



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006

No. 28

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 7, 2006.

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

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

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

### THE SOLOMON AMENDMENT

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Supreme Court unanimously upheld a Federal law ensuring that colleges and universities who receive Federal funds permit open access for military recruiting on their campus. This ruling will allow the United States military to recruit the best and the brightest this Nation has to offer and will also greatly enhance our national security. I commend the Supreme Court for upholding this law.

This issue is of particular interest to me. I attended college on an Air Force

ROTC scholarship and know firsthand the importance of the Armed Forces. Therefore, in order for the United States to win the global war on terrorism, the Armed Forces need access to the highest caliber of people, and that is why we must ensure equal access for military recruiters.

In 1996, Congress enacted a provision of law that came to be known as the Solomon amendment. This provision is named for our former colleague from New York and former Rules Committee chairman, the late Jerry Solomon. This provision provides for the Secretary of Defense to deny Federal funding to colleges and universities if they do not provide military recruiters entry to campuses and access to students that is at least equal in quality and scope to that provided to any other employer.

The Solomon amendment was made necessary when a number of universities began restricting the access of military recruiters because of disagreement with certain military policies, such as the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Mr. Speaker, I will include the entire list of these universities in the RECORD.

Monday's ruling stems from a challenge from a group of law schools on the constitutionality of the Solomon amendment. A number of universities are denying equal access to military recruiters in protest of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Last year, I had an amendment on the floor that was patterned after the Solomon amendment, and it also passed.

Mr. Speaker, some of the universities who are denying equal access to military recruiters, are also receiving millions and millions of hardworking Americans' tax dollars every year in terms of research dollars and other things.

Harvard Law School, for example, allowed military recruiters to interview students at the offices of its Veterans

Association, but did not use its open personnel to set up the interviews as it did for other recruiters. In the wake of the Supreme Court hearing last fall, Harvard has reversed its decision and now plans to fully cooperate with the military recruiters.

Another example is Yale Law School, who had been letting recruiters use a room to meet with students, but had not been helping to arrange the interviews, as they did with other recruiters. These universities allow IBM, General Electric and other corporations full access, but not the military.

Equal access for military recruiters is an urgent issue. With the U.S. engaged in the global war on terrorism, it is more important than ever for the Armed Forces to recruit high-quality, well-qualified and well-trained personnel. This is why it is so important that the Supreme Court made such a strong statement in support of full and equal access to military recruiters on campus.

Chief Justice John Roberts, who wrote for the courts, said that the Solomon amendment "neither limits what law schools may say nor requires them to say anything. Law schools remain free under the statute to express whatever views they may have on the military's congressionally mandated employment policy. Nothing about recruiting suggests that the law schools agree with any speech by recruiters, and nothing in the Solomon amendment restricts what the law schools may say about the military's policies."

The Court went on to say that the law regulates conduct, not speech, and the hosting of recruiters is not expressive conduct that sends out a message as a former protest.

Mr. Speaker, so in conclusion, once again, I commend the Supreme Court for unanimously upholding the Solomon amendment. As the U.S. is engaged in the global war on terrorism, it is more vital than ever to our national

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H573

security that the United States Armed Forces have access to recruit the best people to serve in this country.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

[From SolomonResponse.Org]

FAIR PARTICIPATING LAW SCHOOLS

The members of FAIR willing to be named publicly are:

1. The Faculty of Capital University Law School
  2. The Faculty of Chicago-Kent College of Law
  3. The Faculty of City University of NY (CUNY) Law School
  4. The Faculty of DePaul University College of Law
  5. The Faculty of University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law
  6. The Faculty of Fordham University School of Law
  7. The Faculty of Georgetown University Law Center
  8. George Washington University Law School
  9. Golden Gate University School of Law
  10. The Faculty of Hofstra University Law School
  11. The Faculty of the John Marshall School of Law
  12. New York Law School
  13. New York University School of Law
  14. Northeastern University School of Law
  15. The Faculty of the University of Minnesota Law School
  16. The Faculty of Pace University School of Law
  17. The Faculty of the University of Puerto Rico School of Law
  18. The Faculty of Roger Williams University Ralph R. Papitto School of Law
  19. The Faculty of the University of San Francisco School of Law
  20. The United Faculty of Stanford Law School
  21. The Faculty of Suffolk University Law School
  22. Vermont Law School
  23. The United Faculty of Washington University School of Law
  24. The Faculty of Whittier Law School
- faculties: 24 (18 public)  
institutions: 12 (6 public)

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4167, THE NATIONAL UNIFORMITY FOR FOOD ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4167, the National Uniformity for Food Act. If passed, this bill will be a huge setback to consumer safety, public health and America's war on terror. This bill wipes out over 80 State food safety laws and puts our Nation's food safety standards squarely in the hands of the FDA.

State laws that will be overturned include warnings as to the risk of cancer, birth defects, reproductive health issues and allergic reactions associated with sulfiting agents in bulk food. That is why 37 State attorney generals, Democrats and Republicans, oppose this bill. A bipartisan Association of Food and Drug officials also have strong concerns about the legislation.

Let me quote from them. It says, this bill, H.R. 4167, "undermines our Nation's whole biosurveillance system by preempting and invalidating many of the State and local food safety laws and regulations that provide necessary authority for State and local agencies to operate food safety and security programs. The pre-9/11 concept embodied in this bill is very much out of line with the current threats that confront our food safety and security system."

The Association of Food and Drug Officials also said that H.R. 4167 will severely hamper the FDA's ability to detect and respond to acts of terrorism. Again, quoting from this report, it says our current food safety and security system will be significantly disrupted, and our inability to track suspected acts of intentional alteration will be exploited by those who seek to do our Nation harm.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to these two pictures. Which meat do you think is older, the red meat on top or the brown meat on the bottom? It is not really a trick question, but both of these packages of meat were packaged at the same time. Both have been sitting in a refrigerator side by side for 5 months. The meat on the top has been packaged with carbon monoxide which causes the meat to look fresh and red long into the future. The meat on the bottom has not been treated with carbon monoxide. It is brown and it is slimy.

Like I said, the meat on the top is 5 months old and looks as good as new, but it is not. If consumed, you could become severely ill from a food-borne pathogen like E. coli and possibly die from the red meat here on the top.

The FDA, without any independent study, has no objection to allowing meat to be packaged in carbon monoxide. The FDA merely reviewed the meat industry's carbon monoxide proposal. Review is not the same as independent research. By allowing the injection of carbon monoxide in meat and seafood packaging, the meat industry stands to gain \$1 billion per year because meat begins to turn brown. When it does, consumers reject it.

Consumers rely on color to determine freshness. Numerous studies from 1972 to 2003 cite color as the most important factors consumers use to determine what meat to buy. The whole purpose behind this carbon monoxide packaging is to extend the shelf life of meat and seafood and to deceive the consumer into thinking the product is fresh. Today, States may pass their own laws and put labels on meat that has been packaged with carbon monoxide, but those laws will be overturned if this bill, H.R. 4167, becomes law.

I will be offering an amendment which allows States to label carbon monoxide packaging of meat, so consumers will know the meat may not look as fresh as it may appear.

Is this really the standard we want for our country? Do we offer low car-

bon monoxide in meat packaging to make it look fresher, to stay on the shelf longer, and expose our country and consumers to the health and risk of eating contaminated meat and seafood? Public health and safety for food primarily have been the responsibility of States. We should not tie the hands of States who want to protect the health of their citizens. I urge my colleagues to support the Stupak carbon monoxide labeling amendment and vote "no" on H.R. 4167.

ADDRESSING THE ROOT CAUSE OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, under the leadership of our colleagues JIM KOLBE and JOHN CORNYN, a bipartisan, bicameral delegation attended the 45th meeting of the U.S.-Mexico Inter-Parliamentary group that was held in Mexico. The House Members, on Saturday, then went to the Mexico-Arizona border. We had the opportunity there to meet with local law enforcement officials and hospital administrators to discuss the tremendous strain that illegal immigration imposes on resources and law and order in our communities.

As an advocate of greater security at our borders, I have long supported addressing the root cause of illegal immigration, and that is a lack of economic opportunity that exists at home for the people in Mexico. We know that the majority of illegal immigrants come to this country for one very simple reason. They are seeking economic opportunity. They want to better their lives. They want to feed their families. Economic growth, job creation, and higher wages in Mexico are special components to a long-term solution to the very serious problem of illegal immigration.

By pursuing an open trade agenda that expands economic engagement in this hemisphere, we are not only shoring up our regionally based economy, and creating new opportunities for the United States workers, we are benefiting workers, the business owners and investors as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are hoping to drive the economic growth necessary to reduce the number of illegal immigrants who are trying to make that dangerous trek across the border, doing so simply because of the fact that they are wanting, as I said, to feed their families. It was therefore with great interest that I read a recent Business Week article describing the emergence of a growing middle class in our neighbor to the south.

The success of the North American Free Trade Agreement can be seen in the greater economic stability outlined in this Business Week piece. It talked

about steady growth, tame inflation, climbing wages and falling interest rates. This increasingly stable and healthy economic environment has helped Mexico become, and I quote from the Business Week article, a middle-class nation where millions have access to mortgages, solid jobs provide security, and a class of strivers saves to put its kids through college.

Mr. Speaker, Mexico's middle class has grown to over 10 million families or 40 percent of all the households in Mexico. Business Week also credits home ownership as another key factor in the emergence of a robust middle class. Strong economic fundamentals have slashed mortgage rates in half in just 2 years. The growing ranks of Mexican homeowners buttresses middle-class growth by allowing families to build equity, plan for their financial futures and move further up the economic ladder.

The middle class has also been able to afford additional consumer goods. Last year, auto sales in Mexico were up 33 percent from 2000 as a record 1.3 million cars and trucks were purchased. Home appliance sales have tripled in the past decade. Even extras like concert tickets and sporting events tickets are increasingly accessible to the average working family.

Mr. Speaker, most of us would not consider refrigerators or baseball games to be major luxuries. But for a country that has struggled greatly with poverty and deep economic crises, these are signs of tremendous economic progress. They are proof that our policy of economic engagement through agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement are working to bring new opportunities for the people in Mexico and also for the people right here in the United States.

They are an important step forward in ensuring that the swollen ranks of illegal immigrants are losing their incentive to come here illegally to find opportunity. Mexican officials are demonstrating the fact that they recognize the reality of the problem of illegal immigration as well. On February 16th, the Mexican Congress adopted a resolution that acknowledged the graveness of the illegal immigration issue and outlined the principles of its agenda to combat the problem. This resolution cited economic opportunity as critical to a successful campaign to prevent illegal immigration to the United States and to encourage the return of migrants to their homes in Mexico.

I am encouraged by the Mexican Parliament's bold language in accepting responsibility for action, and putting forth the outline of a plan. I am heartened that economic growth is central to Mexico's long-term strategy, because we know a growing Mexican middle class is a shrinking illegal immigrant class.

With greater hope for the future, there is a greater incentive to stay and build a life at home. Mexico is pledging to remain committed to a pro-growth

agenda. We must remain equally committed to an open trade agenda that helps our southern neighbor to continue down a path of economic growth and greater opportunity.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 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. PUTNAM) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord our God, around the upper part of this Chamber are profile medallions which recall the personal history of lawmaking. In the center, full-faced and bold before us, is the image of Moses, the great lawgiver of the Hebrew scriptures.

May the people of this Nation and, in particular, those elected to the 109th Congress, who gather here to protect and guide this Nation, be faithful to Your commands.

Your revelation, Lord, gives us nothing less than the lessons we need to address the issues of the day. Your commandments are the foundations on which we build hope. They are the supports which strengthen faith in public action and the food which nourishes the human heart.

By obeying Your laws, those in representative government inspire those they represent, the governed. To internalize Your commands and live according to Your Word is to lead to fulfillment and bring promise to a disillusioned world, when left on its own.

Therefore, in the midst of everything, from You, Lord our God, we choose to draw wisdom and strength, 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 Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THORNBERRY 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 6, 2006.

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 March 6, 2006, at 11:05 am:

That the Senate Passed with an amendment and requests a conference with the House on H.R. 2830.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk of the House.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109-384) on the resolution (H. Res. 645) requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109-385) on the resolution (H. Res. 641) requesting the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to electronic surveillance without search warrants on individuals in the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE BARE FACTS ON THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a bit tired of hearing some of my colleagues in the Democrat Party mislead the American people into thinking our economy is in poor shape. Here are the facts, plain and simple.

Our economy has been growing for 17 straight quarters. The National Association for Business Economics predicts the economy will grow at a 4.5 percent rate in the first quarter of 2006. After inflation, disposable incomes increased 2.2 percent in the last 12 months. The Federal Reserve reported that the median net worth of U.S. households increased 1.5 percent between 2001 and 2004. January's unemployment rate fell to 4.7 percent, which is the lowest monthly rate since 2001 and lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. There have been 29 consecutive months of job gains.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of spin from the left can change the fact that our economy is growing stronger every day under Republican leadership.

#### RENEWAL OF U.S. PATRIOT ACT

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act today is literally a matter of life or death because it is helping us to win the war on terrorism.

Since we passed the PATRIOT Act in 2001, we have convicted 212 terrorists, and we have frozen \$136 million in terrorists' assets.

Reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act is purely a matter of common sense. Is it not common sense that we give law enforcement the same tools to go after terrorists as they now have to go after Mafia dons and drug dealers? Is it not common sense that we can now share data between the intelligence community and the law enforcement community? Is it not common sense that we track deadly terrorists, even though they cross jurisdictional lines or switch cell phones?

I am pleased that the Senate recently voted 89-10 to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act. This legislation provides 30 new civil liberty safeguards and strengthens our port security by providing law enforcement authorities with new authority to secure our ports.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the PATRIOT Act.

#### TALIBAN AT YALE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the leftward drift of American higher education has been well documented. On the modern-day campus, nothing is too extreme and all ideas and political philosophies are declared equal in the name of tolerance, often producing ridiculous results.

The most recent example comes from Yale University. In the name of tolerance and diversity, administrators there have enrolled a member of one of the most radically intolerant and non-diverse groups in recent history, the Taliban.

