gallant service of the highest caliber. They worked to preserve our rights, our homes, and in many cases, our lives—keeping our cities and towns safe for the sake of our children and families. These men and women were committed to excellence in leadership, developing community partnerships and always building for a better future.

It is a great honor to pay tribute to such amazing and exemplary individuals. Their selfless efforts and noble service will never be forgotten.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF BRIAN DAVIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR NORTHEAST OHIO COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS

HON. DENNIS. J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Brian Davis, executive director of the Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless (NEOCH), for his activism and dedication on behalf of the homeless women, men and children of our community.

For the past decade, Mr. Davis has fought in the interests of justice and hope for Northeast Ohio's most vulnerable citizens living on the streets. Mr. Davis' unwavering energy, compassion and focus has given a voice to those whose voices have been silenced by poverty and hopelessness. For the past ten years, he has edited The Grapevine, a publication that has provided an income and a communications medium for hundreds of homeless people.

Under Mr. Davis' leadership, NEOCH has helped obtain permanent housing for more than 425 people; provided 150 voice mailboxes for homeless individuals; provided legal assistance for nearly 900 people; and provided 5,800 people social services and empowerment through the Homeless Stand Down.

Beyond Cleveland's local scene, Mr. Davis has been a powerful voice for the homeless on Capitol Hill and at the State House in Columbus. He testified before the Government Reform Committee at my request to speak of the need for the Passport program for homeless men at a time when its funding was threatened. Mr. Davis was a guiding force and active participant in my Homelessness Summit, an advisory group with more than 200 Cleveland area activists working to end homelessness and advise me on legislative proposals. His energy extended to Columbus, where he worked with a state coalition to secure a revenue source for the Ohio Housing Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Brian Davis, the tireless leader of the Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless. His advocacy on behalf of the homeless citizens, the formerly homeless, and those at risk in the community continues to offer protection, guidance and empowerment. Because of the dedication and focus of Mr. Davis, the lives of hundreds of homeless people have been lifted into the light of positive change and hope for a brighter tomorrow.

HONORING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF TROPHY CLUB, TX

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the town of Trophy Club, TX, as they celebrate 20 years as a municipality. Trophy Club, a town of roughly 7,600 residents, was built on a foundation of individuals who sought to create a unique town with less population density.

It is the passion of those like Jim Carter, Trophy Club's first Mayor, Town Manager Donna Welsh and numerous other individuals who dedicated their support, sweat and money to the incorporation of this small town which has allowed it to be so successful.

Trophy Club became the first master planned community in Texas and that foresight has allowed citizens to take hold of their community and develop the amenities and enterprises, which are wanted by their peers.

Originally designed to be a housing development circling a golf course designed by Ben Hogan, Trophy Club has come a long way from that vision, but relishes that it is the only town home to a golf course designed by that golfing legend.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I stand here today to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of a city founded on such sound principles of representation and democracy.

MILITARY RETIREES ARE WAITING—LET'S FINISH THE JOB

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today to introduce a bill to eliminate the Disabled Veterans Tax and to provide immediate concurrent receipt of military retired pay and VA disability compensation to all deserving disabled military retirees.

The ''Immediate and Full Repeal of the Disabled Veterans Tax Act of 2005 (H.R. 2368) does exactly what it says—it eliminates the years of waiting before all disabled military retirees receive all the retired pay and compensation they have earned and deserve.

For the past several years, our Nation's veterans waged a long and determined campaign to eliminate the Disabled Veterans Tax. As my colleagues know, we were partially successful. But only partially.

The laws that we passed make veterans with a disability rating of 50 percent to 90 percent wait for ten years before their tax is completely eliminated. A great number of these veterans are elderly and, unfortunately, may not live to see that day.

Even worse, fully two thirds of America's disabled veterans, with a rating less than 50 percent, have been left behind and will continue to be taxed as before—nearly 400,000

veterans! Despite the actions of Congress last year, the Disabled Veterans Tax is alive and well.

Our Democratic Leader, NANCY PELOSI, recently stated: "On the battlefield, our soldiers pledge to leave no one behind. As a Nation, let it be our pledge that when they return home, we will leave no veteran behind. The Disabled Veterans Tax breaks that promise."

Some of the veterans left behind include:

A veteran of the Kuwait theater who had a below-the-knee amputation after being hit by a drunk driver while jogging near the Pentagon to maintain physical fitness.

A retiree who cannot work on a family farm because of pain, numbness and osteoarthritis of both feet due to exposure to cold during noncombatant military service.

A veteran who lost an eye when an air hose accidentally detached from an airplane being worked on and who cannot work as an airline pilot.

A female retiree who has weekly panic attacks and chronic sleep disturbances as the result of a sexual assault which occurred while on active duty.

My friends and colleagues, Congress did just okay by taking the first steps towards eliminating the Disabled Veterans Tax—I would give us a grade of C−, but we did not do A work.

During my years in Congress, I cannot recall more than or two other issues on which I have received so many letters, e-mails and phone calls. Our veterans have been telling us that this is an important issue to them. They deserve that we do A work.

I understand that there are costs to concurrent receipt. But I also understand that the now-disabled veterans did not hesitate when called to duty. Many have returned home with disabilities they have had to lived with ever since. How can we doubt the imperative that we keep our promise and give them what they deserve? They earned their military retired pay. They deserve their VA disability compensation.

We cannot make them wait any longer for justice to prevail!

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BELINDA ELLIS, TOM GREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions of Belinda Ellis, Tom Green Elementary School Teacher of the Year.

Belinda's greatest influence is her mother, who taught her that things in life don't just happen—if you want something, you need to set a goal and work towards that goal a little at a time. This advice led Belinda to become the first in her family to graduate high school, and later college at Southwest Texas.

Mrs. Ellis has pledged over 18 years to teaching, and currently teaches math and science. She believes that having the support and involvement of a child's parent is the key to her success. During her time at Tom Green Elementary, Belinda has raised close to $3,000 to buy new flags, outdoor benches, and trashcans for her school.

This past year has been extremely hard for Belinda, who has remained strong, positive, and determined to continue working as normal despite her ongoing battle with cancer. Belinda hopes her enthusiasm for teaching and sponsoring extra-curricular activities touches each of her students.

I am honored to acknowledge Belinda Ellis, Tom Green Elementary School Teacher of the Year. Her passion and dedication are cherished by all in her community.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF MR. MIGUEL CONTRERAS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Mr. Miguel Contreras, devoted husband and father; a dedicated labor leader whose exemplary work touched the lives of many Californians.

Mr. Contreras was born and raised in Dinuba, California. The son of migrant farmworkers, Mr. Contreras went to work beside his parents and five brothers in the agricultural fields of California's Central Valley at only five years of age.

As a young man Mr. Contreras worked with the United Farm Workers of America. It was here that he found his true calling by learning from Cesar Chavez the meaning of dignity and self-worth. Mr. Chavez saw the potential of Mr. Contreras and appointed him a staff member of the United Farm Workers. It was here that Mr. Contreras learned the importance of speaking up and standing up for oneself.

With this strong foundation Mr. Contreras fought tirelessly for the rights of immigrants. He was an inspiration to many, bringing a special pride to Latino workers throughout California.

In 1993 Mr. Contreras began his work for the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO as Political Director. In 1996 he became Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Federation, devotedly serving 345 unions with a collective 800,000 members. He held this position until his unexpected death on May 6, 2005. He will be missed greatly.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of Mr. Contreras. I offer my deepest condolences to his mother Esther Contreras; his wife, Maria Elena Durazo; his two sons, Mario Salazar and Michael Contreras, and his five brothers Alex, Antonio, David, Juan and Pablo Contreras.

HONORING METROPORT MEALS ON WHEELS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Metroport Meals on Wheels as they celebrate 25 years of service to numerous communities within the 26th District of Texas. The Metroport Meals on Wheels program grew out of the passion of one individual, Kelly Bradley, who saw the need to aid her neighbors. It was her dedication to others and the generosity of the First United Methodist Church of Roanoke which fostered this program and allowed it to grow into its current state; bringing dignity and respect to seniors in over 19 cities in the North Texas region.

The invaluable support and outreach that Metroport Meals on Wheels provides to these Texas communities is an integral connection for those who wish to stay independent. Last year alone this grassroots organization served over 54,000 meals without the aid of State or Federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my utmost thanks and congratulations to Metroport Meals on Wheels for their 25 years of service to my fellow Texans and those most in need of their support and their humble respect. The generosity of Ms. Bradley and the other volunteers at Metroport is truly making a difference in the lives of those they serve.

A SMARTER APPROACH TO THE BORDER

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, as California's Border Congressman, I rise today to deliver a simple yet important message to this Congress about how we handle affairs on our nation's southern border.