A few years ago, Sayed Rahmatullah Hashemi was a spokesman for Afghanistan's Taliban regime, the same regime that provided safe haven for the 9/11 terrorists and brutally oppressed women and non-Muslims. Today, he is in the Ivy League, a student at Yale.

Rahmatullah said it best himself: "I could have ended up at Guantanamo Bay. Instead, I ended up at Yale."

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a point where elite universities like Yale will tolerate the Taliban on their campus but will not tolerate the ROTC, political correctness in the extreme.

#### ECONOMY AND FISCAL RESTRAINT

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there are some days that it probably is a little depressing to be a mainstream media reporter.

In their world, our economy is sinking and the war on terrorism is absolutely hopeless.

Thankfully, in the real world, Americans know that we have drastically impacted al Qaeda's ability to attack us, and our economy is booming. Yes, it is booming.

We are expecting growth this quarter somewhere around 4 percent or more, and that means jobs. We have created almost 5 million new jobs and had 3 years of strong, solid economic growth.

When you compare our economy to Europe, to most nations, we are in an amazing era. Unemployment is below 5 percent. That is outstanding, and it is a shame that the mainstream reporters just cannot get the story right.

Our tax policies reduced the burden of taxation on Americans, and they have responded as they always do, by creating new jobs.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month.

As we remember the great women of past generations, we must also salute those women who are serving as role models and leaders today.

One such woman is Tammy Cohen of Marietta, Georgia, my district. Tammy is cofounder and president of InfoMart, and under her guidance, InfoMart has grown from a small startup business to the largest female-owned background checking company in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Tammy's success as a female entrepreneur is inspiring, and

while she is deeply respected for her business know-how, she is equally praised for her compassion and willingness to help.

When Hurricane Katrina struck the gulf coast last year, Tammy led a group of InfoMart employees who rented vans, gathered supplies and drove to New Orleans to rescue 15 children and 20 caretakers from a boys' home in Louisiana. Tammy then worked with community groups and local businesses in Marietta to house, feed and clothe these hurricane victims.

Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month, it is important to honor those women who are making a difference in the lives of others. Tammy Cohen is undoubtedly one of these women.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating her accomplishments.

#### SUPREME COURT DELIVERS A VICTORY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and a father of three sons serving in the military, I frequently have an opportunity to meet with the dynamic young men and women of the U.S. military. I am always encouraged to hear them describe their pride as Americans and their strong sense of duty to their country. After witnessing the horrific attacks of September 11, these young people understand that their generation will protect our freedoms in the future.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously to ensure that men and women at colleges and universities will continue to have an opportunity to learn about serving in the United States military. America's Armed Forces have created the broadest spread of freedom in the history of the world, which protects American families. By allowing military recruiters to visit college campuses, the Court has ensured that the United States will remain the best military in the world.

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

#### REAUTHORIZING OF PATRIOT ACT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress will send to the President of the United States the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act. Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER and other members of the Judiciary Committee and the conference committee are to be commended for their effort in putting together a bill that balances the liberty and security interests of the American people.

This is an issue that is not just theoretical for me, Mr. Speaker. I not only

serve on the House Judiciary Committee, but I was here on September 11, and I served on the committee as we built the PATRIOT Act in the immediate days following that national tragedy. That is why making 14 of the 16 provisions of the PATRIOT Act permanent is a critical element of ensuring the security of the American people, and putting safeguards on the two remaining provisions is evidence of a careful balancing act that has been accomplished in a bipartisan way.

We must equip law enforcement and intelligence officials with the tools necessary to protect our Nation from terrorist attacks. We must also safeguard the civil liberties of the American people to fulfill the vision of freedom.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues, with gratitude to our leadership, to move this PATRIOT Act to the President today.

□ 1415

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC., March 6, 2006.

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, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 6, 2006, at 4:42 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits draft legislation entitled, "Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006".

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk of the House.

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO  
ACT OF 2006—MESSAGE FROM  
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED  
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In my State of the Union Address, I asked the Congress to give the President a line item veto. Today, I am sending the Congress a legislative proposal to give the President line item authority to reduce wasteful spending. This legislation will help to limit spending and ensure accountability and transparency in the expenditure of taxpayer funds.

Although the Congress achieved significant spending restraint this past

year, appropriations and other bills that are sent to my desk still contain spending that is not fully justified, is a low priority, or is earmarked to avoid the discipline of competitive or merit-based reviews. When this legislation is presented to me, I now have no ability to line out unnecessary spending. In 1996, the Congress gave the President a line item veto—an important tool to limit wasteful spending—but the Supreme Court struck down that version of the law in 1998.

My proposed legislation, the "Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006," would provide a fast-track procedure to require the Congress to vote up-or-down on rescissions proposed by the President. There has been broad bipartisan support for similar proposals in the past. Under this proposal, the President could propose legislation to rescind wasteful spending, and the Congress would be obligated to vote quickly on that package of rescissions, without amendment. The same procedure would apply to new mandatory spending and to special interest tax breaks given to small numbers of individuals.

Forty-three Governors have a line item veto to reduce spending. The President needs similar authority to help control unjustified and wasteful spending in the Federal budget. I urge you to promptly consider and send me this legislation for enactment to reduce unnecessary spending and help achieve my goal of cutting the deficit in half by 2009.

GEORGE W. BUSH,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 2006.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BARBARA CUBIN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 1, 2006.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

BARBARA CUBIN,  
Member of Congress.

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.

GERARD A. FIORENZA POST  
OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3934) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3934

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

SECTION 1. GERARD A. FIORENZA POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza 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 "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. 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 gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3934, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), would designate the post office in Massapequa, New York, as the Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building. As the postmaster general of Massapequa, Jerry Fiorenza was a vital member of the community, someone who was always available to help out where needed.

His first position with the postal service was as a postal assistant in Jamaica, New York, in 1972. As a letter carrier, he received a letter of recommendation, and in 1990 he was assigned as the officer in charge to the Valley Stream office. He then served as postmaster in Hewlett, Massapequa Park, and finally Massapequa.

While serving in Massapequa, he was known for his strict attention to detail and his friendly demeanor. In fact, the Massapequa Post publisher, Alfred James, is quoted as saying: "When I first came to Massapequa a few years ago as the publisher of the Massapequa Post, it was Jerry who was there to answer all of my questions and help me

whenever a problem arose. Jerry was committed to his profession and to the community and prided himself in providing the best possible postal service."

Along with serving in this capacity, Jerry Fiorenza was also involved in many other organizations, such as the Combined Federal Campaign, the United Way, and Toys for Tots. Locally, aside from being a member of the National Association of Postal Supervisors and a postmaster representative, he also served as a member of the Massapequa Chamber of Commerce, the Sons of Italy, the Columbia Association, American Legion Post 1066, and the Republican Club. In addition, he was named Massapequa's Man of the Year in 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in recognizing this beloved and respected member of the Massapequa community by passing H.R. 3934.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 3934, legislation naming the postal facility in Massapequa, New York, after Gerard A. Fiorenza. This measure was sponsored by Representative Peter King on September 28, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on November 16, 2005. The bill has the support and cosponsorship of the entire New York delegation.

Gerard Fiorenza, a native of New York, was born in Brooklyn, attended St. Anthony of Padua Elementary School, graduated from Brooklyn Academy, and attended Queens Community College. Later, he moved his family to Massapequa and began his career with the U.S. Postal Service as a postal assistant. He was promoted to station manager and then officer in charge before attaining the rank of postmaster of the Massapequa Post Office.

A respected member of his community, Postmaster Fiorenza was active in postal management organizations such as the National Association of Postal Supervisors, NAPS; the National Association of Postmasters of the United States; and local organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, United Way, and Toys for Tots.

Sadly, he passed away, following a battle with cancer, on December 7, 2001. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the legacy of Postmaster Gerard Fiorenza and urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3934, legislation that would designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building."

I cannot think of a more fitting tribute to Jerry Fiorenza than to name the post office in Massapequa where he worked in honor of him. I am proud to have introduced this legislation and to have the support of the entire

New York delegation. Jerry, a native of Brooklyn, worked for the Postal Service for nearly 30 years starting as a postal assistant and rising to serve as postmaster in Hewlett, Massapequa Park, and Massapequa. He also served as president of the National Association of Post Masters, NAPUS, and was deeply involved in his community serving as a member of the Massapequa Chamber of Commerce, the Sons of Italy, the Columbia Association, and American Legion Post 1066. In 2001 Jerry was selected as Massapequa's Man of the Year.

Jerry was also a devoted husband to his wife, Carol, and loving father to his two children, Michael and Jessica. He is truly missed by so many on Long Island.

I urge the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 3934 to honor Jerry Fiorenza, a public servant and community leader.

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

Mr. DENT. 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3934.

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.

#### DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST OFFICE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4054) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4054

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

#### SECTION 1. DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the "Dewey F. Bartlett 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 "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. 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 gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4054, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN). This bill would designate the post office in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office Building.

Dewey Bartlett was born in Marietta, Ohio, on March 28, 1919. He was educated in the Marietta public school system and later went on to attend Princeton University. While in college, he returned home during his summers to work in the Oklahoma oil fields. In 1945, after serving in the military during World War II, he moved to Tulsa to assume a managing role in his family's business.

Dewey Bartlett's political career started in 1963, when he became an Oklahoma State senator. He then ran successfully for Governor of Oklahoma and served in this capacity for 5 years. Finally, in 1972, he was elected to the United States Senate, where he served until 1979.

During his service in government, Bartlett was dedicated to a strong national defense. He also fought for a lean government, with limited layers of bureaucracy, which he felt was important to protect the constitutional guarantees of individual liberty, freedom, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to come together to honor a man who promoted excellence in government by passing H.R. 4054.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 4054, legislation naming a postal facility in Tulsa, Oklahoma, after Dewey F. Bartlett. This measure was sponsored by Representative JOHN SULLIVAN of Oklahoma on October 7, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on February 1, 2006. The bill has the support and cosponsorship of the entire Oklahoma delegation.

Dewey Bartlett was born and raised in Marietta, Ohio. He later attended Lawrenceville Preparatory School in New Jersey and graduated from Princeton University. During World War II, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps as a dive-bomber pilot in the South Pacific. After the war, Dewey Bartlett moved to Oklahoma, working as a farmer, rancher, and independent oil producer.

Politics called and Mr. Bartlett was elected to the State senate in 1962. Four years later, he made a successful run for Governor. He was recognized for his efforts in economic development, which benefited all Oklahomans, and for working in a bipartisan manner.

In 1972, Governor Bartlett was elected to the U.S. Senate, where he served

from 1973 to 1979. He did not seek reelection because he was battling lung cancer. Sadly, he passed away in Tulsa, Oklahoma, on March 1, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the legacy of Senator Dewey F. Bartlett by naming a postal facility in his hometown, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of my bill, H.R. 4054, which will designate the 6110 East 51st Place post office in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office.

Dewey F. Bartlett was a strong advocate for conservative values. A war veteran and public servant for Oklahoma and the Nation, he served as the second Republican Governor of Oklahoma and is a distinguished alumnus of the United States Senate.

□ 1430

He was a true representative of Oklahoma values, leadership and drive. I am pleased that we are able to honor him in this way.

After graduating from Princeton University in 1942, Dewey Bartlett served in the Marine Corps as a combat dive-bomber during World War II. As a result of his courageous efforts in the South Pacific theater, he was awarded the Air Medal.

After the war, he moved to Tulsa, Oklahoma, and became a farmer, rancher and oil man. He was a partner in Keener Oil Company, one of the oldest independent oil companies. In 1963, Bartlett began his career in public service by joining the State senate, and in 1967 he became Oklahoma's 19th Governor. One of his priorities while in office was increasing industry in Oklahoma. As Governor, the results of his hard work helped to produce a record \$148.4 million in new industries or improvements on existing facilities and create an additional 7,500 jobs for Oklahomans.

From 1972 to 1978, Bartlett served as a Member of the United States Senate. During his tenure, this proud Oklahoman maintained a strong and consistent stance of limiting government bureaucracy, reducing burdensome taxes, and maintaining fiscal responsibility. I am proud to share Dewey Bartlett's vision of conservatism, and work daily towards the goal of promoting commonsense Oklahoma values in Congress.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation. By designating the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office in Tulsa, we are commemorating an exceptional citizen who embodied the Oklahoma spirit.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of H.R.

4054, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4054.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### HIRAM L. FONG POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2089) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1271 North King Street in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, as the "Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2089

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

#### SECTION 1. HIRAM L. FONG POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1271 North King Street in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, shall be known and designated as the "Hiram L. Fong 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 "Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. 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 gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate bill S. 2089 offered by Senator AKAKA. This bill would designate the post office in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building."

Hiram Fong was born on the island of Oahu in Honolulu on October 15, 1906. The seventh of 11 children, Fong helped to support his family at an early age

by earning money selling newspapers, shining shoes and caddying on golf courses. After graduating from high school, he went on to attend the University of Hawaii and was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa as a graduate in 1930. He then graduated from Harvard Law School and began a career of public service that spanned over 40 years. He served in the Territorial House for 14 years, including 6 as Speaker of the House.

With the coming of statehood in 1959, he ran for a seat in the United States Senate and was elected to three consecutive terms until his retirement in 1976. While serving in office, he was highly regarded for his work on immigration and naturalization law, and for encouraging relations with the People's Republic of China and other developing nations of Asia. From providing timely answers to constituent concerns, to being widely respected by both sides of the aisle, Senator Fong was indeed a great leader.

I ask all Members to honor his leadership by passing S. 2089.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the author of this legislation.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to amplify my formal statement with a few personal observations. The chairman has kindly indicated some of the history of Senator Fong. It is interesting when I look down and see the word Hiram L. Fong, because he is so much of the history of Hawaii, we all think of him as Senator Fong.

As has been noted, he was the seventh of 11 children of an immigrant family. If there was ever a story of Hawaii, of our rainbow people and our aloha spirit, it is Hiram Fong. He worked a lot of jobs and worked his way through school and did very, very well. He founded not only a prominent law firm but founded as well what became a financial empire.

I have some real interest in it because the very first campaign that I ever ran was funded by Senator Fong's Finance Factors. I went down to get a loan. I thought if I was going to run against him, I thought the least I could do, in the spirit of bipartisanship, was to ask him to help fund my campaign. As a graduate student at the University of Hawaii, I went down to borrow \$50. They said we cannot lend you \$50, we have to lend you \$200 if we are going to make any money on this. So I said, I will take it. I was able to run my very first campaign on Hiram Fong's dime, although I should say nickel, because that is what I passed out in the streets of Honolulu to represent the inflation that I thought we were going to have to deal with in those days. That was an innocent time.

Senator Fong was always gracious. Senator Fong was always able to reach out. As has been noted, he was elected

as a Republican in a very Democratic State. He was supported in great measure and elected in great measure with the support of labor in Hawaii. Most particularly, the ILWU, the International Longshoremen Workers Union, testifying in favor of the establishment of a commission in 2005, after he passed away, to honor and recognize him as a political, business and community leader testified, "The Senator was a successful businessman and a Republican who never forgot his humble beginnings. He was a strong supporter of civil rights and often crossed the aisle to cooperate on issues important to Hawaii's unions and workers."

Senator Hiram Fong came to the United States Senate with the arrival of Hawaii as the last State of the Union. Probably nothing could be more fitting than to recognize him today through this legislation and the pioneer effort that he made. Yes, the last State to enter the Union had as its first Senator the son of an immigrant family who came from China looking for opportunity, looking for justice, and found it in the person of their son, and a true son of Hawaii, Hiram Fong.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2089, a bill to designate a post office in Honolulu, Hawaii, after Senator Hiram L. Fong. This is a fitting tribute for a man who was a great statesman, businessman and community leader.

Senator Fong was born on October 15, 1906, in Kalihi. He was the seventh of 11 children in an immigrant family. A firm believer of standing on his own feet, he worked numerous odd jobs while in public school in order to help support his family. He worked his way through the University of Hawaii where he graduated with honors in 1930. He went on to Harvard Law School and became the state and county Deputy Attorney General of Honolulu for three years.

At the age of 31, Senator Fong began his public service career by serving in Hawaii's Territorial House of Representatives. His ability to work well with both Democrats and Republicans was quickly identified and he was elected Speaker of the House during his first term in office. In 1959, he was elected to the first of three consecutive terms in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Fong never forgot his humble beginnings and was an ardent supporter of labor rights. Despite being a Republican, Senator Fong enjoyed widespread support from the labor unions, particularly the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) which endorsed Senator Fong's candidacy to Congress and campaigned for his reelection.

Senator Fong played an integral role in Hawaii becoming the 50th state and worked on many landmark laws such as the authorization of the Interstate Highway System and the establishment of the East-West Center.

Senator Fong's work and leadership will impact generations to come and it is with great honor that I rise to support S. 2089 in recognition of his leadership and service to this country. I ask my colleagues to support this measure and appreciate the House's attention to the life and work of this great man.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in consideration of S. 2089, legislation naming the postal facility in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, after Hiram L. Fong. This measure, sponsored by Senator DANIEL AKAKA and cosponsored by Senator DANIEL INOUE, was unanimously passed by the Senate on March 3, 2006. An identical measure, H.R. 4509, sponsored by Mr. ABERCROMBIE, was unanimously reported by our committee on February 1, 2006.

Hiram L. Fong, a native of Hawaii, was a noted and well-known member of Hawaii politics. Mr. Fong was a graduate of the University of Hawaii and Harvard Law School before practicing law in Honolulu. He later served as deputy attorney for the city and county of Honolulu, and during World War II, Mr. Fong served as a major and judge advocate of the 7th Fighter Command of the 7th Air Force from 1942 to 1945.

He began his political career in 1938 as a member of the Territorial legislature, serving 4 years as Vice Speaker and 6 years as Speaker and Vice President of the Territorial Constitutional Convention in 1950. In 1959, Mr. Fong was elected as a Republican to the United States Senate. Upon the admission of Hawaii as a State, he was re-elected in 1964 and again in 1970.

Senator Fong did not seek reelection in 1976. Instead, he returned to private enterprise, serving as chairman of Finance Enterprises, Limited. Sadly, he passed away on August 18, 2004.

Mr. Speaker, as Senator AKAKA, my good friend and colleague observed last week upon the Senate passage of S. 2089, "Senator Hiram Fong was a man of great integrity and a compassionate advocate for civil rights and workers' rights. It is fitting that a United States Post Office near his home in Kalihi be named in his honor. During his 20 years of service in the United States Senate, Senator Fong personified a spirit of bipartisan cooperation. He was instrumental in enacting landmark civil rights legislation in the 1960s; reforming U.S. immigration laws to end discrimination against Asian immigrants; improving job training programs for workers; and fighting for equal pay for women. The people of Hawaii were truly fortunate to have been represented by Hiram Fong."

I commend my colleagues for seeking to honor the political legacy of Senator Hiram Leong Fong and urge swift passage of this legislation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of S. 2089, legislation which provides permanent recognition—the naming of the prominent Kapalama post office in Honolulu, Hawaii—of the late, great U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong of Hawaii, whose long life—he died in August 2004 at the age of 97—was dedicated to reshaping, for the betterment of all, the social and political landscape of twentieth-century Hawaii.

S. 2089, introduced by Senator DANIEL AKAKA, and cosponsored by Senator DANIEL INOUE, passed the Senate on March 3. I was pleased to reintroduce its companion, H.R. 4509, with Congressman NEIL ABERCROMBIE on December 13, 2005.

Born into poverty in Honolulu in October 1907, Hiram L. Fong was the seventh of 11 children of Chinese-immigrant parents. His father, Fong Sau Howe, originally from China's Kwangtung Province, arrived in Hawaii in 1872, one of 45,000 Chinese immigrants who came to Hawaii to work on the plantations of the islands' once dominant sugar industry. His mother, Fong Lum Shee, arrived in Hawaii when she was 10 years old to work as a maid.

By all accounts, Hiram Fong was enterprising, even as a child. He shined shoes, delivered poi, sold newspapers, led visitors to local tourist spots as well as caddied nine holes of golf for 25 cents.

He attended Hawaii's public schools and was a member of McKinley High School's famous class of 1924, whose 216 members, many of them first-generation immigrants, became some of Hawaii's most distinguished lawyers, business executives, and public servants. Hiram Fong himself became the first resident of Hawaii to receive the Horatio Alger Award for overcoming poverty to achieve great success in law, business, and public service.

As a student at the University of Hawaii, Fong found time to edit the student paper and the yearbook, become a member of the volleyball, rifle and debate teams, and serve as president of the YMCA and Chinese Students Alliance, all the while working at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard as a supply clerk. He somehow managed to graduate from the University of Hawaii with honors in 1930 after just 3 years.

After working at what was then the Suburban Water System of Oahu from 1930 to 1932, Hiram Fong attended Harvard Law School. Upon graduation in 1935, he returned to Honolulu to work as a deputy city attorney.

In 1938, when he was 31, he founded the law firm of Fong, Miho, Choy and Robinson, and entered and won a race for a seat in the Territorial House of Representatives. A member of the Republican Party, he forged a coalition of independent Republicans and Democrats to win election as speaker of the Territorial House, where he would serve a total of 14 years, including three terms as speaker.

Hiram Fong's political career was interrupted by World War II, when he was called to active duty with the Army Air Corps. He served as judge advocate with the 7th Fighter Command of the Seventh Air Force. He later retired as a colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

As a member of the Hawaii Territorial House, Fong supported legislation designed to help organized labor and working families. In 1945, he supported what became known as the "Little Wagner Act," which allowed agriculture workers to unionize. It was Hiram Fong's understanding of and identification with Hawaii's laborers and plantation workers and fellow immigrant families that enabled him, a Republican in an increasingly Democratic Party-dominated Hawaii, to continue winning elections.

His one electoral defeat, which ended the first phase of his political career, came in 1954, when he lost his race for re-election to the Territorial House seat by a mere 31 votes.

Hiram Fong then focused on real estate, insurance, and investments, and established a number of successful island firms: Finance Factors, Finance Realty, Finance Home Builders, and Finance Investment, to name a few.

In the Statehood year of 1959, Fong embarked on the second phase of his political career by running for and winning one of the two new United States Senate seats created for the newly established State of Hawaii. He won re-election in 1964 and 1970, and served with honor and distinction, beloved by all in his native Hawaii and beyond, until his retirement on January 2, 1977. At his retirement, Senator Fong was the ranking Republican on the Senate Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

But even then, Senator Fong, as he was universally known thereafter with great affection, returned home to his various business enterprises and to the devotion of his expanded family. Well into his nineties, he was a remarkable sight as he strode through downtown Honolulu on his way to and from work, excited by what the day brought and eager to continue his long string of accomplishments. At his death, his body lay in state in Hawaii's State Capitol as whole generations of citizens paid tribute to a remarkable man who led a remarkable life.

It is both fitting and appropriate that we provide this modest memorial, as he would have wished, in order to remember the essence of public service and a life well lived by Hawaii's quintessential native son, Hiram L. Fong.

I would like to thank our House Leadership, Congressman TOM DAVIS, chairman of the House Government Reform Committee, and Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, the committee's ranking member, for their assistance in moving this bill expeditiously to the House floor. I also appreciate the support of my colleagues on this measure.

I am certain that Senator Fong's family and friends, and all of Hawaii, are appreciative of all of your support. Mahalo.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of S. 2089, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2089.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF DANA REEVE

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dana Reeve who passed away last night following a battle with lung cancer.

I am deeply saddened by the loss of my dear friend, and would like to take a moment to reflect on her life. She

faced extraordinary challenges and handled them with the utmost grace, dignity and strength.

When her husband, Chris, was first injured, Dana helped establish the Christopher Reeve Foundation. Recognizing a lack of any place to go for comprehensive information for newly injured patients and their families, she worked tirelessly to establish the Christopher and Dana Reeve Paralysis Resource Center. Since the launch of this center in 2002, it has assisted thousands of spinal cord injured patients and their loved ones in dealing with the many issues and anxieties that come along with such an injury. Dana used her personal experience to improve the quality of life for all people living with paralysis.

This was typical of Dana, to see beyond her own circumstances and find a way to ease the suffering and confusion of others. After her husband's passing, she moved forward with his message of hope and healing. Today, it is up to all of us to continue their legacy. As Chris and Dana would say, let us go forward.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Dana Reeve's family, friends and all those who mourn her. May God bless her.

#### USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2271) to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2271

*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 "USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

As used in this Act, the term "applicable Act" means the Act entitled "An Act to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes." (109th Congress, 2d Session).

#### SEC. 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FISA ORDERS.

Subsection (f) of section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

"(f)(1) In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'production order' means an order to produce any tangible thing under this section; and

"(B) the term 'nondisclosure order' means an order imposed under subsection (d).

"(2)(A)(i) A person receiving a production order may challenge the legality of that order by filing a petition with the pool established by section 103(e)(1). Not less than 1 year after the date of the issuance of the pro-

duction order, the recipient of a production order may challenge the nondisclosure order imposed in connection with such production order by filing a petition to modify or set aside such nondisclosure order, consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (C), with the pool established by section 103(e)(1).

"(ii) The presiding judge shall immediately assign a petition under clause (i) to 1 of the judges serving in the pool established by section 103(e)(1). Not later than 72 hours after the assignment of such petition, the assigned judge shall conduct an initial review of the petition. If the assigned judge determines that the petition is frivolous, the assigned judge shall immediately deny the petition and affirm the production order or nondisclosure order. If the assigned judge determines the petition is not frivolous, the assigned judge shall promptly consider the petition in accordance with the procedures established under section 103(e)(2).

"(iii) The assigned judge shall promptly provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for any determination under this subsection. Upon the request of the Government, any order setting aside a nondisclosure order shall be stayed pending review pursuant to paragraph (3).

"(B) A judge considering a petition to modify or set aside a production order may grant such petition only if the judge finds that such order does not meet the requirements of this section or is otherwise unlawful. If the judge does not modify or set aside the production order, the judge shall immediately affirm such order, and order the recipient to comply therewith.

"(C)(i) A judge considering a petition to modify or set aside a nondisclosure order may grant such petition only if the judge finds that there is no reason to believe that disclosure may endanger the national security of the United States, interfere with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation, interfere with diplomatic relations, or endanger the life or physical safety of any person.

"(ii) If, upon filing of such a petition, the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation certifies that disclosure may endanger the national security of the United States or interfere with diplomatic relations, such certification shall be treated as conclusive, unless the judge finds that the certification was made in bad faith.

"(iii) If the judge denies a petition to modify or set aside a nondisclosure order, the recipient of such order shall be precluded for a period of 1 year from filing another such petition with respect to such nondisclosure order.

"(D) Any production or nondisclosure order not explicitly modified or set aside consistent with this subsection shall remain in full effect.

"(3) A petition for review of a decision under paragraph (2) to affirm, modify, or set aside an order by the Government or any person receiving such order shall be made to the court of review established under section 103(b), which shall have jurisdiction to consider such petitions. The court of review shall provide for the record a written statement of the reasons for its decision and, on petition by the Government or any person receiving such order for writ of certiorari, the record shall be transmitted under seal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction to review such decision.

"(4) Judicial proceedings under this subsection shall be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The record of proceedings, including petitions filed, orders granted, and statements of reasons for decision, shall be

maintained under security measures established by the Chief Justice of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence.

“(5) All petitions under this subsection shall be filed under seal. In any proceedings under this subsection, the court shall, upon request of the Government, review *ex parte* and *in camera* any Government submission, or portions thereof, which may include classified information.”.

#### SEC. 4. DISCLOSURES.

(a) FISA.—Subparagraph (C) of section 501(d)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(d)(2)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(C) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (1) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.”.

(b) TITLE 18.—Paragraph (4) of section 2709(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the Director or such designee of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request under subsection (a).”.

(c) FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 626(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(d)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the Director or such designee of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for the identity of financial institutions or a consumer report respecting any consumer under this section.”.

(2) OTHER AGENCIES.—Paragraph (4) of section 627(c) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(c)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the authorized government agency, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the requesting official of the authorized government agency the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the requesting official of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for information under subsection (a).”.