To my fellow Members of Congress, I implore you: Don't block clinics that want to help Mexican children with severe medical needs. Don't block border schools from hosting their Mexican neighbors. And don't block our tourism industry from welcoming Mexican field trips. Instead, join me in supporting the VISA Act!

Prior to September 11, 2001, the Valley Orthopedic Clinic in Calexico, California treated low-income Mexican children who suffered from cleft palates or other maladies. In fact, over forty years, they treated 125,000 children! The Port Directors at the border selectively issued humanitarian visa waivers so that these children could briefly visit the United States without paying for an unaffordable $100 visa.

Since September 11, Port Directors have ceased issuing these visa waivers. As a result, children have been blocked from receiving specialized medical attention, participating in educational exchanges between border schools and taking field trips to tourist sites in border states.

That's why I have re-introduced the Visitors Interested in Strengthening America (VISA) Act (H.R. 2367). The bill gives Port Directors the discretion to issue humanitarian visa waivers to Mexican children making brief, prescheduled visits to the U.S. for medical, educational or recreational purposes.

In addition to clearing the way for American doctors who wish to provide specialized care to Mexican children, this bill would boost the economy in the border region and strengthen cultural and political understanding with Mexico.

The bill is identical to legislation that the Border Trade Alliance, National Council of La Raza, former U.S. Ambassador to Mexico Jeffrey Davidow and others supported in the 108th Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting for this important legislation.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CARLA BANDY, DAHLSTROM MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions of Carla Bandy, Dahlstrom Middle School Teacher of the Year.

Carla Bandy considers herself lucky to have given teaching another chance—initially quitting after 2 years because she felt she wasn't cut out for the job. Carla now understands that she made the right choice, and currently teaches Art at Dahlstrom Middle School.

In class, Carla stresses friendship; she respects her students and earns their respect in return. She believes that once she can achieve the trust of her students, the ''real learning'' begins.

Carla does her best to reach students of all abilities, skills, and interests. She keeps all students equally engaged—from the timid and unsure to the extremely talented. She researches the psychology behind different types of learning in an effort to customize her teaching techniques for each individual student.

I am honored to recognize Carla Bandy, Dahlstrom Middle School Teacher of the Year. Her dedication and hard work reward her students everyday.

ON RECEIVING THE NORTHEAST OHIO COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS LIFETIME COMMITMENT TO SOCIAL JUSTICE AWARD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Michael Foley, the executive director of the Cleveland's Tenants Organization (CTO), for his activism and dedication on behalf of Northeast Ohio's families who pay rent for their housing. Mr. Foley has proudly served the Cleveland community and has focused on meeting the housing needs and protecting the housing rights of Cleveland area tenants.

Mr. Foley has dedicated his entire professional career to fighting for social justice on behalf of Cleveland's residents. Mike received his Bachelor of Arts Degree in Philosophy from the University of Dayton and his law degree from Cleveland Marshall College of Law. He has served as a community organizer for the St. Clair-Superior Coalition and was a Field Representative for the City of Cleveland Community Relations Board. From 1990 to 1996, Mike was the court administrator and personal bailiff for Judge William H. Corrigan at Cleveland Municipal Housing Court. In 1996 and 1997 he was an instructor with the Cleveland Marshall College of Law, Housing Law Clinic. In 1997 he began working with the CTO—Cleveland's premiere organization focusing on the rights of tenants—as the Director of the Rental Information Center. He became the assistant director of CTO in 1998 and in late 1999 Mr. Foley became CTO's Executive Director.

Mr. Foley has worked collaboratively with me since I began serving in the US. House of Representatives. He was a guiding force and active participant in my Homelessness Summit, an advisory group with more than 200 Cleveland area activists working to end homelessness and advise me on legislative proposals. When out-of-state landlords bought one of the largest 55–and-over communities in Ohio's 10th Congressional District and immediately increased seniors' rent by as much as 25 percent, Mr. Foley worked with me, and the seniors, to organize one of the largest tenant organizations in the State. He went on to work with the seniors to organize the largest rent strike in Ohio's history. Mr. Foley has also facilitated the passage of a local landlord tenant act and extended the services his agency provides to include an eviction diversion program and a lead testing program.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Michael Foley. His long-time advocacy on behalf of rent-payers in the Cleveland area exemplify the Lifetime Commitment to Social Justice Award that he received from the Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless at the NEOCH Annual Meeting and Awards Ceremony on May 13. Because of the dedication and focus of Michael Foley, the lives of thousands of people have been lifted.

PHONE CALLS FOR THE TROOPS!

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, we are all committed to ensuring that our troops have the support they need to succeed in their mission and maintain high morale.

As part of this effort, we have taken important steps to ensure that the soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan can make free phone calls home to their loved ones. Last year, we passed a Defense Authorization bill that provided a $40 per month calling program to these soldiers. And our military hospitals have created adhoc programs, largely based on privately donated calling cards, to ensure that hospitalized troops can call home as well.

In order to strengthen and expand these efforts, I have introduced the bipartisan ''Troops Phone Home Free Extension'' Act (H.R. 2366). This legislation would extend the calling program until the end of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. My bill would also extend the program to future contingency operations to ensure that our troops do not have to wait for the legislative process to catch up with their phone call needs. Finally, the ''Troops Phone Home Free Extension'' Act would extend the monthly calling card program to the wounded to ensure that the Federal government will provide the phone benefit if private donations are insufficient.

I invite you join me in fighting to maintain the morale of our troops, support our military families and give our soldiers the benefits that they have earned through their sacrifice and courage. Please join me in co-sponsoring the ''Troops Phone Home Free Extension'' Act!

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF NANCY PHILLIPS IMPACT CENTER SCHOOL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions of Nancy Phillips, Impact Center School Teacher of the Year.

Nancy's interest in teaching stemmed from her ''lifelong love affair'' with the language arts. Following a Bachelor's degree, a teaching certificate in English and two subsequent Master's degrees, she dove into a teaching career that has continued for the past 25 years.

Nancy Phillips teaches English at an alternative school, where students are sent because of past drug use or violent histories. She teaches grades six to twelve, and is challenged to stretch her creative capabilities and management skills every time she walks into the classroom.

Nancy does her best to lead her students gently towards the good things they can find in books, describing herself as a ''combination tight rope walker and ring master.'' She is humble, and acknowledges that when she stays late at work or comes in during the weekend, she is not alone.

I am honored to recognize Nancy Phillips, Impact Center School Teacher of the year. Through her drive and consistent hard work, she is able to set her students on track for whatever challenges the future may bring.

DEMOCRACY AND DR–CAFTA

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the importance that the Dominican Republic—Central America Free Trade Agreement will have on stabilizing the democracies of the participating nations. While we have witnessed firsthand the benefits than free trade has on emerging democracies, no one is in a better position to describe the benefits than President Enrique Bolanos of Nicaragua. His country continues to face serious challenges to democratic reform, yet he is unwavering in his commitment to DR–CAFTA because he knows it will lead to further democratic progress.

Last week, President Bolanos gave an address at the Nicaraguan Embassy here in the United States where he presented Senator RICHARD LUGAR and Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick with the Order of Ruben Dario, the highest honor of Nicaragua. I am including his remarks in the RECORD to reiterate to my colleagues that this trade agreement is about far more than trade.

SPEECH BY H.E. PRESIDENT ENRIQUE BOLANOS

EMBASSY OF NICARAGUA—MAY 13, 2005

Distinguished Guests and Dear Friends: I am in the United States this week with my

fellow Central American Presidents. Together, we are here as the singular voice of Central America bringing a crucial message to the United States Congress. That message is as simple as it is important: pass the Central American—Dominican Republic Free Trade Agreement and pass it as quickly as possible.

There is a common misunderstanding about DR–CAFTA in the United States. The misunderstanding is that DR-CAFTA is primarily about trade. Yes, it is true that DR–CAFTA will bring very important trade and economic benefits to both the United States and to the nations of Central America and the Caribbean. This is an undeniable fact. But to truly understand DR–CAFTA, you have to get underneath the surface and see what DR–CAFTA is really about. In its central core, DR–CAFTA is really about ''democracy.'' It is about rewarding a region who has fought so hard to build their democratic institutions and increase the security of the region.

Democracy has made very important gains in Central America in the last 15 years. But many of those gains are not irreversible. As we have seen recently in some of the countries of South America, some people are beginning to question whether democracy and free markets can solve their country's problems. But they are wrong. This well-negotiated free trade agreement will consolidate the democratic gains and ensure that the region does not back slide into the insecurity and violence of previous decades. DR–CAFTA binds the United States and Central America not only economically, but more importantly, democratically. DR–CAFTA should be seen for what it really is: a chance to lock in the democratic future for Central America with all economic and security benefits that implies for the United States. I want all Americans, particularly members of Congress, to understand that CAFTA is a democracy issue more than a trade issue.