(d) RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (D) of section 1114(a)(3) of the Right to Financial Pri-

vacancy Act (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(3)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(D) At the request of the authorized Government authority or the Secret Service, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the requesting official of the authorized Government authority or the Secret Service the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the requesting official of the authorized Government authority or the Secret Service of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for financial records under this subsection.”.

(2) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Clause (iv) of section 1114(a)(5)(D) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(D)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(iv) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the Director or such designee of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for financial records under subparagraph (A).”.

(e) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Paragraph (4) of section 802(b) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436(b)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the authorized investigative agency, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the requesting official of the authorized investigative agency the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the requesting official of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request under subsection (a).”.

#### SEC. 5. PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR LIBRARY PATRONS.

Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by the applicable Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LIBRARIES.—A library (as that term is defined in section 213(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9122(1)), the services of which include access to the Internet, books, journals, magazines, newspapers, or other similar forms of communication in print or digitally by patrons for their use, review, examination, or circulation, is not a wire or electronic communication service provider for purposes of this section, unless the library is providing the services defined in section 2510(15) (‘electronic communication service’) of this title.”.

This Act shall become effective immediately upon enactment.

□ 1445

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 S. 2271 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate 2271, the USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006. On December 14 of last year, the House passed the conference report on H.R. 3199, the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, by a strong bipartisan vote of 251-174. Last Thursday, the other body followed the bipartisan lead of this House and approved the conference report by an overwhelming vote of 89-10.

When the House Judiciary Committee unanimously reported the PATRIOT Act a month after the 9/11 attacks, I pledged to vigorously examine its implementation to ensure that enhanced law enforcement authority is required to reduce America's vulnerability that terrorism did not erode our constitutional or civil liberties.

As the historical record makes amply clear, it was the House, led by former majority leader Dick Armey and me, that forcefully insisted that much of the PATRIOT Act's expansion of law enforcement authority sunset without affirmative congressional reauthorization.

These sunsets helped complement aggressive Congressional oversight of the implementation of the PATRIOT Act. The conference report now passed by both houses represents the product of comprehensive bipartisan consideration consisting of legislative and oversight hearings, briefings, and inspector general reports and committee correspondence. This extensive record, a chronology of which I will submit for the RECORD, has demonstrated that the PATRIOT Act has been an effective tool against terrorists and other criminals.

At the same time, intense congressional and public scrutiny has not produced a single substantiated claim that the PATRIOT Act has been misused to violate American civil liberties. However, the conference report contained over 30 important civil liberties amendments and revisions revised to further mitigate the potential for misuse of the PATRIOT Act.

This bill includes three additional clarifications of the conference report to address concerns raised by some Members of the other body.

First, current law does not expressly provide a recipient of a section 215 order or a national security letter the

right to challenge it. The conference report clearly delineated judicial review for such challenges, including the ability of NSL recipients to challenge an accompanying nondisclosure order. S. 2271 would extend the section 215 recipients similar access to judicial review, to challenge and attach the nondisclosure order.

Second, because of national security concerns, the conference report contained language that would allow the government to ask a recipient of one of these national security orders to identify the persons to whom disclosure will be or was made. The Director of National Intelligence expressed concern that without this safeguard, a recipient could disclose the government's investigative efforts to a person with ties to hostile foreign governments or entities.

The conference report permitted the government to determine whether a request is warranted, and if the defendant has made such a request to determine whether the disclosure affected an ongoing investigation. An exception was included for information that might interfere with attorney-client relations, specifically barring the disclosure of the identity of an attorney to whom a recipient planned to disclose. This bill extends the exception to prevent the government from requesting the name of counsels with whom the recipient had already consulted.

Finally, S. 2271 clarifies current law that a library may only be subject to an NSL request if it falls under 18 U.S.C. 2516(15), which defines an electronic communications service provider as any service which provides to users thereof the ability to send or receive wire or electronic communication. This change addresses the potential for misuse alleged by critics of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 5 years, the PATRIOT Act has been the focus of virtually unprecedented congressional and public scrutiny. Opponents of this legislation have relied upon exaggeration and hyperbole to distort a demonstrated record of accomplishment and success.

The Justice Department and other agencies have properly used the PATRIOT Act to detect, disrupt and dismantle sales in New York, Virginia and Oregon before they struck. The PATRIOT Act helped tear down the pre-9/11 wall that prevented law enforcement intelligence agencies from sharing critical information necessary to avert terrorist attacks on American soil.

It has become a critical tool of America's law enforcement arsenal and a vital deterrent against terrorist subversion. It upheld our constitutional values, and none of the provisions authorized by the conference report have been held unconstitutional.

Simply stated, the PATRIOT Act has made America safer while safeguarding our civil liberties. The conference report contained provisions to address

claims that the PATRIOT Act might be misused to violate civil liberties, and Senate 2271 contains additional provisions to further allay these concerns. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and look forward to the eminent enactment of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 into law.

The following material is a chronology of the oversight of the PATRIOT Act from October of 2001 to November of 2005 and a listing of additional civil liberties protections contained in the conference report of H.R. 3119:

OVERSIGHT OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT FROM OCTOBER, 2001, TO NOVEMBER, 2005

1. November 9, 2005, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary staff on press accounts of FBI use of NSLs;

2. October 25, 2005, Department of Justice classified briefing for House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary and Committees on Intelligence staff on press accounts of FBI use of NSLs;

3. October 6, 2005, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on press accounts of mistakes in FBI applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court under the USA PATRIOT Act;

4. July 12, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to July 1, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

5. July 12, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to May 19, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

6. July 11, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to Rep. Bobby Scott responding to questions regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

7. July 11, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the House Committee on the Judiciary regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

8. July 5, 2005, letter from FBI Director Mueller to Senate Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

9. July 1, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to Rep. Bobby Scott responding to questions regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

10. July 1, 2005, letter from House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

11. June 29, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary responding to April 5, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

12. June 10, 2005, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing on reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act;

13. June 8, 2005, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing on reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act;

14. May 26, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Material Witness Provisions of the Criminal Code and the Implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act; Section 505 that Addresses National Security Letters; and Section 804 that Addresses Jurisdiction over Crimes Committed at U.S. Facilities Abroad;

15. May 19, 2005, letter from House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

16. May 10, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on the prohibition of Material Support to Terrorists and Foreign Terrorist Organizations and on the DOJ Inspector General's Reports on Civil Liberty Violations under the USA PATRIOT Act;

17. May 10, 2005, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on continued oversight of the USA PATRIOT Act;

18. May 5, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Section 212 of the USA PATRIOT Act that Allows Emergency Disclosure of Electronic Communications to Protect Life and Limb;

19. May 3, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Sections 201, 202, 213, and 223 of the USA PATRIOT Act and Their Effect on Law Enforcement Surveillance;

20. April 28, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing: Section 218 of the USA PATRIOT Act—If It Expires Will the "Wall" Return?;

21. April 28, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing: Have Sections 206 and 215 Improved Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Investigations?;

22. April 26, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to Senator Dianne Feinstein responding to April 4, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

23. April 26, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing: Have Sections 204, 207, 214, and 225 of the USA PATRIOT Act, and Sections 6001 and 6002 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, improved FISA Investigations;

24. April 21, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Crime, Terrorism, and the Age of Technology—(Section 209: Seizure of Voice-Mail Messages Pursuant to Warrants; Section 217: Interception of Computer Trespasser Communications; and Section 220: Nationwide Service of Search Warrants for Electronic Evidence);

25. April 20, 2005, Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security hearing: A Review of the Material Support to Terrorism Prohibition;

26. April 19, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Sections 203(b) and (d) of the USA PATRIOT Act and their Effect on Information Sharing;

27. April 6, 2005, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing with Attorney General Gonzales;

28. April 5, 2005, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on Oversight of the USA PATRIOT Act;

29. March 22, 2005, Department of Justice law enforcement sensitive briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on the use of FISA under the USA PATRIOT Act;

30. September 22, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing: A Review of Counter-Terrorism Legislation and Proposals, Including the USA PATRIOT Act and the SAFE Act May 5, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing: Aiding Terrorists—a Review of the Material Support Statute;

31. May 20, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on FBI Oversight: Terrorism;

32. April 14, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on Preventing and Responding to Acts of Terrorism: A Review of Current Law;

33. February 3, 2004, Department of Justice briefing for House Committee on the Judiciary staff on its views of S. 1709, the "Security and Freedom Ensured (SAFE) Act of

2003," and H.R. 3352, the House companion bill, as both bills proposed changes to the USA PATRIOT Act;

34. November 20, 2003, request by Chairmen Sensenbrenner and Hostettler to GAO requesting a study of the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act anti-money laundering provisions. Report was released on June 6, 2005;

35. October 29, 2003, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on the use of FISA under the USA PATRIOT Act;

36. September 10, 2003, Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security hearing on Terrorism: Two Years After 9/11, Connecting the Dots;

37. August 7, 2003, Department of Justice briefing for House Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff regarding the long-standing authority for law enforcement to conduct delayed searches and collect business records and the effect of the USA PATRIOT Act on those authorities;

38. July 23, 2003, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on Law Enforcement and Terrorism;

39. June 13, 2003, letter from Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs at the Department of Homeland Security, Pamela J. Turner, to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

40. June 10, 2003, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on the use of FISA under the USA PATRIOT Act;

41. June 5, 2003, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing on the U.S. Department of Justice, including its use of the provisions authorized by the USA PATRIOT Act;

42. May 20, 2003, House Subcommittee on the Constitution hearing: Anti-Terrorism Investigations and the Fourth Amendment After September 11th: Where and When Can Government Go to Prevent Terrorist Attacks;

43. May 13, 2003, letter from Acting Assistant Attorney General, Jamie Brown to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

44. April 1, 2003, letter from the House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

45. October 9, 2002, Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security hearing: Tools Against Terror: How the Administration is Implementing New Laws in the Fight to Protect our Homeland;

46. September 20, 2002, letter from Assistant Attorney General, Daniel Bryant, to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

47. September 10, 2002, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on the USA PATRIOT Act in Practice: Shedding Light on the FISA Process;

48. August 26, 2002, letter from Assistant Attorney General, Daniel Bryant, to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

49. July 26, 2002, letter from Assistant Attorney General, Daniel Bryant to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

50. July 25, 2002, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on the Department of Justice, including its implementation of the authorities granted by the USA PATRIOT Act;

51. June 13, 2002, letter from the House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

52. April 17, 2002, Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts

hearing: "Should the Office of Homeland Security Have More Power? A Case Study in Information Sharing;"

53. December 6, 2001, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on DOJ Oversight: Preserving our Freedoms While Defending Against Terrorism;

54. December 4, 2001, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on DOJ Oversight: Preserving our Freedoms While Defending Against Terrorism;

55. November 28, 2001, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on DOJ Oversight: Preserving our Freedoms While Defending Against Terrorism; and

56. October 3, 2001, Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Property Rights hearing: Protecting Constitutional Freedoms in the Face of Terrorism.

#### ADDITIONAL CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS CONTAINED IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3199, THE USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

The conference report contains the following additional safeguards:

Requires a description of a specific target in both the application and the court order for "roving wiretaps," and specific facts in the application that show that the target's actions may thwart surveillance efforts—if the target's true identity is unknown.

Requires that the FBI must notify the court within 10 days after beginning surveillance of any new phone for all "roving wiretaps." The notice must include the total number of electronic surveillances conducted under the court's multipoint order.

Includes new reporting requirements to Congress, including new details about the use of "roving" authority.

Requires that for delayed notice search warrants that notice of the search be given within 30 days of its execution, unless the facts justify a later date, eliminating the open-ended period of delay permissible under current law.

Allows for extensions of the delay period in giving notice of a search, but only upon an updated showing of the need for further delay. Also, it limits any extension to 90 days or less, unless the facts of the case justify a longer delay.

Adds new reporting requirements to Congress on the use of delayed notice search warrants.

Requires for section 215 orders, relating to investigator's access to business records, a statement of facts showing reasonable grounds to believe that the records or other things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism or espionage. This provides additional safeguards to the original USA PATRIOT Act, which required the government only to certify that the records at issue were sought for an authorized investigation—without any factual showing.

Requires a three part test for section 215 orders that ensures the records are sought for: a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power; the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of an authorized investigation; or an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of an authorized investigation. This test combined with the newly required statement of facts should mitigate concerns of government "fishing expeditions," while maintaining the flexibility for legitimate terrorism investigations.

Explicitly guarantees the right for recipients of section 215 orders to consult legal counsel and seek judicial review.

Requires high level approval by either the FBI Director, Deputy Director, or Executive Assistant Director for requests for certain

records, including library records, medical records, educational records, and tax return records.

Limits the scope of section 215 orders to materials that could be obtained via grand jury subpoena or a similar court order for the production of records.

Limits retention, and prohibits dissemination, of information concerning U.S. persons.

Requires that the DOJ Inspector General conduct two separate audits of the FBI's use of section 215 orders that will examine: any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to 215 orders, including any improper or illegal use of the authority; the manner in which such information is collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the FBI; and an assessment of whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.

Requires enhanced reporting to Congress of section 215 orders, including a breakdown of its use to obtain library records, medical records, educational records, and other sensitive types of records.

Requires public reporting of the aggregate use of section 215 orders.

Allows recipients of National Security Letters (NSLs) to consult with legal counsel.

Creates an explicit right to judicial review of NSL requests.

Permits a reviewing court to modify or set aside an NSL if compliance would be unreasonable, oppressive, or otherwise unlawful—this is the same standard used to modify or quash a subpoena in a criminal case.

Provides for judicial review of the non-disclosure requirements.

Adds a "knowing and willfully" standard that must be proven before someone who discloses an NSL can be subject to a 1-year misdemeanor offense.

Requires the DOJ IG to conduct two comprehensive audits of the FBI's use of NSLs.

Requires the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of applying minimization procedures to NSLs to ensure the protection of constitutional rights of U.S. persons.

Adds a new "sunshine" provision that requires annual public reporting on NSLs.

Provides for expanded congressional access to significant FISA reporting currently provided to the Intelligence Committees.

Includes a provision requiring the FISA Court to submit its rules & procedures to Congress.

Creates new reporting requirements for the use of emergency authorities under FISA.