Today, Nicaragua's democracy faces a new set of threats. Yesterday's enemies of democracy used pure military force. Today's enemies of democracy have evolved and refined their techniques. Today's enemies of democracy leave the outside facade of democratic institutions intact, while at the same time they hollow out these institutions from the inside, leaving nothing but the hollow shell.

Unfortunately, this is exactly what the enemies of democracy are attempting to do in Nicaragua. As many of you who are following events in Nicaragua know, democracy is under a direct threat. The assault is being led by what the Economist magazine called an ''unholy alliance'' of the extreme left, led by Daniel Ortega, and of the extreme right led by ex-President Arnoldo Aleman who is currently serving a 20-year prison sentence. Together these two party bosses, or caudillos, as we say in Spanish, are attempting to dismantle some of democracy's most sacred principles—principles such as checks and balances and the independence of the judiciary—principles without which no democracy can be called a democracy.

When the military dictatorship was ended and freedom was restored to our country in 1991, many believed that progress towards building fully functioning democratic institutions would be linear, that is to say forever upward on a steady course. This has not been the case, however. And once again those who value democracy and believe in democracy for Nicaragua are being called to the ramparts to defend it.

My administration will never cease to fight for the independence of the judiciary, will never cease to fight for the separation of powers, will never cease to fight against corruption by government officials. And my administration will fight on every front: we will rally Nicaraguan people who crave democracy and functioning democratic institutions; we will fight to enforce the ruling of the Central American Court of Justice which in a historic decision on March 29, 2005 ruled against the attempts of the Nicaraguan National Assembly to strip the Presidency of its powers and declared it a violation of the principle of separation of powers. And we will fight if necessary in the Organization of American States with its wonderful and powerful Democratic Charter. And we will fight with the help of the many friends of Nicaragua that are here tonight who have supported the cause of freedom.

Finally, I would like to point out, only eleven days ago, on May 1st at the May Day ceremonies in Havana, Cuba, Daniel Ortega was hugging the dictator Fidel Castro and calling the United States ''an enemy of humanity.'' This would be a scene intimately familiar to both of our honorees here tonight from their days of defending democracy in the 1980s. All of which proves that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and with the help of all our friends here tonight, together we will meet the new challenges with the same courage and resolution that was brought to the earlier challenges to democracy in Nicaragua in the past.

A TRIBUTE TO LANCE BRET TAYLOR

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a constituent of mine, Lance Bret Taylor of Spring Valley, California. On April 6, 2005, Lance was traveling on a CH–47 Chinook helicopter when it crashed in the desert of Afghanistan, killing all eighteen Americans on board.

With the brave military personnel aboard that aircraft, there were three civilians, all noncombatants. Working for Halliburton subsidiary KBR, Lance was responsible for providing U.S. and coalition forces operating in Afghanistan with vital logistics and life support services.

A specialist in vector control who was returning to the U.S. base in Bagram from a mission, Lance was, like many Americans, proudly serving his country in other ways besides wearing a uniform. While Lance recognized the dangers inherent to working in a war zone, he was driven by a desire to help improve the lives of others.

Lance leaves behind his loving mother Lori, brother Kevin, his beautiful wife Deborah, a ten-year-old daughter, four stepchildren, and a baby granddaughter. He will continue to be remembered and loved by all those who knew him—not just today, but for as long as the U.S. defends the ideas of democracy and liberty throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the members of Lance's bereaved family and loved ones. Lance's dedication and service represents the best America has to offer and his sacrifice will never be forgotten.

WE ARE ALMOST OUT OF TIME

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise to join with my colleagues in the recognition of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. The contributions of Asian Pacific Islander Americans throughout the history of the United States are widely known.

One of the contributions that has never been properly acknowledged by the United States and by Congress is the part that was played in World War II by soldiers of the Philippines, a territory of the United States at that time.

They were drafted in World War II by President Roosevelt. They did not say no. They fought bravely and gallantly, in the battles of Bataan and Corrigidor, and the bullets did not distinguish between those who were U.S. citizens at the time and those who were citizens of the Philippines. Death did not make a distinction. The participation of the Filipino soldiers was critical to the successful outcome of the war in the Pacific. We owe them a great deal.

And yet, in 1946, the Congress said thank you, but no thank you. Congress withdrew the benefits that these brave men were promised. Although some positive steps were taken in the six decades since the war, we have not properly redeemed that promise.

Congressman CUNNINGHAM and I have introduced H.R. 302, the Filipino Veterans Equity Act, and Senator INOUYE has introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 146. These bills will complete the job and restore all the benefits that were rescinded by Congress. The passage of these bills will benefit the Filipino veterans in a substantial way.

But, at a deeper level, these bills are also about restoring dignity and honor to these proud veterans. Sixty years of injustice burn in the hearts of the Filipino World War II Veterans and in the hearts of their sons and daughters. It is time that our nation recognizes their contributions, recognizes the injustice, and acts to correct it. To those who say that we cannot afford to redeem this debt, I answer that we cannot afford not to! The historical record remains blotted until we recognize these veterans.

In passing these bills, we can make good on the promise of America.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JENNIFER WELMA, HAYS CSID SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions of Jennifer Welma, Hays CSID Special Education Teacher of the Year.

Growing up, Jennifer always knew that one day she wanted to be a teacher. Yet it was the 1991 State Competition for the Special Olympics in San Marcos which sparked a special passion. She was emotionally touched by

the bravery, courageousness, and beautiful spirit of the Olympians, and instantly knew she needed to be involved with such amazing individuals.

Jennifer Welma now teaches Phys Ed., and has a great time dancing, moving, laughing, and learning with her students.

Special Education has become even more important to Jennifer now that she has a son who is visually impaired and considered disabled. She continues her fight to promote the active participation of disabled students, ensuring their role as a visible part of a school campus. She thanks her son Kameron for the continued inspiration to become a better teacher, friend, and person.

I am honored to recognize Jennifer Welma, Hays CSID Special Education Teacher of the Year. Jennifer's passion and dedication to teaching enrichs the lives of all around her.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NORTHWESTERN HAWAIIAN ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE REFUGE ACT OF 2005

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a truly novel and revolutionary proposal to create the largest marine protected area in our world. I offer for this Congress' consideration and prompt action the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands National Marine Refuge Act of 2005, which would provide the maximum level of permanent protection for a magnificent marine system and international treasure, larger even than Australia's Great Barrier Reef Marine Protected Area. In so doing, my proposal would do for our country's, and world's, oceans what another then-novel and revolutionary action—our 1872 set-aside of what later became the foundation of our National Park System, Yellowstone National Park—did for permanent protection of our treasured and endangered terrestrial ecosystems.

This ''Ocean Yellowstone'' lives and breathes in the waters of our country surrounding the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI), an equally magnificent chain of islands starting at Nihoa Island lying just northwest of the main Hawaiian Islands and stretching fully 1,200 miles northwest across the Pacific to Kure Atoll. In these waters and among their reefs, banks, and seamounts, and existing as an integrated ecosystem with their terrestrial neighbors, lie some 70 percent of our nation's coral reefs.

This remote and incredibly diverse ecosystem is also home to some 7,000 species, at least one-quarter of which (some scientists say as much as half) are endemic to this area and found nowhere else on earth. It also serves as a pu'uhonua (place of refuge) to many species of coral, fish, birds, and marine mammals, including the highly endangered Hawaiian monk seal, threatened green sea turtle, and the endangered leatherback, loggerhead, and hawksbill sea turtles. An estimated 14 million seabirds thrive in these islands and their waters, including 99 percent of the world's Laysan albatrosses and 98 percent of the black-footed albatross population. This also may be the last predator-dominated marine ecosystem left on the planet—some 55 percent of the total fish biomass is made up of predator species, the natural way of our oceans.

Yet this incredible remnant of a purer world will not survive absent affirmative protective action, for by its isolation it is a fragile world, one where the most seemingly insignificant and benign human interaction can have the most magnified effect. As a prime example, the islands and waters of the NWHI have developed a unique ecosystem whose isolation at one time provided protection ttom invasive species. Yet today some invasives have become established due not only to marine debris from the Northern Pacific but from fishing, transiting, and other vessels. And commercial fishing and other human interaction is itself inherently invasive, as is evident in the introduction of rats (now eliminated) and the consequences of overfishing, leading the near-extinction of the black-lipped pearl oyster and other species and, more recently, the crash of the lobster fishery. Just last February, as another example, our Marine Mammal Commission reported that the world's dwindling Hawaiian monk seal population of an estimated 1,400, based in the NWHI, has ''no tolerance for additional mortality associated with fisheries or other human activities.''

Jurisdiction of the NWHI and waters has been shared by our federal and Hawai'i state governments. As an overall template, the islands themselves (with the exception of Midway Island, an unassociated federal possession) are part of the State of Hawai'i (and my Second Congressional District) along with the waters around those islands out to the three-mile limit. Beyond three miles and out to the fifty-mile boundary is the current Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve (Reserve), established by President Clinton and under the jurisdiction of the National Ocean Service (NOS) within the Department of Commerce's National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. The waters beyond the Reserve out to the extent of our country's 200-mile exclusive economic zone are also administered by the Department of Commerce in non-reserve status. Midway and its waters out twelve miles constitute the Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge, established in 1988 and administered by the Department of the Interior's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). With the exception of Midway, the islands of the NWHI and certain offshore waters, including some Hawai'i waters and some Reserve waters (except for waters off Kure Atoll), also constitute the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, originally established as a bird reservation by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909 and now under joint FWS-Hawai'i management.

On the face of it, if one's end-goal is, as is mine, to provide the highest level of permanent protection to the total ecosystem of the NWHI and waters, this structure can work and is, in most cases, working. The FWS is managing its jurisdiction within the Midway Atoll and the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuges toward the goal of full protection and preservation under longstanding and well-established federal mandates and mechanisms.

And just last Friday, May 13th, the State of Hawai'i's Board of Land and Natural Resources, responsible for the administration of all state lands and waters, voted to establish throughout Hawai'i's NWHI waters the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Marine Refuge, together with rules prohibiting commercial or recreational fishing within refuge waters. The Board's action followed a public input process which yielded some 110,000 comments supporting the most stringent protections. As Peter Young, Chair of the Board, said at the time: ''We are dealing with a special place, and it's different.'' For this action, Chair Young and the Board deserve our lasting gratitude.

To complete now this penumbra of protection and truly discharge our responsibility of stewardship, we must turn our attention primarily to the Reserve. Following its establishment, subsequent legislation mandated that the Reserve be converted to a National Marine Sanctuary. Public scoping meetings began in 2002, and the National Marine Sanctuary Program published ''Advice and Recommendations on Development of Draft Fishing Regulations'' in September 2004.

Essentially, in an effort to forge compromise between the interests of fishermen who operate in the Reserve, the desire of the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council (WESPAC) to retain control over the Reserve, the opinion of scientists and conservationists that the area remains vulnerable, and the overwhelming sentiment of the people of Hawai'i for protection, the Program proposed a management plan that would allow current fishing to continue and keep WESPAC involved in Reserve fishery management. WESPAC, however, subsequently proposed alternative Reserve regulations that would expand current fishing, open a fishery for precious corals, and provide only a temporary closing of the lobster fishery. Final Program Reserve regulations are pending.

This is an opportune, in fact optimum, time, before the Program acts any further, for us all to first stop, look, and listen, and second move to a whole different beat. And in doing so we must first ask this basic question: shouldn't there be some special places in our marine world which are in fact true reserves—truly off-limits, where our marine species can live and thrive in their natural state, without the invasive, extractive hand of humankind? I know in my heart that the answer is yes, and that the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and their waters are where we should just do it.

The challenge, however, is that we simply do not have an existing federal marine statutory and regulatory regime that encompasses this goal. We do have a National Marine Sanctuary Program run by good people with good intentions, administering a number of national marine sanctuaries. But the basic statutory and regulatory authority under which the Program operates and the sanctuaries are administered requires a balancing of sometimes-competing uses, including extractive uses, which is why some form of extractive use, fostered by fisheries management councils such as WESPAC, is allowed in all of our nation's national marine sanctuaries. There is simply not the regime in place to create what truly would be a sanctuary in the literal sense of the word, to forge a world such as my State of Hawai'i just proudly did in creation in its waters of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Marine Refuge.

My Northwestern Hawaiian Islands National Marine Refuge Act of 2005 would do just that: establish the public policy of this country that there should exist in the waters of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands one place that is

truly a refuge for our marine world. This refuge would extend seaward from the boundary of the federal national wildlife refuges-with concurrent jurisdiction over those portions also within Hawaii's Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Marine Refuge—out fifty miles to the boundaries of the current federal Reserve, except that the boundary would be further out past Kure Atoll to encompass newly-identified precious coral beds and monk seal foraging areas. The total area of this precious refuge would be approximately 137,000 square miles, eclipsing Australia's Great Barrier Reef Marine Protected Area of 135,000 square miles.

Under my bill, the Refuge would continue to be managed by NOS through a new Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and Refuges. This is consistent with NOAA's longstanding desire to elevate the current National Marine Sanctuary Program to full office level, and it provides NOS with a management option for marine resources in need of a higher level of protection than that currently provided under the Program. And that office, in managing the Refuge (in consultation with an advisory council including representatives from the State of Hawai'i and the Native Hawaiian, scientific, and marine conservation communities), would be statutorily charged with implementing Congress's purpose ''that the preservation of biodiversity and the protection and conservation of the natural resources and cultural heritage of [the Refuge] shall be the exclusive basis for all associated decisions by Federal agencies.''

Passage through and activities in the Refuge would be by permit only. Permitted activities would include scientific research and other uses consistent with the purpose of the Refuge. These uses would not include commercial fishing or other extractive practices except in very narrow circumstances. As there are some existing commercial fishing permitholders, my bill provides a mechanism to buy out these permits at fair value.

It is vital to note that this bill is grounded solidly in the cultural heritage and traditions of the indigenous peoples of Hawai'i, our Native Hawaiians. Their respect for the 'aina—our natural world in all its manifestations—in their practice of environmental protection and sustainability, was not just a profoundly spiritual belief but a basic survival strategy. So it is no surprise that one of the principal groups working toward just such a Refuge is Kahea: the Hawaiian Environmental Alliance, dedicated to bringing to our modern world this pu'uhonua for the rare and precious species of the NWHI. And in that same spirit my bill provides, as does Hawai'i's newly-proposed Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Marine Refuge, for continued traditional use of the Refuge by Native Hawaiians for religious, cultural, and sustenance purposes.

Here is a quick overview of my proposed Northwestern Hawaiian Islands National Marine Refuge Act of 2005:

Section 1: Entitles the act.

Section 2: Outlines Congress's findings, including the finding that the ''waters of the NWHI must be set aside as a fully protected national marine refuge to preserve in perpetuity their unique and fragile ecosystems, habitats, and communities of flora and fauna, as well as areas of traditional Hawaiian cultural significance. ''

Section 3: Sets forth the purposes and policies of the Act, including the provision that ''all human activities in the [Refuge] shall be limited to those entirely consistent with preservation and protections in the true nature of a full protected refuge, and that all commercial use of such refuge shall be prohibited.''

Section 4: Provides Act definitions, including Refuge boundaries and cooperative management between federal and Hawai'i agencies.

Section 5: Designates the Refuge.

Section 6: Provides for management of the Refuge by NOS through the new Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and Refuges in cooperation with the State of Hawai'i through memoranda of agreement and in consultation with an advisory council.

Section 7: Provides for vessel presence in the Refuge by permit only; outlines prohibited activities; provides compensation for current permitholders.

Section 8: Provides for enforcement and penalties.

Section 9: Provides for liability and other legal consequences.

Section 10: Repeals prior inconsistent laws.

Section 11: Requires issuance of implementing regulations within six months of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I confess to speaking on this floor today with a mix of excitement and awe. Excitement at continuing a journey to a next, higher level that is not only novel and revolutionary, but so right. And awe at the responsibility and opportunity we all have to truly preserve and protect one of the most incredible places on this world. I hope and believe that we can all come together to harness the collective aloha of so many for this place, and promptly pass the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands National Marine Refuge Act of 2005.

Mahalo, and aloha!

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER ''SANDY'' ELLENBERG

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Alexander ''Sandy'' Ellenberg, and to recognize his lifelong achievements and legacy of volunteerism and dedication to public service.

In the Jewish faith, there is a commandment requiring that one give tzedakah, which in Hebrew means an act of ''charity'' or ''righteousness'' without expecting anything in return. Sandy Ellenberg was a man of faith, and his life represented a life-long example of tzedakah. Sandy Ellenberg was a good friend of mine and a true pillar to the local community; he was a man of character, compassion and goodwill. He will be deeply missed by all who knew him and were touched by his work.

Alexander Ellenberg was born on October 13, 1933 in Stockton, California—the first child in his family to be born in the United States. Sandy worked his way through the University of California, completing his undergraduate degree at Berkeley and his medical degree at UC San Francisco. Recognizing his own good fortune and the difficulty in achieving one's dreams, Sandy endowed an annual scholarship at Cal for a San Joaquin County student to study medicine.