Requires new reporting on the use of emergency disclosures of communications information made under section 212 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

Requires the Department of Justice to submit a report to Congress on the Department's data-mining activities.

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

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let me just begin by pointing out that in the dissent from the bill reported, there are six precise examples of when the PATRIOT Act has been abused so that no one will be able to say that they don't know where they are. They are on page 2 and 3 of the dissents that have been filed with the committee.

What we have, we have passed the conference report already. It was passed on December 14, 2005. Because of the other body, and the serious objections that they have raised, we are getting now to three other points that are

being raised. Two of the points are the basis of my remarks this afternoon.

The first I would like you to know about in S. 2271 is that amazingly enough, after all the debate, this measure that we are considering today makes section 215 intelligence orders for any tangible thing harder to challenge in court than the current conference report which allows a recipient to challenge the gag order immediately. This measure before us that we will be voting on would make the recipient wait a year, but then to make it really worse, rather than the reviewing court immediately allowing the gag order, allowing the gag as the government's *carte blanche* assertion of national security is conclusive.

We have added two things. We make the assertion of national security conclusive, plus we make the person that challenges it not able to immediately go to court. This is a setback.

The second thing that we do is that we add no meaningful protection for library records. That is to say that the present conference reports allow immediate challenge. What we do is that according to the National Association of Library Records, we make the protection for library records exempt only if, the national security letters, they don't offer Internet access. But the American Library Association puts the number of libraries without Internet access at nearly zero.

What we have done is create a fig leaf that really does nothing to give the meaningful protection that the library association has requested and that we tried to get through in our legislation. So it is with great reluctance that even on two out of the three measures that are before us in this very small bill, we find that this is unsupported.

In addition, finally, what this measure doesn't do is address any of the core problems with the PATRIOT Act, the main one being that we have asked for moderate changes that would have ensured that these extraordinary new powers are directed solely at terrorists or to those associated with terrorists, and this measure fails to do that. For those reasons, I am unable to support this measure and urge that it be defeated.

There is no more difficult task we have as legislators than balancing our Nation's need for security against our citizens' civil liberties. Nearly five years after the tragedy of September 11, and in the midst of a war against terror without any clear endpoint, it is increasingly clear that we are failing in that task.

We failed when we rushed through the first PATRIOT Act while the wreck of the World Trade Center was still smoldering. We failed when we refused to address the repeated civil liberties abuses by our own government, including the warrantless surveillance of U.S. citizens. And today, we are failing yet again, by taking up S. 2771. Not only is the bill substantively dangerous, it does nothing to respond to the serious flaws in the conference report.

First, the bill is dangerous because it makes it practically impossible to challenge the gag

orders that come with secretive 215 orders. It would not only make the recipient wait at least one full year before challenging a gag order, it deems government certifications concerning possible harm to national security to be "conclusive." This is far worse than what is proposed by the conference report which would allow the FISA court to ensure that the law and the Constitution are not violated.

Second, the bill operates as a mere fig leaf, covering over serious problems in the underlying conference report. For example, the bill pretends to protect libraries from receiving National Security Letters, but then revokes that protection if the library offers internet access. The bill does nothing to prevent the government from using security letters to obtain confidential information having nothing to do with terrorism; nothing to protect secret physical searches of homes and offices; and nothing to rein in abusive roving wiretap orders.

If we are serious about combating terror in the 21st century, we must move beyond symbolic gestures and color coded threat levels, and begin to make the hard choices needed to protect our Nation. If we really want to prevent terrorists from targeting our citizens and our cities, we need keep assault weapons out of the hands of suspected terrorists. And if we really want to protect our people and secure our ports and other transportation hubs, the administration needs to honor the letter and the spirit of our security laws and fully fund our homeland security needs.

The legislation before us today endangers our civil liberties, while doing nothing meaningful to protect our citizens. I urge a no vote.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), chair of the Subcommittee on Crime.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, pardon my immodesty. I believe that this bill has been thoroughly and consistently examined, but I don't think there has been a committee other than the House Judiciary Committee, I don't think there has been a subcommittee, other than the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, that has worked any more diligently than have we.

Now, the chairman used the words vulnerable and vulnerability in his opening statement. We are indeed, we were on 9/11, we are today. But as the chairman furthermore pointed out, much misleading and inaccurate information has been associated and directed to the PATRIOT Act. I used this example on the floor earlier, Mr. Speaker. A constituent of mine came to me all upset, concerned about the PATRIOT Act.

We must get rid of the PATRIOT Act, he said to me. I said to him, give me an example how it has adversely affected you. He said, I can't do it. I said, give me an example of how it has adversely affected anyone you know. I can't do it, he replied. I further said, give me an example where any third party has been adversely affected. Again he came up short.

This is the misleading information that has convinced many people across our land that it is no good. In this era of instant and universal communications, if a piece of legislation is as bad as my constituents thought it was, surely he would have some evidence as to some information to indicate to me why the bill is so onerous.

□ 1500

Granted, the bill expanded the parameters of law enforcement, but not to the detriment of law-abiding citizens.

After 9/11, I made the statement that my most pressing fear is that the next attack will come by water at ports and/or harbors, the very issue that plagues us today with the ports issue. We are indeed still vulnerable, but we are not as vulnerable as we were on 9/11, and part of that security must be directly related to the PATRIOT Act. We are not invincible, by any means; but we are more secure, we are more protected than we were then, because I think we now fully appreciate the enemy, the terrorism that hangs heavy over our heads; and I think the PATRIOT Act, Madam Speaker, will serve a good purpose to that end.

I again thank the chairman for having yielded time to me, and I thank him for his leadership as we have pursued this effort in the past several months.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I want to say to my good friend and my respected chair and the Member who just spoke that one of the things you have to keep in mind is the information that they are saying hasn't been brought forward to the public wouldn't be brought forward to the public under what has been essentially a secret manner of investigation.

I rise in strong opposition to this legislation because it offers only superficial reform that would have little, if any, impact on safeguarding our civil liberties. Furthermore, it has become crystal clear that this administration is currently and will continue to abuse, attack, and outright deny the civil liberties of the people of this country in defiance of our Constitution. This administration is illegally wiretapping American citizens, illegally collecting information on peace groups, and illegally signing statements to ignore the torture ban recently enacted by this Congress.

Some of my colleagues will stand up here today and argue the PATRIOT Act had nothing to do with these nefarious activities, but my colleagues are not looking at the big picture. The administration is violating the laws Congress has passed and trampling on the Constitution of the United States.

I will not give this administration any additional police powers. Congress has failed to do its job as a coequal branch of government. The administration's attack on our democracy has to

be reined in. This Congress must not walk away from its role in providing a check and balance to the administration's exercise of executive power.

This Congress was not zealous in oversight prior to 2001; but since that time, this Congress has ignored its constitutional duty, and 200 years of American democracy have suffered. The complacency of this Congress is clearly viewed by the administration as a license to ignore the laws it disagrees with, and then it demands Congress pass expanded police powers.

In the name of the Constitution of the United States of America, I reject this complacency. I will not vote to give a single new police power to this administration. I voted against the PATRIOT Act when it first passed, and I remain even more opposed to this legislation today.

The bill before us today enables the FBI to investigate any American for any reason without the checks and balances of the judicial system. History tells us that unchecked police powers with little or no oversight will be abused and the citizens will be harmed. The administration's record in this area is concrete proof that history repeats itself.

I am for police function that protects citizens of this great Nation, not a police function that is used to terrorize them. I urge my colleagues to vote against the PATRIOT Act reauthorization, to stand up for our Constitution, to stand up for our Bill of Rights, to remember the long struggle that was instrumental in establishing those liberties.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, the statement we just heard is at variance with what has happened since the PATRIOT Act was enacted.

First, none of the 16 provisions that expanded law enforcement powers has been held unconstitutional by any Federal Court in the country in over 4 years of being tested. Second, the PATRIOT Act requires the Justice Department Inspector General to report to Congress twice a year on civil liberties violations that have been investigated. We have gotten those reports. There haven't been any. Third, there is a provision in the PATRIOT Act that said anybody who thinks their civil liberties are violated can sue the Justice Department and get \$10,000 of statutory damages in addition to proven economic damages and attorneys fees. So far, not a dime has been paid out in judgments or settlements under this section.

This is an example of how the PATRIOT Act has been distorted by those who are opposed to it. Let us talk about the PATRIOT Act, because the PATRIOT Act has passed muster, and the facts and the court decisions show it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, after 9/11, one of the most responsible things that this Congress did was to pass the PATRIOT Act. It tore down that wall that existed between the intelligence community and the law enforcement community, a wall that was specifically talked about in the 9/11 Commission report as one of the failures of our government to prepare for the threats that we had prior to 9/11. What we are doing now is reaffirming that responsible act by this Congress. This today is the final critical piece of the USA PATRIOT Act, reflecting the careful balancing of national security and the civil liberties of our citizens.

In total, over 30 changes, additional civil liberty protections, have been made to the base legislation. It reflects the reality that security must not be juxtaposed against the notion of rights. It is absolutely true that the first civil right of all Americans is the right not to be murdered, not to be murdered by terrorists.

The three additional changes contained in the bill before us, S. 2271, go beyond the 30 additions that we had in the conference report itself. There are civil liberties protections concerning, first, the ability to challenge the legality of a section 215 order. Section 215 deals with business records, including library records. Secondly, it adds civil liberties protections concerning the protection of the confidentiality of a name of an attorney to whom information has been disclosed. Third, it places limitations concerning the use of national security letters with respect to libraries.

These 30-plus changes to the underlying legislation were made despite the fact that in this last year we had 13 separate hearings on the PATRIOT Act; and in those 13 hearings we found not a single, single, incidence of abuse of the law. We placed the Attorney General of the United States under oath. We placed the number two person at the Justice Department under oath. We heard from supporters of this act; we heard from the detractors of this act. We examined the Inspector General's reports. We had the opportunity to look at classified data that backed up the request for the use of this act.

I personally did that, as well as other members of the subcommittee and the full committee; and we could not find a single example of an established abuse of the statute as written or as applied.

On the basis of the Bali terrorist attacks, the bombing in Spain, the terrible 7/7 incident in London, the threat to the safety and security of our citizens continues. It didn't end with the passage of the PATRIOT Act. The PATRIOT Act, as it has been implemented, has allowed us to protect ourselves from future such attacks.

We must not now lapse into a pre-9/11 lethargy. Unlike normal criminal investigations, terrorism presents law

enforcement with the task of preventing a cataclysmic attack. That is why I rise in support of this bill before us.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Virginia, I yield myself 45 seconds, because this is getting a little bit out of hand.

The assertion has been made that none of the 16 provisions have violated the law, but two Federal District Courts in New York and Connecticut have found that the national security letters themselves are illegal. Two courts, that the national security letters were held to be illegal. And to say that there have been no abuses, read pages 2 and 3 of the dissent of the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee about all of the violations that have gone on.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, the national security letters were not one of the additional law enforcement powers that were passed as a part of the PATRIOT Act. They were passed in 1986, 15 years before 9/11 and the PATRIOT Act was passed.

The gentleman is correct in saying that national security letters were held unconstitutional, and what we did in this reauthorization bill is to provide a procedure to challenge them and make them constitutional, even though they weren't in the original PATRIOT Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, let me just first say I believe it is inappropriate to even discuss the PATRIOT Act until we have had hearings to find out what is going on with the NSA wiretaps. The PATRIOT Act could be, in fact, irrelevant if you are wiretapping at will, as the President has suggested; and we want to know exactly what is going on with those wiretaps before we do anything else. But this bill is on the floor, so we have to discuss that.

Unfortunately, I have to oppose this bill because it still continues to require no finding of individualized suspicion as a trigger to the secret record search powers in sections 215 and 505. That means that innocent Americans can have their sensitive records searched without any showing that they are an agent of a terrorist organization or scheming with terrorist organizations or doing anything illegal. Instead, this continues the problems in the original PATRIOT Act. This bill addresses several of the problems, but doesn't actually solve them.

One thing it helps is the fact that the recipient of a national security letter will be able to consult a lawyer without having to notify the government of the attorney's name. This is merely cosmetic, because that has actually been the recent practice.

In terms of these interstate letters, the bill addresses the right to challenge the gag order which applies to the secret orders under 215, as well as the national security letters; but it says that you can't make the challenge for 1 year. It codifies a 1-year period during which you can't do anything. That makes the present law worse. Presumably, you could go in right away to challenge the NSA and see the secret orders; but now you have to wait a year, and at the end of the year, you can't do anything, because all the government has to do is certify that the gag order needs to stay in effect. The judge has no discretion as to overturning that certification. So although this issue is addressed, it is actually made worse.

Finally, Madam Speaker, there is a question on the protection of privacy of library patrons in terms of the Internet service providers as to whether or not the library is an Internet service provider. The language is a little bit confusing.

Madam Speaker, I would enter into the RECORD a colloquy between the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SUNUNU, the chief patron of the bill. Assuming that he means what he said he meant on the floor of the Senate, we don't have a problem with it. So I would like to ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD the colloquy between the two Senators as to what section 5 actually means.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, is it in order to introduce into the RECORD in this body debate that has been taken in the other body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By unanimous consent, it may be done.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Further reserving the right to object, let the record be clear that as manager of the bill, I do not necessarily agree with the debate that was taken between the two Senators in the other body.

□ 1515

But if the gentleman from Virginia wishes to insert that in the RECORD for its hortatory nature, I will not object.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Without objection, it will be entered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce this. It represents the intent of the chief sponsor of the bill, which we agree with, although I understand the manager of the bill in the House may not.

COLLOQUY BETWEEN SENATORS JOHN SUNUNU AND DICK DURBIN ON SECTION 5 OF S. 2271, FEBRUARY 16, 2006

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at this moment, I wish to address the bill pending before the Senate, and that is S. 2271.

I commend Senator John Sununu of New Hampshire, who is here in the Chamber. Were it not for his hard work, we would not be here today. For weeks, while many of us were doing other things back home, Senator Sununu was working assiduously with the White House to find a way to address some very vexing and challenging issues when it came to modifying the PATRIOT Act. He has done an excellent job. I commend him and tell him that I have enjoyed working with him over the last 2 years, where we have crossed party lines and tried to find ways to keep the PATRIOT Act as a tool to make America safe but also at the same time to protect our basic liberties.