A successful plastic surgeon by profession, Sandy said that he got the most joy from performing serious reconstructive surgery. Through these operations, he could use his medical training and surgical skills to repair damages, correct congenital disorders and bring hope back into the faces of those who suffered traumatic injuries and disfigurations. Twice, Sandy traveled to Venezuela to fix children's cleft palates and lips with Rotaplast International, a charitable organization sponsored by the Rotary Club.

In addition to his work with Rotaplast, Sandy was politically active and socially conscious—an advocate of civil rights, a generous political campaign donor and patron of the arts. He was a visible figure in the Jewish community: an active member of his local synagogue and a past board member of the Jewish Federation of Silicon Valley. Sandy lived a rich and full life, and contributed to his community in so many ways.

Sandy Ellenberg died on February 27, 2005. On that day America lost one of its quiet heroes. In a world that is always looking out for the bottom line, where a ''free lunch'' is rarely ever ''free,'' Sandy Ellenberg was a breath of fresh air. He recognized his own good fortune, and was committed to making success, equality, freedom and happiness available to others. His life was an example of righteousness and unselfish giving—of tzedakah.

Sandy leaves behind his wife of fifty years, Maureen, and 2 sons, Steven and Gary. Our thoughts and prayers go out to their family and friends; Sandy is deeply missed by us all.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring the life and work of Alexander Ellenberg, a man whose life exemplified goodwill and selfless giving; he was one of America's true heroes.

TRIBUTE TO SIX HONOREE TEACHERS OF ST. RICHARDS SCHOOL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of six exemplary veteran teachers who have combined experience of over 166 years in the teaching profession. In April these six teachers were honored with the Heart of St. Richards Parish award because of the positive influences they contribute to students, families, and the whole community of St. Richards Parish. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these teachers for their outstanding commitment to our Nation's youth. They stand as a symbol of the positive influences that teachers contribute to students every day across this great country.

The first teacher I am privileged to recognize is Mrs. Kathleen Riordan Pona who began teaching in 1959 with a class of 51 energetic second grade students. Mrs. Pona has served with 4 pastors and 7 principals who have helped her build the foundation that has continued the road of success at St. Richards School. Her 43 years of teaching is a shining light for teachers around the country who are beginning their careers in teaching and struggling to bring success to the classroom on an annual basis. This Nation is indebted to Mrs. Pona and teachers like her who have made teaching their first love.

Miss Joann Gaus began her teaching career in 1969 at St. Richards School and continually

requested new opportunities inside and outside of the classroom to benefit the lives of her students. Miss Gaus had the honor of taking an active part in the parochial education of her students preparing them for both Communion and Reconciliation. She has been a team leader in the teaching profession by being a coordinator for nearly every subject area and representing her fellow faculty members at meetings within the Archdiocesan Council.

Another outstanding teacher is Ms. Josephine Granat who has graciously and excitedly served her students for 32 years in teaching and 17 years at St. Richards. Her concern for her students is matched by the excitement and energy that she brings into the classroom. St. Richards is proud and lucky to have such a great teacher continuing her career at their institution of learning.

Mrs. Rita Zbella is currently in her 29th year of teaching at St. Richards School, where she came and taught in 1976. Mrs. Zbella has proven to be an essential asset to St. Richards where she is currently teaching the computer class, which ranges from 3–year-old preschoolers to 8th grade junior high students. Her commitment to her family and profession is representative of the sacrifices teachers make everyday in their lives.

Mr. Frank Trapani has been a teacher for 28 years, dedicating 20 of those years at St. Richards teaching religion and social studies. Individuals like Mr. Trapani enjoy the feeling of community, connection, brotherhood and sisterhood, and culture that a teacher receives when teaching at a parochial school. As a teacher, Mr. Trapani enjoys the privilege of being able to know his students, their parents, and the community that make up St. Richards Parish. He is truly grateful to have been able to dedicate his life to the teaching profession.

Finally, it is an honor to give praise to Mrs. Pamela Toppings, who began her teaching career in 1984 and has dedicated 21 years to St. Richards School. Her career is a promising one and her experience with St. Richards has been rewarding. St. Richards is fortunate to have a quality teacher as shown by Mrs. Topping's dedication and hard work.

I am honored today to pay tribute to 6 wonderful and dedicated teachers who have shown quality service to a great institution, St. Richards School.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kathleen Riordan Pona, Joann Gaus, Josphine Granat, Rita Zbella, Frank Trapani, Pamela Toppings, and the parish of St. Richards for the many years it has provided services to the community and wish them the very best in the years yet to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber on May 10, 2005. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 162 and 163.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 2005

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 6 million Jews who lost their lives in the Holocaust. I pay tribute to these innocent men, women, and children who died at the hands of the brutal Nazi regime.

While the Nazis were defeated by Allied Forces 60 years ago, the specter of bigotry, prejudice, and intolerance has tragically survived. The best way to honor the victims of the Holocaust is to ensure that such an event never happens again. Yet, with every year and every generation that passes this tragedy becomes less a reality and more a story to read about in a history book.

Everyone of us shares in the responsibility to make sure those who have died in the Holocaust have not done so in vain.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RAY McKENNA

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and dedication of an East Hartford legend and community sports leader, the late Ray McKenna. In honor of his memory, I am submitting for the RECORD a letter to the editor by Don Pitkin in the East Hartford Gazette.

[From the East Hartford Gazette, Mar. 10, 2005]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

(By Don Pitkin)

TO THE EDITOR: Ray McKenna, the Sports Legend, icon, humanitarian, and more importantly, the friend we all lost a week ago. Much has been spoken and chronicled about his many accomplishments and the giving of himself. Any attempt to try and say more along those lines would be to repeat what has already been stated. Now is the time to try and envision what Ray has been, or is doing, since he left us. It is easily believed that on his journey to his new "Burnside," he is thinking of those he will be joining. How many will there be? What have they been doing? Are there any sports activities there? It soon became clear what he would do first. He would look for his old coach and mentor, Mr. John "Crafty Jack" McGrath. Once arrived it didn't take long. Everyone knew Mr. McGrath. After all, the residents in this area all came from East Hartford. Ray will be surrounded by those he has known for years. After the greetings and reminiscing is over, Ray gets right to the point. Are there any sports here? Are there are athletes from East Hartford around? There are! Who are they? Will you help me find them? And off Ray went with Coach. Ray spotted them even before he and Coach got there. Someone was banging out fly balls for Al Jordan and Johnny Lichatz to chase down. Then it was a grounder to the left of Ed Cox at short. The scoop and the toss to Bill Wood at second and the throw to Long John Gorman at first. It was wide, but John snared it and made the swipe to tag the imaginary runner. Over there, isn't that Andy Senicrope pitching to Bill Luika? Then it was like they were all as one when they spotted Ray and came to greet him. It was talk, talk, yak, yak for a while. Ray brought up the subject of playing as a team. They were all from the 1938 team of East Hartford High. The only ones missing, Bobby Brown at third and Pitkin in right. Now the vision changes. It is a month later. Someone has filled the vacancies and Coach has found others from his past teams. They are all wearing the knicker length baseball pants. On the front of their shirts it is East Hartford, and on the back, Ray's '38 Team. They look pretty sharp as they work out. Word is that they have joined the Eastern Division of the newly formed Sky League. Yes! Ray had an important role in this endeavor. If any of you would like to see them play their first season, it is quite easy. Walk out into your yard, tilt your head back and look up into the blue. Now close your eyes. Did you see that? Loika threw out the man trying to steal. Just stay like that. This is only the third inning. There is more coming. You all know the rest of this vision. Mr. Editor. If you should happy to be in touch with Ray, please tell him that when I am finished here, I will join them with glove and shoes in hand. P.S. Good Luck guys! Thanks, Don Pitkin of East Hartford Note: Don Pitkin is a graduate of East Hartford High School, Class of 1938. He and East Hartford Gazette Sports Editor Ray McKenna were teammates.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 12th, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes on that day.

Had I been present I would have voted the following: "no" on rollcall vote number 169, the Weiner Amendment limiting the number of Urban Area Security Initiative grants during any given fiscal year to 50, and "yea" on rollcall vote number 170, final passage of H.R. 1544, the Faster & Smarter Funding for First Responders Act of 2005.

THE "PRESERVING PATIENT ACCESS TO PHYSICIANS ACT OF 2005"

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague, Representative CLAY SHAW, to introduce the "Preserving Patient Access to Physicians Act of 2005."

This is an issue of great importance to Medicare beneficiaries and to the providers who care for them. Under current law, physicians are reimbursed according to a payment formula that uses the Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR). This formula led to a 5.4 percent cut in payments in 2002. Additional cuts in 2003, 2004, and 2005 were averted only after Congress intervened. The most recent short term intervention—in the 2003 Medicare Modernization Act—will expire in seven and a half

months on January 1, 2006. If Congress does not act soon, a 4.3 percent across-the-board cut will be imposed for 2006 and between 2007 and 2012 cuts would total approximately 30 percent. To restore predictability and stability to providers, Congress must devise a permanent solution that will stave off this impending crisis and its potential impact on beneficiaries' access to care.

The current physician payment formula is flawed for two primary reasons: first payment rates are calculated by using the SGR, which is in turn tied to our Nation's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). When the economy softens and GDP declines—unless physician volume and costs decline correspondingly—physician payment updates will be decreased. But this is a faulty measure of appropriate utilization, because the health care needs of our seniors do not decline during economic downturns. We faced such a situation in 2002, when the economy faced a downturn, yet the rising costs of caring for beneficiaries continued to rise. As a result, CMS cut the physician update by 5.4 percent.

Furthermore, the SGR system fails to recognize that several factors driving volume and cost increases are beyond providers' control. These include administrative coverage decisions that promote greater use of physician services, increases in the cost of the physician-administered drugs, and the addition since 1997 of valuable, life-saving preventive benefits, including mammograms, pap smears, colorectal and prostate cancer screening, and bone mass measurements for osteoporosis. In addition, the 2003 MMA added a physical examination for new beneficiaries, cholesterol and lipid screenings, and limited prescription drug coverage.

As a result of these initiatives, beneficiaries will visit their physicians more often-to get prescriptions for newly-covered drugs, to be monitored for drugs' side effects, to receive newly-covered preventive services, or to receive follow-up care for conditions diagnosed by these services. These costs must be taken into account in determining payment updates for physicians. Physicians should not be penalized for increases in volume resulting from Congressional initiatives.

The volatility of Medicare reimbursement jeopardizes the ability of physician practices to make sound long-term financial decisions. Many physicians in my home State of Maryland are beginning to limit the number of Medicare patients they treat. Cuts in Medicare payments also jeopardize access to care for our military families and retirees, because the TRICARE program sets its rates based on Medicare's. In addition many State Medicaid programs and other third party payers rely on Medicare's system to set their rates.

Congress must replace the SGR with a methodology that assures adequate and appropriate payments as well as a stable updates for Medicare providers. The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission in its March 2005 report and recommends implementation of a system where updates are based on a fair assessment of practice costs and adequacy of payment rates.

The Preserving Patient Access to Physicians Act of 2005 would set the Medicare physician payment update for 2006 at no less than 2.7 percent, in accordance with MedPAC's recommendation. For 2007 and beyond, it would replace the flawed physician payment formula with a new formula that increases the update to reflect changes in the cost of providing care. There is bipartisan agreement that Congress needs to fix the physician payment formula permanently. Unfortunately, budgetary constraints have limited us to only short-term fixes. Our nation is facing a $7 trillion debt, and this year's budget deficit exceeds $500 billion. Given our Nation's fiscal situation and the budget rules on Congress, the likelihood that Congress will enact a permanent fix this year is diminished. But each year that we delay increases the ten-year cost of the bill, and Congress must move beyond a band-aid approach to a more comprehensive, responsible and permanent solution to this flawed payment system. This is an ambitious bill, but one that I believe is necessary to initiate serious debate on this matter. Congress must make sure that the enactment of a solution for physician reimbursement is done in a fiscally responsible manner.

MedPAC's March 2005 report also notes that neither the SGR nor any previous mechanism has been successful in moderating growth of physician services through the use of volume targets. Specifically, according to MedPAC, ''volume has continued to grow and legislated targets have not succeeded in differentiating between beneficial volume growth and increases in inappropriate services. The current sustainable growth rate (SGR) formula has resulted in both budgetary and policy problems.'' Congress must devise a way to control unwarranted growth in services without compromising the delivery of needed medical care.

I also want to address an issue of great importance to our beneficiaries—rising Medicare premiums and copayments. Increases in Medicare Part B premiums are set by law based on the actuarial value of the coverage. Increases in Part B costs in turn increase the monthly premiums and copayments that beneficiaries must pay. I recognize that this bill is no exception to the rule. CMS has just reported that monthly premiums for Part B will rise to an estimated 14 percent to $89.20 in 2006, largely because of an unexpected 15 percent increase in spending on physician visits and other outpatient services in 2004. According to CMS, the higher spending levels can be attributed to longer office visits, more services provided, an increase in laboratory tests and imaging services, and higher use of physician-administered drugs. CMS also reported that enrollment growth and a 1.5 percent increase in Medicare physician reimbursements last year were not significant factors in the overall spending increase.

The annual cost-of-living increases in our seniors' and disabled persons' Social Security checks are not sufficient to cover rapidly increasing Medicare premiums. Furthermore, because the prescription drug coverage enacted in 2003 will be administered by private plans that will set their own premiums, seniors do not know what they will have to pay for a drug plan premiums next year or in the years to come. So, in addition to fixing SGR, Congress must also act to protect beneficiaries from sharp increases in premiums. We must make sure that seniors do not pay the price for appropriate increases to health care providers. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I will continue to work with my colleagues and with all groups who want to preserve access and affordability for beneficiaries while achieving fairness in our reimbursement system.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. JUSTIN COLLIER

HON. LINCOLN DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Mr. Justin Collier, who has been named the 2004–2005 Outstanding AG/HEC Ambassador. Mr. Collier is from McMinnville, TN, he is currently a student at Tennessee Tech University studying Agriculture with concentrations in horticulture and nursery and landscape management.

Mr. Collier received an engraved plaque and a $500 cash award which was presented by Don Elkins, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Human Ecology and AG/HEC Ambassadors advisor, at the Agriculture Awards Banquet on April 15, 2005.

Mr. Collier began his work in recruiting and public relations even before he was officially an AG/HEC Ambassador. He started speaking to several groups of new students and their parents in the summer of 2004 during SOAR sessions. He also visited 7 high schools on recruitment visits during the year, where he gave presentations to classes about Tennessee Tech, the College of Agriculture and Human Ecology, and career opportunities available to Agriculture/Human Ecology graduates.

In addition, he gave official welcome tours to several groups of campus visitors. During these tours he hosted several individuals and small groups of campus visitors and gave them a complete campus tour, which included a farm tour. His efforts also included writing, emailing and calling numerous prospective students. In 2005 Mr. Collier participated in LEAD 2005, an Ambassador Leadership Conference held in February at the University of Georgia in Athens.

Regarding his experiences as an AG/HEC Ambassador in 2004–05, Mr. Collier states, ''The recruiting and other activities have allowed me to share my love for the College with many people. I have met more new people and made more friends than I could have possibly imagined. Having had the opportunity to serve as an AG/HEC Ambassador has been an honor and will definitely go down as one of the most memorable and exciting experiences during my time at TTU.''

IN HONOR OF ARMY SERGEANT ADAM PLUMONDORE AND ARMY SPECIALIST CLINTON GERTSON, BOTH OF WHOM WERE KILLED IN COMBAT DURING OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, SGT Adam Plumondore of Gresham, Oregon, was killed

in action on 16 February 2005, and SPC Clinton Gertson of Houston Texas, was killed in action on 19 February 2005. Both men were snipers assigned to the 1st Battalion, 24th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade, 25th Infantry Division, Ft. Lewis, Washington. Lieutenant Colonel Michael E. Kurilla commands the 1–24 Infantry Regiment and he shares his comments made at the memorial service for these Great Americans.

GEN Bergner, COL Brown, SGTs Major, friends of Deuce Four, and most importantly the men of Deuce Four. Thank you for coming today to honor two of the finest warriors that I have had the privilege and honor to serve beside.

GEN William T. Sherman stated that War is Hell. My friends, he was right. It affects all those in its all consuming grasp. It affects us physically, mentally, emotionally, and spiritually—it does not differentiate between civilian or soldier. No one wishes for war—to do so is sheer madness. GEN MacArthur said it best—The soldier above all others prays for peace, for it is the soldier who must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war.

To the men of Deuce Four, we now honor our 7th warrior to die defending the freedom of a people we neither know nor completely understand. But such action is truly the nobility of our profession. We sacrifice all for a people that do not fully understand the extent of our sacrifice. A people that had never tasted the sweet waters of freedom until 30 Jan of this year. And it is because of your valiant actions, the valiant actions of heroes like SGT Adam Plumondore and SPC Clint Gertson.

I would like to tell you about what kind of men they were as I remembered them—for these were extraordinary men that accomplished extraordinary things.

Clint Gertson was the first man I met from Deuce Four three weeks before I took command of the Battalion. I was visiting Deuce Four in Feb 2004 conducting live fires at Yakima Training Center. I approached the support by fire position and this 6'4'' square jawed PFC stood up and greeted me with that big Texas smile and asked me if I wanted a clinic on how to shoot; he subsequently proceeded to hit a man sized target at 500m. I immediately knew that I would love this battalion and that if the rest of the soldiers were half as impressive as he was, I would have the best battalion in the Army.