Every step of the way, as we considered changes to the PATRIOT Act, we have been supported by our Nation's librarians. These are wonderful men and women—professionals—who are dedicated to the libraries across America, which are such rich resources. I thank the librarians of America, especially for their heroic efforts to amend the PATRIOT Act in a responsible way and, equally as important, to defend our Constitution.

I understand that section 5 of Senator Sununu's bill, S. 2271, will help protect the privacy of Americans' library records. I ask the indulgence of the Chair that I might enter into a colloquy with Senator Sununu relative to section 5.

I would like to ask Senator Sununu, through the Chair, if he could explain to me what section 5 will accomplish.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I am pleased to be on the floor today and pleased to be able to see the light at the end of the tunnel on PATRIOT reauthorization, thanks to the work of Senator Durbin and others. We have legislation before us that will make the adjustments to the PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report mentioned by the Senator from Illinois. He specifically mentioned section 5 of our legislation. As he began to describe, section 5 is intended to clarify current law regarding the applicability of National Security Letters to libraries.

A National Security Letter is a type of administrative subpoena, a powerful tool available to law enforcement officials, to get access to documents. It is a document signed by an FBI agent that requires a business to provide certain kinds of personal records on their customers to the Government. These subpoenas are not approved by a judge before being issued.

What we did in this legislation is add clarifying language that states that libraries operating in their traditional functions: lending books, providing access to digital books or periodicals in digital format, and providing basic access to the Internet would not be subject to a national security letter. There is no National Security Letter statute existing in current law that permits the FBI explicitly to obtain library records. But, as was indicated by the Senator from Illinois, librarians have been concerned that existing National Security Letter authority is vague enough so that it could be used to allow the Government to treat libraries as they do communication service providers such as a telephone company or a traditional Internet service provider from whom consumers would go out and get their access to the Internet and send and receive e-mail.

Section 5 clarifies, as I indicated, that a library providing basic Internet access would not be subject to a national security letter, simply by virtue of making that access available to the public.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. It is my understanding that most public libraries, as he explained, offer Internet access to the public. Because of

this, they are concerned that the Government might consider them to be communications service providers similar to the traditional providers, such as AT&T, Verizon, and AOL.

So if I understand it correctly, your bill clarifies that libraries, simply because they provide basic Internet access, are not communications service providers under the law and are not subject to national security letters as a result. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire, through the Chair, is that a correct conclusion?

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I absolutely believe that the conclusion of the Senator from Illinois is correct. A library providing basic Internet access would not be subject to a National Security Letter as a result of that particular service and other services that are very much in keeping with the traditional role of libraries.

Some have noted or may note that basic Internet access gives library patrons the ability to send and receive e-mail by, for example, accessing an Internet-based e-mail service. But in that case, it is the Web site operator who is providing the communication service—the Internet communication service provider itself—and not the library, which is simply making available a computer with access to the Internet.

So I certainly share the concerns of the Senator from Illinois and others who have worked very long and hard on this and other provisions. I think it does add clarity to the law as he described, in addition to providing other improvements to the PATRIOT Act as they relate to civil liberty protections. All along, this has been about providing law enforcement with the tools that they need in their terrorism investigations while, at the same time, balancing those powers with the need to protect civil liberties. I think, in the legislation before us, we have added clarity to the law in giving access to the courts to object to section 215 gag orders and, of course, striking a very punitive provision dealing with counsel and not forcing the recipient of a National Security Letter to disclose the name of their attorney to the FBI.

All of these are improvements to the underlying legislation, and I recognize that we had a overwhelming, bipartisan vote today to move forward on this package. I anticipate that we will have similar bipartisan votes in the days ahead to conclude work on this legislation and get a much improved PATRIOT Act signed into law.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, as well, because that clarification is important. So if a library offers basic Internet access, and within that access a patron can, for example, send and receive e-mail by accessing an Internet-based e-mail service such as Hotmail, for example, that does not mean the library is a communications service provider and, therefore, it does not mean that a library could be subject to these national security letters of investigation.

By way of comparison, a gas station that has a pay phone isn't a telephone company. So a library that has Internet access, where a person can find an Internet e-mail service, is not a communications service provider; therefore, it would not fall under the purview of the NSL provision in 18 U.S.C. 2709. It is a critically important distinction. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for making that clear and for all of his good work on this bill.

Libraries are fundamental to America. They symbolize our access to education. They are available to everyone, regardless of social or economic status.

When we first introduced the SAFE Act, I went to the Chicago Public Library to make the announcement. The library was established in 1873, and for over 130 years it has

given the people of the City of Chicago the ability to read and learn and communicate. Here is what the mission statement says at that public library:

We welcome and support all people and their enjoyment of reading and pursuit of lifelong learning. We believe in the freedom to read, to learn, and to discover.

We have to ensure, in the Senate and in Congress, in the bills that we pass, including the PATRIOT Act, that this freedom to read, learn, and discover is preserved for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the continued effort to reauthorize the United States PATRIOT Act. It is well overdue for this Congress to ensure those trying to protect the American people have all the tools necessary to combat terrorism.

With the passage of this bill, Congress will have demonstrated its overwhelming desire to protect our civil liberties while protecting our homeland. We have taken every precaution to ensure an overzealous government cannot overstep its constitutional responsibility.

Among other provisions, this legislation allows a person receiving a FISA production order to produce any tangible item that they deem necessary to challenge that order before a district court.

This bill also removes libraries from the definition of a wire or electronic service communication provider for purposes of granting the national security letters, unless, unless the library actually provides electronic communication service.

These are commonsense amendments that will continue to fine-tune the balance between our homeland security and our constitutional rights as American citizens. I thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for yielding me the time and for his outstanding work on this vital issue.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Madam Speaker, just to keep the record straight, in 1986, national security letters were limited to terrorists. The PATRIOT Act lowered the standard to anything relevant to an investigation, and now over 30,000 are issued every year. The sham fix does not help us at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, we are engaged in a serious war with terrorism. But we are going after the wrong targets. We are not protecting ourselves, but we are attacking our liberties. We are not doing anything adequate to secure the loose nuclear materials all over the former Soviet Union before they are smuggled to al Qaeda to make atomic bombs.

We search only 5 percent of the 9 million shipping containers that come into

our country every year, any one of which could contain a weapon of mass destruction.

But what are we doing? Well, the President has orchestrated a secret conspiracy to violate the criminal law by ordering clearly illegal domestic surveillance.

And now we renew the PATRIOT Act with some of the worst provisions only cosmetically changed and continuing to threaten civil liberties. Section 215 allows the government to obtain business reports about people, including library, medical and various other types of business records, as long as they are "sought for a terrorism investigation."

The government simply has to come up with a statement of facts showing there are reasonable grounds to believe that tangible things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation. Relevant? Almost anything can be relevant.

To make matters worse, the recipients of a section 215 order are subject to an almost unreviewable automatic gag order. Now we are told, under this bill, that judicial review can take place after a year. At best. A year? And in order to prevail in challenging a gag order, a certification by the government that disclosure would harm national security or impair diplomatic relations would be conclusive, unless shown it would be in bad faith.

Conclusive? No evidentiary showing, no evidentiary test. That is absurd. That means there is no test at all. Section 505 authorizes FBI field office directors to collect in secret almost limitless sensitive personal information from entities simply by issuing national security letters.

The FBI can simply say they want your private and sensitive information and they can get it. This is very much like the writ of assistance the British used to grant in 1761 that helped start the American Revolution. Under the conference report, recipients would theoretically have the ability to challenge these gag orders, but again that will be virtually impossible.

As with section 215, the government's assertion that the gag order is necessary to protect the national security would be a conclusive presumption that the government is telling the truth that the gag order could stand.

You can only challenge the government's bad faith. This automatic permanent gag rule very likely violates the first amendment, as two courts have already found. We ought to have real protections. We ought to have some procedural safeguards in the PATRIOT Act such as our entire American tradition demands.

The conference report does not replace the section 215 showing of relevance standard with the three-part test that was the basis of the Senate compromise which provided some meaningful due process protections. It should.

The conference report does not restore the section 505 previous standard

of specific and articulable facts connecting the records sought to a suspected terrorist. It should.

The conference report does not allow recipients of section 215 orders and national security letters a meaningful court challenge to the gag order. It should.

And, finally, the conference report does not sunset section 505, national security letters, in 4 years. It should.

I very much urge defeat of this PATRIOT Act reauthorization so that we can mend the bill so it doesn't destroy our constitutional liberties. Mend it, not end it. But this doesn't help.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I would just say to this side, this bill has gone through so many iterations, and so many times we have looked at this. It includes 30 additional civil liberties safeguards. And, you know, I admit that your fighting against this bill has probably improved it a little bit.

But at this point, we have done so much to help it. I think it is a very good bill. I commend the author, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for his patience all during this process.

These new civil liberty safeguards include allowing recipients of search requests or national security letters to seek legal counsel for appealing the decision to the FISA court and mandated reporting to the public and Congress on the use of national security letters, data-mining and delayed-notice search warrants.

This is a vigilant protector of civil rights and national security, and it is the right balance. It is critical that we pass this bill today. I would say in passing that part of the PATRIOT Act was a cargo amendment that I included. I thank the chairman for allowing me to do that.

In Florida alone, local and State agencies joined together and developed a unified strategy for prevention and enforcement against cargo theft, resulting in about a 25 percent decrease in cargo thefts. Unfortunately, my colleagues, the FBI estimates, and these are only estimates because we do not have any way to track this information, overall national loss from cargo theft remains at almost \$6 billion annually.

The interagency cooperation must be expanded from the State level to include nation-wide enforcement. Cargo theft imperils our Nation's security, and data indicates profits from cargo theft often go to organized crime or to terrorist activities.

So for that reason, for 2 years I have been working on this amendment, which is included as part of the PATRIOT Act, to, first of all, combat this crime by increasing mandatory minimum sentencing and directing consolidation of cargo theft trend data—simple collection of this cargo theft trend data into the federal Uniform Crime Reporting system, so in fact that system we have a better understanding of

it, and we can coordinate between different law enforcement agencies.

These are vital steps to fight this growing nation-wide threat, and I am pleased to have it included in the PATRIOT Act.

I ask my colleagues to realize the amount of work that has gone into this bill. It is absolutely necessary we pass it. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Chairman for your efforts to pass this critical legislation.

Our founding fathers knew our young Nation faced dangerous security challenges from its amorphous and expansive border and aggressive European powers. With that in mind, Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance."

The situation confronting us today mirrors that of our founders. Our border is even larger and more difficult to control. With additional points of entry at every airport, prohibiting entry of those intent on doing harm is even more complex. Advanced technologies allow individuals across the oceans to coordinate attacks within our cities. This is an eventuality impossible for our founding fathers to foresee, and yet necessary for us to combat. We must keep pace with the changing environment. The PATRIOT Act equips us to do that by breaking down communication barriers between law enforcement and intelligence agencies, a weakness identified by the 9/11 Commission.

In Florida, law enforcement increased inter-agency cooperation with impressive results. In 2001, local and state agencies joined together and developed a unified strategy for prevention and enforcement against cargo theft, resulting in a 25% decrease in cargo thefts. Unfortunately, the FBI estimates overall national loss from cargo theft remains more than \$6 billion annually. Interagency cooperation must be expanded from the state level to include nationwide enforcement. Cargo theft imperils our national security, and data indicates profits from cargo theft often funds organized crime or terrorist activities. For two years, I have worked to pass legislation combating this crime by increasing mandatory minimum sentences and directing consolidation of cargo theft trend data into the federal Uniform Crime Reporting system to better coordinate enforcement activities. These are vital steps to fight this growing nationwide threat, and I am pleased they were included in this PATRIOT Act reauthorization.

As we debate these amendments to the PATRIOT Act, I hear echoes of another founding father's words. Benjamin Franklin's assertion that, "They who give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety," resounds as an admonition to those of us standing in this chamber to ensure proper oversight and protect civil liberties.

This legislation includes 30 additional civil liberties safeguards. These include: allowing recipients of search requests or National Security Letters to seek legal counsel for appealing the decision to the FISA Court, and mandated reporting to the public and Congress on the use of National Security Letters, data mining, and delayed notice search warrants.

As vigilant protectors of national security, and critical guardians of civil liberties, with full

realization of the immediate threat we face, I call upon my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. Due diligence has been observed . . . investigated . . . executed . . . and critiqued. Now it is time to pass this Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, this is an extremely important debate. I want to begin by expressing my disappointment that this bill is being considered as a suspension along with the naming of post offices. Well, you know what, this is not a post-office-naming bill. This is a bill that deals with constitutional rights. It is an issue about which seven States in this country have raised concerns, as have hundreds of municipalities from one end of America to the other.

This is a bill that should allow for amendments and serious debate and not be considered simply as a suspension.

Madam Speaker, many Americans are wondering how it could be that in terms of national security, our President believes that it is okay for a foreign government with terrorist ties to run major ports in America; that that is okay. But when some of us say that maybe kids or just ordinary American citizens should be allowed to read the books that they want in libraries without being investigated by government agents, without any evidence that they are engaged in terrorist activities or have any ties to terrorism, that we cannot protect.

Madam Speaker, there is growing concern in this country with regard to the state of our civil liberties and our constitutional rights. Whether it is the President of the United States engaging, through the NSA, in illegal wiretaps without court orders, or the widespread use of national security letters, millions of Americans, whether they are progressives, whether they are conservatives or in between, are very concerned about Big Brother investigating the private lives, the private reading habits of ordinary Americans.

Madam Speaker, in June of 2005, I offered an amendment that passed with a very strong bipartisan vote, which said that libraries and book stores should be exempt from section 215, that it is wrong for the government to be able to access the reading records or the book purchases of innocent Americans unless they can establish that those individuals have ties with terrorism.

All of us want our government to be vigorous in protecting the American people against terrorism. But we want to do that in a way that does not undermine the constitutional rights of the American people. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership took that amendment, which passed with strong bipartisan support, and they tossed it out. They rejected the will of a vast

majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and did not incorporate that language into the final bill.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue of huge consequence. Fighting terrorism is an enormously important issue, but we can and must do it without undermining the constitutional rights of the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as I indicated before, we need to have hearings on the NSA wiretaps. The question there is not whether or not the wiretaps can take place, but whether or not they take place in the concept of checks and balances.