Gerty became a main stay of motivation for me. If one ever needed to know why it is a privilege and honor to command the sons and daughters of America they only needed to meet Clint Gertson.

I remember 11 Nov like it was yesterday. What started as a raid to kill or capture an HVT turned into a 6 hour firefight with 60 insurgents, leaving 25 confirmed enemy dead and estimates of up to 40 killed. This was only because of men like Clint Gertson. We were taking significant small arms, RPG and mortar fire when we moved to the top of a building to get better fields of fire. As we arrived at the top of the building, I heard the distinctive bark of the .50 Cal sniper rifle from the corner and looked over to see Gerty in all his glory. Gerty and the sniper crew were killing RPG gunners as they moved between buildings in an attempt to reposition on Apache company. At one point he turned around and gave that big Texas smile and turned back to administering death to the enemy.

I also remember one month later when Gerty missed a shot on an enemy mortar team only 300m from his hide site (I think it was closer to 250m)—I teased him that he needed more range time but he quickly reminded me that at least it scared the shit out of the enemy to drop the mortar tube and we did capture it. Good point Gerty. Clint Gertson was the kind of man that made you proud to say that you served with him.

SGT Adam Plumondore was also such a man. An extraordinary leader that did extraordinary things. I had the privilege to observe the actions of SGT Plumondore on a daily basis—and stand back in awe and wonder.

Plum was a walking uniform violation—but strangely, that is one of the things I loved about this man. I do not think a day would go by where I did not tell him to roll down his sleeves, buckle his chin strap, or trim up his Delta Force mustache. Sure enough, he would make the correction and in the thick of a fire fight there would be Plum with sleeves up, chin strap unbuckled, a big smile on his face and a weapon that never missed—unless he was firing 40mm from his M203 which he often reminded me was an area weapon.

I remember 3 Dec like it was yesterday. Sixty to seventy enemy had set up a 2km ambush along Route Tampa and the Recon platoon and TAC found itself running a 2km gauntlet of 15 IEDs, over 30 RPGs, hand grenades and significant machinegun and AK47 fire. Six soldiers were wounded including SPC Moore who was blown from the hatch of his Stryker that was now running on 8 flat tires—without missing a beat SGT Plumondore immediately jumped up and manned the MK19 and suppressed and killed enemy positions allowing the platoon to get casualties to the CSH and then launch a Battalion counter attack that killed 22 enemy.

I remember 11 Dec like it was yesterday. As we were beginning to exfil from destroying a weapons cache a suicide car bomb slammed into the side of Hunter 1. The entire vehicle was in flames, 6 soldiers were wounded. The enemy then engaged with mortars, RPGs, and machinegun fire from 3 directions. Without even thinking twice, SGT Plumondore jumped from his vehicle with fire extinguishers in his hands and his weapon slung on his back. Without hesitation he began to put out the Stryker on fire and assist in the evacuation of the wounded from the Stryker. The fire out, Plum then turned his attention to the enemy and began to engage them with precision fires. Because of his actions, Plum saved soldiers lives and the Stryker did not burn to the ground—in fact his determined face was back in the gunner's hatch of his vehicle engaging an enemy RPG team that tried to ambush the platoon during exfil—complete with sleeves rolled up to the elbows.

How do you honor such heroes as Clint Gertson and Adam Plumondore? You honor them by telling the stories of their friendship, camaraderie, and fierce bravery. You honor them by continuing to fight to protect the man on your left and right who would lay down his life so that others might live. You honor them by continuing in this noble endeavor providing freedom to a people we do not know or understand the sacrifices that are made—but that is what makes America the greatest nation on earth.

We will miss them both terribly, but I know that our Deuce Four snipers, Gerty and Plum, are looking down from Heaven continuing to look out for us—that voice you hear in your head is Gerty calling the winds, Plum ensuring you have the correct distance, and both always reminding you to always look for the positive in life.

On this day, we ask almighty God to grant us patience and steadfast resolve in all that is to come. May God Bless Deuce Four, 1st Brigade, and may God Bless America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 2005

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the record and regret that I could not be present today, Thursday May 12, 2005 to vote on rollcall vote nos. 171, 172 and 173 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall vote no. 171 on H.R. 627—to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Putnam Avenue in Hamden, Connecticut, as the "Linda White-Epps Post Office"; "yea" on rollcall vote no. 172 on H. Res. 266—supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day; and, "yea" on rollcall vote no 173 on H.R. 2107—the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund Act of 2005.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 17, 2005 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 18

8:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to protecting the judiciary at home and in the courthouse.
SD–226

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider comprehensive energy legislation.
SD–366

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine eco-terrorism specifically examining the Earth Liberation Front (''ELF'') and the Animal Liberation Front (''ALF'').
SD–406

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine FEMA's response to the 2004 Florida hurricanes, and its impact on taxpayers.
SD–562

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine issues relating to the taking of land into trust.
SH–216

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Regulation NMS designed to strengthen our national market system for equity securities, focusing on recent market developments.
SD–538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of David A. Sampson, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce, and John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.
SR–253

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider the proposed Workforce Investment Act Amendments of 2005, and pending nominations.
SD–430

10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine human spaceflight.
SR–253

2:30 p.m.
Intelligence
To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

MAY 19

9 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To receive a closed briefing regarding weapons proliferation, terrorism and democracy in Iran.
S–407 Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider comprehensive energy legislation.
SD–366

Environment and Public Works
Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Endangered Species Act.
SD–406

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Philip J. Perry, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security; to be followed by a hearing on the nominations of Carolyn L. Gallagher, of Texas, and Louis J. Giuliano, of New York, each to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, and Tony Hammond, of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Rate Commission.
SD–562

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2006 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
SD–124

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings to examine Regulation NMS designed to strengthen our national market system for equity securities, focusing on recent market developments.
SD–538

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine weapons proliferation, terrorism and democracy in Iran.
SD–419

10:30 a.m.
Intelligence
To hold a closed meeting to discuss certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

1 p.m.
Foreign Relations
International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine S. 883, to direct the Secretary of State to carry out activities that promote the adoption of technologies that reduce greenhouse gas intensity in developing countries, while promoting economic development.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Ben S. Bernanke, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.
SD–538

2:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the need for a constitutional amendment relating to the protection of marriage.
SD–226

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine accountability and results in Federal budgeting, focusing on steps being taken to ensure that federal programs are effective and accountable and to explore in-depth the Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART), which is used by OMB to assess and evaluate federal programs.
SD–562

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider comprehensive energy legislation.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine S. 529, to designate a United States Anti-Doping Agency and to examine the competitive pressures that lead amateur athletes to use drugs, the sources of such drugs, and the science of doping.
SR–253

2:30 p.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Education and Early Childhood Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to American history.
SD–430

3 p.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine money laundering and terror financing issues in the Middle East.
SD–538

MAY 25

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider comprehensive energy legislation.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the U.S. Grain Standards Act.
SR–328A

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–430

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine S.J. Res. 15, to acknowledge a long history of official depredations and ill-conceived policies by the United States Government regarding Indian tribes and offer an apology to all Native Peoples on behalf of the United States.
SR–485

MAY 26

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider comprehensive energy legislation.

SD–366

10 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine issues relating to the 21st century workplace.

SD–430

SEPTEMBER 20

10 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the American Legion.

345 CHOB

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5197–S5248

Measures Introduced: Six bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1036–1041, S. Res. 142–143, and S. Con. Res. 33. **Page S5219**

Measures Passed:

Senate Legal Counsel: Senate agreed to S. Res. 143, to authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to appear in legal proceedings in the name of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in connection with its investigation into the United Nations' ''Oil-For-Food'' Program. **Page S5247**

Transportation Equity Act: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 3, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S5197–S5215**

Adopted:

Inhofe/Jeffords Amendment No. 761 (to Amendment No. 605), to make certain revisions and modifications. **Page S5214**

Withdrawn:

Inhofe (for Ensign) Amendment No. 636 (to Amendment No. 605), to authorize the State of Nevada to continue construction of the US–95 Project in Las Vegas, Nevada. **Pages S5214–15**

Schumer Amendment No. 674 (to Amendment No. 605), to increase the transit pass and van pooling benefit to $200. **Pages S5211–15**

Pending:

Inhofe Amendment No. 605, to provide a complete substitute. **Page S5197**

Allen/Ensign Amendment No. 611 (to Amendment No. 605), to modify the eligibility requirements for States to receive a grant under section 405 of title 49, United States Code. **Page S5197**

Sessions Modified Amendment No. 646 (to Amendment No. 605), to reduce funding for certain programs. **Page S5197**

Reid (for Lautenberg) Amendment No. 619 (to Amendment No. 605), to increase penalties for individuals who operate motor vehicles while intoxicated or under the influence of alcohol under aggravated circumstances. **Pages S5199–S5205**

Inhofe (for Snowe) Amendment No. 706 (to Amendment No. 605), to specify which portions of Interstate Routes 95, 195, 295, and 395 in the State of Maine are subject to certain vehicle weight limitations. **Pages S5205–11**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Chair sustained a point of order that Dorgan Amendment No. 652 (to Amendment No. 605), to provide for the conduct of an investigation to determine whether market manipulation is contributing to higher gasoline prices, was not germane, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S5214**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:45 a.m. on Tuesday, May 17, 2005, with 30 minutes of debate equally divided. **Page S5247**

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following conventions:

Convention Concerning Migratory Fish Stock in the Pacific Ocean (Treaty Doc. No. 109–1), and Convention Strengthening Inter-American Tuna Commission (Treaty Doc. No. 109–2).

The conventions were transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed. **Pages S5246–47**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Daniel R. Stanley, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Eric S. Edelman, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

Sandra L. Pack, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Paul A. Trivelli, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua.

Ann Louise Wagner, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Victoria Nuland, of Connecticut, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador.

Terence Patrick McCulley, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali.

Larry Miles Dinger, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Fiji Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, Tuvalu, and the Republic of Kiribati.

Michael E. Hess, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Janice B. Gardner, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of the Treasury.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

5 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Pages S5247–48

Messages From the House: **Page S5217**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5217–19**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5219**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5219–21**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5221–32**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5215–17**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S5232–37**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S5237**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 6:29 p.m. until 9:45 a.m., on Tuesday, May 17, 2005. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5247.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 23 public bills, H.R. 2362–2384; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 152–153, and H. Res. 279 were introduced.

Pages H3330–31

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3331–32**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Filed on Friday, May 13: H.R. 1817, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Homeland Security, amended (H. Rept. 109–71, Pt. 2);

Filed on Friday, May 13: H.R. 1817, to authorize appropriations for fiscalyear 2006 for the Department of Homeland Security, amended (H. Rept. 109–71, Pt. 3);

Filed on May 13: H.R. 2360, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (H. Rept. 109–79);

Filed on May 13: H.R. 2361, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (H. Rept. 109–80);

H.R. 1224, to repeal the prohibition on the payment of interest on demand deposits, amended (H. Rept. 109–81);

H.R. 1215, to provide for the implementation of a Green Chemistry Research and Development Program, amended (H. Rept. 109–82); and

H. Res. 278, providing for consideration of H.R. 2360, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (H. Rept. 109–83). **Page H3330**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative McMorris to act as speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3265**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:48 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H3268**

Commission on International Religious Freedom: The Chair announced the Speaker's reappointment of Ms. Nina Shea of Washington, D.C., and upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader, Ms. Felice Gaer of Paramus, New Jersey to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a two year term ending May 14, 2007. **Page H3269**

Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for FY 2006—CBO Estimate: The House agreed that the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for H.R. 1817 be inserted in the appropriate place in the Congressional Record. **Pages H3269–70**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Linda White-Epps Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 627, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Putnam Avenue in Hamden, Connecticut, as the "Linda White-Epps Post Office", by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 390 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 171; **Pages H3270–71, H3286–87**

Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 1760, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in Madison, Wisconsin, as the "Robert M. La Follette, Sr. Post Office Building"; **Pages H3271–73**

Supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day: H. Res. 266, supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 391 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 172; **Pages H3273–75, H3287–88**

Providing for the authorization to store water from the city of Cheyenne in the Kendrick Project, Wyoming: H.R. 1046, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the city of Cheyenne, Wyoming, for the storage of the city's water in the Kendrick Project, Wyoming; **Page H3275**

Potash Royalty Reduction Act of 2005: H.R. 485, amended, to provide that the royalty rate on the output from Federal lands of potassium and potassium compounds from the mineral sylvite in the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be reduced to 1.0 percent; **Pages H3276–77**

National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund Act of 2005: H.R. 2107, to amend Public Law 104–329 to modify authorities for the use of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 392 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 173; **Pages H3277–78, H3288**

Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility Transfer Act: H.R. 540, amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District; and **Pages H3278–83**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Newlands Project Headquarters and Maintenance Yard Facility to the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District. **Page H3283**

Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Act: H.R. 938, amended, to establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. **Pages H3283–86**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:16 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H3286**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings today and appear on pages H3287, H3287–88, and H3288. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:58 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies approved for full Committee action the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations for Fiscal Year 2006.

UN OIL-FOR-FOOD PROGRAM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "The United Nations Oil-for-Food Program: Saddam Hussein's Use of Oil Allocations to Undermine Sanctions and the United Nations Security Council." Testimony was heard from Gerald C. Anderson, Director, Office of Peacekeeping, Sanctions and Counterterrorism, Department of State; and public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2360, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The rule provides for one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Under the rules of the House the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill), except as specified in the resolution. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Rogers of Kentucky and Representative Sabo.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Committee on Rules: Heard testimony from Chairman Taylor of North Carolina, Representatives Pombo and Dicks, but action was deferred on H.R. 2361, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2005

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine the progress of the Capitol Visitor Center, 10:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Defense, 2:30 p.m., SD–192.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the current legal and regulatory requirements and industry practices for credit card issuers with respect to consumer disclosures and marketing efforts, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine measures that have been taken since September 11, 2001, to secure our nation's ports, focusing on the implementation of the Maritime Transportation Security Act and vulnerabilities that remain in the maritime transportation sector, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider comprehensive energy legislation, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety, to hold closed hearings to examine nuclear security, 9:30 a.m., S–407, Capitol.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine activities of the Commission for Africa, focusing on recommendations for a coherent strategy for Africa, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Retirement Security and Aging, to hold hearings to examine the Administration's recommendations for the Older Americans Act Reauthorization, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to resume hearings to examine the United Nations' Oil-for-Food Program, the illegal surcharges paid on Iraqi oil sales, and the nature and extent of the 2003 Khor al-Amaya incident, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship, with the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, to hold joint hearings to examine strengthening our national security, regarding the need for comprehensive immigration reform, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Education and the Workforce, hearing entitled "High School Reform: Examining State and Local Efforts," 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, hearing entitled "Examining Pay-for-Performance Measures and Other Trends in Employer-Sponsored Health Care," 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Subversion of Drug Testing Programs," 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing on H.R. 1999, State and Local Housing Flexibility Act of 2005, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Federal Workforce and Agency Organization, to consider the following bills: H.R. 994, 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 a TRICARE supplemental premiums; H.R. 1283, To provide that transit pass transportation fringe benefits be made available to all qualified Federal employees in the National Capital Region; to allow passenger carriers which are owned or leased by the Government to be used to transport Government employees between their place of employment and mass transit facilities; and H.R. 1765, Generating Opportunity by Forgiving Educational Debt for Service Act of 2005; followed by a hearing entitled "Question: What is More Scrambled Than an Egg? Answer: the Federal Food Inspection Program," 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, hearing entitled "Fostering Democracy in the Middle East: Defeating Terrorism with Ballots?" 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing on Intellectual Property Theft in China, 10 a.m., and an oversight hearing on Intellectual Property Theft in Russia, 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 1817, Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, 2:30 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, to mark up the following: H.R. 50, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Act; and a measure to establish a Science and Technology Scholarship Program to award scholarships to recruit and prepare students for careers in the National Weather Service and in Administration marine research, atmospheric research and satellite programs, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on Protecting and Strengthening Social Security, 2 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on the Future of the World Trade Organization, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:45 a.m., Tuesday, May 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 60 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 3, Transportation Equity Act, and following 30 minutes of debate, vote on certain pending amendments, to be followed by a vote on final passage of the bill.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Tuesday, May 17

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Begin consideration of H.R. 2360, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (open rule, one hour of debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E979
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E984, E985
Cardin, Benjamin L., Md., E990
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E979
Case, Ed, Hawaii, E988
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E984, E985, E986, E986, E987
Davis, Lincoln, Tenn., E991
Davis, Tom, Va., E983
Dreier, David, Calif., E986
Emanuel, Rahm, Ill., E981
Evans, Lane, Ill., E979
Filner, Bob, Calif., E983, E984, E985, E986, E987
Gutierrez, Luis V., Ill., E990
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E989, E990
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E987
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E991
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E984, E985, E986
Larson, John B., Conn., E990, E992
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E990
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E989
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E979, E980
Moore, Dennis, Kans., E982
Pearce, Stevan, N.M., E980
Reynolds, Thomas M., N.Y., E980
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E983
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E982
Thomas, William M., Calif., E983
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E981
Weiner, Anthony D., N.Y., E982

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.