Also, we need to know what kinds of wiretaps are going on, and it would be nice to have hearings on that before we consider the PATRIOT Act. But when one of the previous speakers talked about the due process involved, we have to remind people that the due process is not for the person whose records are being gathered, but due process on the library that does not have enough money to operate the library, whether or not they have a right to go out and hire a lawyer to protect somebody else's rights.

The person affected does not have any rights in this situation. It is just the library and their own good will. If they want to go out and protect somebody's rights, they have that opportunity. These are extraordinary rights, police rights and police powers; and we need to make sure that people actually understand what is going on here.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Madam Speaker, it has been said that there have been no abuses of the PATRIOT Act. Let me just run down what has already been reported, and probably there have been more, since we filed our report.

It was used against Brandon Mayfield, a Muslim American, to tap his phone, seize his property, copy his computer files, spy on his children, take his DNA, all without his knowledge.

It has been used to deny, on account of his political beliefs, the admission to the United States of a Swiss citizen and prominent Muslim scholar to teach at Notre Dame University. It has been used to unconstitutionally coerce an Internet service provider to divulge information about e-mail activity and Web surfing on its system, and then gag that provider from even disclosing the abuse to the public.

□ 1530

Because of gag restrictions, we will never know how many times it has

been used to obtain reading records from libraries and book stores, but we do know that libraries have been solicited by the Department of Justice, voluntarily or under threat of the PATRIOT Act, for reading information on more than 200 occasions since September 11.

Finally, it has been used to charge and detain and prosecute Muslim students in Idaho for posting Internet Web site links to objectionable material.

Let us not support this PATRIOT Act today.

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

Madam Speaker, I can't believe what I have heard from my friends on the other side of the aisle. If they succeed in defeating this bill, it is a case of be sorry for getting what you ask for. This bill actually puts more civil liberties protections into the PATRIOT Act than the conference report which has already been passed by both Houses and is ready to be enrolled and sent to the President for his signature.

So if you have your way and you vote down the bill that was authored by the gentleman from New Hampshire, Senator SUNUNU, you are not going to have the additional civil liberties protections that are contained in Senate 2271. That is not going to stop the conference report which you opposed in December, as is your right, from going to the President and being signed without these additional civil liberties protections.

If you are for more civil liberties protections in the PATRIOT Act, vote for this bill. If you are against them, vote against this bill. But the fate of this bill has no bearing on the fact that the conference report on the PATRIOT Act reauthorization has been cleared by both Houses and is ready to go to the White House. So think before you vote "no." I am voting "aye" because this is a good bill, and we ought to vote on this bill based upon what is in it rather than what is in other legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 2271, a bill that circumvents the regular legislative process and fails to truly improve the PATRIOT Act.

Last year, I rejected the PATRIOT Act reauthorization and the conference report because I thought Congress could strike a more reasonable balance in empowering law enforcement and protecting civil liberties. I was concerned then, as I am now, that the reauthorization language would remove the protection of sunsets to most of the PATRIOT Act, which was critical to earn support for such sweeping legislation in 2001. These sunset provisions ensure that Congress will continuously be able to take a closer look at how law enforcement powers are implemented and the effectiveness of balancing security and freedom. I continue to believe that Congressional oversight over one of the most fundamental challenges of our time would not hinder our society but enhance it.

First, let us be clear about what we are voting on today—an amendment to a conference

report. Conference reports are not amendable. Conference reports are the product of conference committees that have hammered out the differences between House and Senate versions of legislation. A conference report is one of the last stages of the legislative process and it must be wholly rejected or accepted by the two chambers.

Since the Majority and the Administration cannot pass the PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report on its merits through the regular legislative process, the House must now consider a bill that amends the report. Instead of being honest with the American people that the conference report is flawed, the Majority is attempting to maneuver legislation through the House that they purport will "fix" the underlying problems of the PATRIOT Act reauthorization and fast-track the bill to President Bush's desk.

Even if this "fix" was added to the conference report, many discrepancies in the protection of privacy, civil liberties and Congressional oversight still remain. For example, with no meaningful changes to the conference report, access is still allowed to sensitive personal records, including medical, business and library records (Section 215) and national security letters that request personal information are still issued with no judicial review (Section 505).

Today, I reject the idea that the Majority and the Administration can use this bill as political cover to gain enough support for passage of the PATRIOT Act reauthorization. The fact remains that the PATRIOT Act reauthorization still needs more work, more safeguards, and more oversight. As the 109th Congress continues to discuss protecting the homeland and civil liberties, I challenge my colleagues to have an open review and debate on improving the PATRIOT Act, and to work together—in a bipartisan manner—to strengthen national security in a way that is consistent with the fundamental rights and freedoms this country was founded on.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I strongly support the PATRIOT Act, which plays an instrumental role in the detection and prevention of terrorist attacks.

Terrorists will strike again. It is not a question of if, but of when, where and of what magnitude. We are in a race to stop the terrorists before they use weapons of mass destruction against us.

The PATRIOT Act empowers our intelligence and law enforcement communities to play vital roles in helping the United States win this race.

To fight the war on terrorism, our intelligence agencies must have the right tools. However, with these added tools, there must be added oversight. The protection of our civil liberties is of utmost concern to me.

For this reason, Congresswoman MALONEY and I have offered H.R. 1310, the Protection of Civil Liberties Act, which would reconstitute the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board as an independent agency within the Executive Branch.

The establishment and adequate funding of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board was a crucial recommendation by the 9/11 Commission. In its Final Report on 9/11 Commission recommendations, the commission notes "very little urgency" and "insufficient" funding as it relates to the establishment of the Board.

The bottom line is, we can no longer think in terms of the Cold War paradigm of contain-

ment, reaction and mutually-assured destruction. The modern threat requires us to detect and prevent attacks.

The PATRIOT Act improves our anti-terrorism capabilities by focusing on intelligence gathering, immigration, criminal justice and the financial infrastructure.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 2271, the "USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006.

I am strongly committed to fighting and winning the war on terror. The most solemn obligation of government is to protect the citizenry, and we need to make sure that law enforcement has the powers it needs to do so.

At the same time, governments throughout history, including our own, have abused their authority in the name of promoting such security. Americans should feel comfortable that while government is protecting them from others, their private lives are protected from unwarranted government intrusion. The right to privacy is one of our most precious rights, a hallmark of the American experiment.

I opposed the initial USA PATRIOT Act in 2001 because it threatened our civil liberties. As I have said before, while the compromise makes some improvements to the original USA PATRIOT Act, it does not go far enough to preserve civil liberties.

It will remain too easy for the government to fish through the private information of innocent Americans. This includes medical, gun, library, and financial records. Institutions that receive requests for information are still prevented from talking about them, and their ability to successfully challenge these "gag orders" is limited or nonexistent. Government's power to conduct secret searches of one's personal effects without prior notice, so called "sneak and peak" authority, remains too expansive.

S. 2271 only makes three changes to the prior act. First, it allows recipients of Section 215 orders to challenge accompanying "gag orders." However, it delays any action for at least one year and makes a successful challenge virtually impossible. Second, it clarifies that recipients of Section 215 orders and National Security Letters (NSLs) do not have to disclose to the government the identities of attorneys consulted to assist in responding to these requests. Finally, it seeks to exclude libraries from the reach of NSLs. Unfortunately, there is considerable disagreement about whether the language in S. 2271 actually will accomplish its goal of clarifying that libraries are not subject to NSLs.

These changes, taken as a whole, are at best small improvements which, most significantly, do not address the larger concerns I discussed earlier. As such, I cannot endorse S. 2271 and this reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act.

I am pleased that Senator SPECTER and others have said they will revisit the USA PATRIOT Act to deal with the many problems that remain. I look forward to a new bill that more properly balances our need to protect civil liberties and provide tools necessary in fighting terrorism.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, the Patriot Act Conference Report which Congress will amend today deals with the outcry leveled at provisions in the original Patriot Act that allow the government to have access to library records.

I strongly agree that the original PATRIOT Act was too broad: it permitted the FBI and

other agencies to issue National Security Letters (NSL)—secret administrative subpoenas—without court approval to obtain a wide range of data from libraries that had little or nothing to do with fighting terrorists.

But embedded in the law was something I felt and still feel was essential to prevent and disrupt terrorist plots: it covered Internet sites at libraries that also function as Internet Service Providers (ISPs), places terrorists use to communicate with each other—something they have done effectively in the effort to evade being monitored.

Though it was extremely unpopular, I voted against early efforts to repeal Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act—the so called Library Provision—because those efforts included ISPs. Last year, Congressman BERNIE SANDERS' amendment Section 215 expressly did not include ISPs, and I spoke for it on the floor.

Today's bill modifies the PATRIOT Act by barring the government from using NSLs to obtain records from libraries functioning in their traditional roles. Only libraries that also function as ISPs are now covered. This compromise is right and the law ensures that we can continue to monitor terrorist activity on the Internet.

In my view, however, we need to do more. Congress should fold additional checks and balances into the NSL process to protect business and other records in the same way this bill protects libraries. Checks and balances—such as those contained in legislation sponsored by the Intelligence Committee Democrats and senior Judiciary Committee Democrats—would subject NSLs to judicial oversight and enhanced congressional scrutiny.

The specter of a terrorist attack on U.S. soil is very real. It is a prospect that keeps me up at night. Clearly, we need modern tools to track 21st century threats, but not at the expense of our precious liberties, which are the essential foundation of American democracy. Today's bill to amend the PATRIOT Act is a step in the right direction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, today, the House considers S. 2271, The USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act.

I opposed the original 2001 PATRIOT Act because it failed to strike an appropriate balance between giving law enforcement agencies the tools necessary to protect Americans from terrorism and maintaining the freedoms that protect America from tyranny. Like the 2001 bill, the PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report is unacceptable, and the amendments proposed by S. 2271 again fall short of the mark.

Last year, the Senate unanimously agreed to legislation striking an appropriate balance between security and liberty. That bill offered an opportunity to fight terrorism effectively without giving up our rights and freedoms. By contrast, S. 2271 would make minor changes to the PATRIOT Act, and the final result falls well short of the standard set by the Senate legislation.

We should insist on real PATRIOT Act reform that protects both our safety and our freedom. Until then, I cannot support fig leaf legislation intended to cover up the basic problems of the PATRIOT Act.

You not only have to do the right thing, you have to do it in the right way. This act and these amendments do neither.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose S. 2271, Additional Reauthor-

izing Amendments to the PATRIOT Act. This legislation fails to address any of the core fundamental flaws with the original PATRIOT Act and makes controversial provisions permanent which threaten American's civil liberties. By making the sunset provisions permanent, we are losing the opportunity for a meaningful review.

Time and time again, we have extended the reauthorization deadline in an effort to fix the flaws and yet once more we have brought forth legislation that compromises our civil rights in exchange for government control.

As we saw last year, the administration was cavalier with domestic spying through the National Security Administration. Their ability to undermine the American public should worry my colleagues and makes me question the reasoning behind giving additional authority with the USA Patriot Act.

In S. 2271, a recipient of national security letters (NSL) is able to challenge a nondisclosure (gag) order but they must wait a year until they can file a petition and that order can be renewed indefinitely at the government's discretion, making it harder to challenge.

In addition, S. 2271 fails to provide meaningful protection for the privacy of library patrons and library records. It exempts libraries that operate in their traditional role, but does not exempt those who use or offer electronic communication services such as Internet access.

This legislation gives the administration too much flexibility and does not force Congress to review the act as needed. In a country that prides itself on civil rights and freedom of speech we must have the ability to question and modify legislation. We must maintain a system with checks and balances to ensure that our government works for our citizens in a transparent way.

The lack of transparency is further demonstrated with the Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Act. Methamphetamine has taken Oregon, as well as this country, by storm. I fully support efforts to combat this epidemic; however, I will not vote for the egregious PATRIOT Act just because it includes methamphetamine provisions. This is a cheap tactic and we should not be using victims of this epidemic as political chess pieces.

I have no doubt that we can keep America safe without compromising our civil liberties. Sadly, the bill does compromise our rights.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, while I will vote for this bill, I cannot be enthusiastic about it because it does very little to improve the laws it amends. And I cannot help regretting that the House is not being allowed to even consider improving the bill itself.

By refusing to allow any amendments to be considered, the Republican leadership not only is missing an opportunity to refine and clarify the language of this Senate bill, it is insisting on preventing any attempt to broaden the bill so it will do more to strike the right balance between fighting terrorism and respecting civil liberties. This is not the right way for us to do our work.

The bill in effect amends the conference report on H.R. 3199, the bill to revise and renew various provisions of the "USA PATRIOT Act" (more commonly called simply the "PATRIOT Act") that was passed by the House last year.

I voted against that conference report.

I support renewing the new tools the PATRIOT Act provided to fight terrorists. But I

also thought then—and still think today—Congress should take care to protect Americans' civil liberties. And, after careful review, I concluded that the conference report did not do enough to reduce the potential that the authority it gives to the FBI and other agencies could be abused or misused in ways that intrude on Americans' privacy and civil liberties—a potential that has led more than 300 communities as well as Colorado and six other States—governments that in all represent over 62 million people—to pass resolutions opposing parts of the PATRIOT Act.

I had hoped I could vote for the conference report, because earlier the Senate, to its credit, did a better job than the House in responding to the concerns that prompted such resolutions, while still providing ample tools that the government can use to work against the threat of more terrorist attacks, at home and abroad.

I could have supported enactment of the bill as passed by the Senate, and I hoped that the conference report would closely resemble that Senate-passed bill. Unhappily, those hopes were not fulfilled—but I took new hope when the Senate refused to cut off debate on the conference report and it became clear that there would be an effort to revise it to address concerns about its effects on civil liberties.

Specifically, I hoped that the conference report would be revised to include provisions like those in H.R. 1526, the "Security and Freedom Ensured Act of 2005," or SAFE Act. I am a cosponsor of that bill, which would amend the PATRIOT Act in several important ways.

It would modify the provisions regarding "roving wiretaps" to require that: (1) an order approving an electronic surveillance specify either the identity of the target or the place to be wiretapped; and (2) surveillance is to be conducted only when the suspect is present.

It would revise provisions governing so-called "sneak and peek" search warrants to: (1) limit them to cases where immediate notice of issuance would endanger someone's life or physical safety, result in flight from prosecution or intimidation of a potential witness, or lead to destruction of or tampering with evidence sought; and (2) require notice of the warrant within 7 days (instead of just a "reasonable period") after execution, with extensions for additional periods of up to 21 days if the court finds reasonable cause.

It would require the FBI to have a more specific reason to seek to obtain that person's business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations.

It would provide that libraries shall not be treated as wire or electronic communication service providers under provisions granting counterintelligence access to provider subscriber information, toll billing records, or electronic communication transactional records.

It would redefine "domestic terrorism" to mean activities that involve acts dangerous to human life that constitute a Federal crime of terrorism. And it would add several provisions to the list subject to "sunset," so that Congress would have more incentive to review their implementation and to consider possible changes.

I think the SAFE Act sets an appropriate standard for legislation to revise and reauthorize the PATRIOT Act.

Unfortunately, the conference report did not meet that standard, and even more unfortunately the negotiations that followed the Senate's refusal to end debate on the conference

report did not result in legislation that would bring the conference report into line with the "SAFE" Act.

Instead, those negotiations resulted in the bill now before the House, on which the only choice allowed by the Republican leadership is "yes" or "no."

The bill would make some revisions in the conference report. Specifically, it would—(1) allow recipients of a production order under Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act to ask a judge of the special court established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) to modify or quash the "gag rule" that bars disclosure of the order; (2) end the rule that recipients of a Section 215 order or national security letter (NSL) must name any attorney consulted about the order or NSL; and (3) clarify that libraries, the services of which include offering patrons access to the Internet, are not subject to NSLs, unless they are functioning as electronic communication service providers.

However, a challenge to the gag rule could not be brought until a year after an order or NSL is issued, and the bill would establish as conclusive a government certification that a waiver may endanger national security unless it was made in bad faith.

At best, these are very minor improvements in the conference report. And the language of the bill is not without ambiguity on several points—which is why the Republican leadership should have allowed consideration of clarifying amendments.

But, unfortunately, both the House and the Senate have approved the conference report and it is ready to go to the President to be signed into law. So, the choice now before the House is whether to pass this bill or whether we instead will allow the conference report to become law without even these minor improvements.

And on that question, I think our country is better served by enactment of this inadequate and incomplete bill than by its defeat—and so I will vote for it.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, contrary to its proponents' claims, S. 2271 fails to address the constitutional flaws in the PATRIOT Act or protect innocent Americans against future abuses of their civil liberties. Rather, passing this bill makes the permanent authorization of most of the act inevitable. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against S. 2271 in order to force the House and Senate to craft a new legislation giving the government the tools necessary to fight terrorism without sacrificing constitutional liberties.

The Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee essentially admitted that S. 2271 does nothing to address the core concerns constitutionalists and civil libertarians have with the PATRIOT Act. In fact, he has announced his intention to introduce his own PATRIOT Act reform bill! However, if S. 2271 passes and PATRIOT Act extension becomes law, it is highly unlikely that this Congress will consider any other PATRIOT Act reform legislation.

USA Today's Editorial of March 1, "Patriot Act 'compromise' trades liberty for safety," accurately describes how people concerned about individual liberty should react to S. 2271's "reforms": "Big Deal. By any standard of respect for the Bill of Rights, those provisions never should have been in the law in the first place. What is it about the Fourth Amendment ('The right of the people to be secure

... against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated') that Congress doesn't get?"

Among S. 2271's flaws are provisions restricting recipients of a "gag" order regarding government seizure of private records from seeking judicial review of such orders for a year and requiring that recipients prove government officials acted in "bad faith," a ridiculously high standard, simply to be able to communicate that the government has ordered them to turn over private records. The bill also requires that recipients of National Security Letters, which can be abused to sidestep the requirements of the Fourth Amendment, provide the FBI with the names of any attorneys from whom they have sought legal counsel from. S. 2271 would thus prohibit a National Security Letter recipient from even asking a lawyer for advice on complying with the letter without having to report it to the FBI. In fact, S. 2271 requires National Security Letter recipients to give the FBI the names of anyone they tell about the letter. This provision will likely have a chilling effect on a recipient of a National Security Letters ability to seek legal advice or other assistance in challenging or even complying with the National Security Letter.

Madam Speaker, S. 2271 does not address the fundamental constitutional problems with the PATRIOT Act. To the contrary, S. 2271 will make most of the PATRIOT Act's dramatic expansions of federal power a permanent feature of American life. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and work to ensure government can effectively fight terrorism without sacrificing the liberty of law-abiding Americans.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 2271, the PATRIOT Act Amendments.

James Madison, our 4th President, said, "I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."

The PATRIOT Act and its subsequent amendments are exactly what the "Father of the Constitution" was talking about.

Democracy means the "common people rule". And the "common people" of the 17th district have proclaimed that Americans should not have to compromise their civil liberties in order to combat extremism. The local governments of Pacific Grove, Salinas, Santa Cruz, and Watsonville, California have all passed resolutions expressing their concerns with the anti-privacy and anti-liberty nature of the PATRIOT Act.

As we promote democracy at other countries, should we not ourselves be practicing and preserving democracy within our own society?

Madam Speaker, I urge a no vote on the PATRIOT Act amendments.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 2271, the USA PATRIOT Act. Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006. This bill is a great example of what happens when you put Republican Senators in a room with DICK CHENEY to negotiate over Constitutional rights. It's like two foxes negotiating over who can do more damage to the henhouse without upsetting the neighbors.

Examining this deal more closely, we see that giving the American people the right to

consult a lawyer or challenge a gag order in court is somehow considered a concession by the Bush Administration. Other than that, it's the same old PATRIOT Act that criminalizes speech, protest, and meetings of citizens while also eliminating the right to due process and a search warrant.

This bill permanently extends 14 of 16 expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act. Government can still listen in on your phone conversations without any proof that a terrorist is using the phone and can conduct secret searches of your property. The law will still allow our Government to send a letter to your bank, Internet Service Provider, insurance company, or any other business demanding information about you. The only difference is that businesses no longer have to tell the FBI when they consult an attorney about the request.

A government official can still forbid a business from telling anyone that records have been obtained, although this gag would last for an initial one-year period rather than indefinitely. However, the gag can be renewed and doing so is actually made easier by this supposed grand compromise. Finally, the Bush Administration has magnanimously agreed not to look at your library borrowing records, although this agreement makes it easier for them to find out what websites you visit while at the library.

Madam Speaker, the PATRIOT Act can never be fixed because it starts with the fundamental presumption that the Constitution gets in the way of protecting Americans. In fact, we need the Constitution more than ever to protect us from politicians who think they're above the law.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 2271. This bill makes a few cosmetic changes, but the changes do little to address the serious civil liberties concerns that I and countless Americans have raised during the debate over the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act.

For example, nothing has been done to integrate needed checks and balances into the National Security Letter (NSL) process. NSLs are requests for financial, telecommunications, credit, and other business records issued directly by government agencies in national security investigations without the approval of a judge. Before the PATRIOT Act, the FBI and other issuing agencies could issue an NSL only if there was some nexus to an agent of a foreign power or terrorist. Post-PATRIOT Act, the government only has to show the request is relevant to an investigation. The lowering of this standard has resulted in an all-time high number of NSLs issued. Passage of this legislation will do nothing to change this disturbing trend or enhance congressional or judicial oversight over NSLs.

This bill also fails to address issues related to the President's National Security Agency (NSA) domestic surveillance program. I strongly believe this program must be subject to statutory restrictions, including the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). Congress should not stand by in silence and allow this controversial program to continue unchecked.

Unfortunately, in spite of having adequate time to engage in constructive discussions to fix the PATRIOT Act reauthorization Conference Report, the sponsors of S. 2271 chose again to exclude Democrats from negotiations. Instead, they've offered a bill that

makes only a few superficial changes to the Conference Report, and because this bill is being considered under suspension of the rules, we don't have an opportunity to offer meaningful amendments that could greatly improve the PATRIOT Act and ensure the protection of privacy and civil liberties as well as our national security.

I oppose this bill and find it regrettable that an important opportunity to initiate real reforms to this legislation has been squandered.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, later this afternoon we will consider additional reauthorizing amendments to the PATRIOT Act. The PATRIOT Act Conference Report is a balance between liberty and security. Chairman SENSENBRENNER and those of us serving on the House Judiciary Committee dedicated ourselves to achieving this end. The additional safeguards that we will agree to today will further enhance the safety and security of the American people, and I enthusiastically support that. It is time, after two extensions and a debate worthy of the high standards of American democracy, that we send the PATRIOT Act to the President for his signature.

We all lived through September 11th. I was here at the Capitol that day. I saw the evil of our enemies written in the smoke rising above the Pentagon. And we are reminded yet today that their desire to do such violence in our homeland and in the homeland of our allies is real.

Since September 11th, we have seen attacks on buses and subway cars in London, attacks on commuter trains in Madrid, hotel bombings in Amman, and nightclub bombings in Bali. Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri have spoken recently in videotapes expressing their desire to bring further terrorist destruction upon America. There is no doubt that we are under an extreme threat each day. However, there also is no doubt about America's determination to protect itself.

Just recently the President recounted how a planned al Qaeda attack on an office tower in Los Angeles was thwarted, thanks in part to the tools provided under the PATRIOT Act. The information sharing provisions of the PATRIOT Act also have enabled investigators to break-up terror cells in Portland, Oregon and Lackawanna, New York. Thwarting terrorist attacks such as these at home is accomplished by the hard work of the men and women in the law enforcement and intelligence communities. But, it also is done by making sure that these brave men and women have available to them the powers necessary to do the job, such as those in the PATRIOT Act.

For that reason, making permanent 14 of the 16 expiring PATRIOT Act provisions is so important. The two remaining provisions, Section 206 which authorizes roving wiretaps used by law enforcement to perform surveillance on terrorists or spies who throwaway their cell phones and change locations frequently and Section 215 which authorizes the FBI to ask the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Courts to issue an order for business records of terrorists to be used by the FBI in its investigations, are extended for 4 years.

We must equip law enforcement and intelligence officials with the tools necessary for them to protect Americans from terrorist attacks. We also must safeguard the precious civil rights and liberties that make our lives so free and fulfilling. We are doing both today. Madam Speaker, our solemn duty is to protect

Americans from terrorists and safeguard their civil liberties, and today we fulfill that duty by passing this bill and sending the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act to the President to sign.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2271.

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. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### STOP COUNTERFEITING IN MANUFACTURED GOODS ACT

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 32) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in counterfeit marks.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT MARKS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.*—

(1) *SHORT TITLE.*—This section may be cited as the "Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act".

(2) *FINDINGS.*—The Congress finds that—

(A) the United States economy is losing millions of dollars in tax revenue and tens of thousands of jobs because of the manufacture, distribution, and sale of counterfeit goods;

(B) the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection estimates that counterfeiting costs the United States \$200 billion annually;

(C) counterfeit automobile parts, including brake pads, cost the auto industry alone billions of dollars in lost sales each year;

(D) counterfeit products have invaded numerous industries, including those producing auto parts, electrical appliances, medicines, tools, toys, office equipment, clothing, and many other products;

(E) ties have been established between counterfeiting and terrorist organizations that use the sale of counterfeit goods to raise and launder money;

(F) ongoing counterfeiting of manufactured goods poses a widespread threat to public health and safety; and

(G) strong domestic criminal remedies against counterfeiting will permit the United States to seek stronger anticounterfeiting provisions in bilateral and international agreements with trading partners.

(b) *TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT MARKS.*—Section 2320 of title 18, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after "such goods or services" the following: "

or intentionally traffics or attempts to traffic in labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature, knowing that a counterfeit mark has been applied thereto, the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive,".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The following property shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States and no property right shall exist in such property:

"(A) Any article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark used in committing a violation of subsection (a).

"(B) Any property used, in any manner or part, to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of subsection (a).

"(2) The provisions of chapter 46 of this title relating to civil forfeitures, including section 983 of this title, shall extend to any seizure or civil forfeiture under this section. At the conclusion of the forfeiture proceedings, the court, unless otherwise requested by an agency of the United States, shall order that any forfeited article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark be destroyed or otherwise disposed of according to law.

"(3)(A) The court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of an offense under this section, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed, that the person forfeit to the United States—

"(i) any property constituting or derived from any proceeds the person obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of the offense;

"(ii) any of the person's property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, facilitate, aid, or abet the commission of the offense; and

"(iii) any article that bears or consists of a counterfeit mark used in committing the offense.

"(B) The forfeiture of property under subparagraph (A), including any seizure and disposition of the property and any related judicial or administrative proceeding, shall be governed by the procedures set forth in section 413 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 853), other than subsection (d) of that section. Notwithstanding section 413(h) of that Act, at the conclusion of the forfeiture proceedings, the court shall order that any forfeited article or component of an article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark be destroyed.

"(4) When a person is convicted of an offense under this section, the court, pursuant to sections 3556, 3663A, and 3664, shall order the person to pay restitution to the owner of the mark and any other victim of the offense as an offense against property referred to in section 3663A(c)(1)(A)(ii).

"(5) The term 'victim', as used in paragraph (4), has the meaning given that term in section 3663A(a)(2)."

(3) Subsection (e)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) a spurious mark—

"(i) that is used in connection with trafficking in any goods, services, labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature;

"(ii) that is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a mark registered on the principal register in the United States Patent and Trademark Office and in use, whether or not the defendant knew such mark was so registered;

"(iii) that is applied to or used in connection with the goods or services for which the mark is registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or is applied to or consists of a label, patch, sticker, wrapper, badge, emblem, medallion, charm, box, container, can, case,

hangtag, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature that is designed, marketed, or otherwise intended to be used on or in connection with the goods or services for which the mark is registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office; and

“(iv) the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive; or”;

(B) by amending the matter following subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“but such term does not include any mark or designation used in connection with goods or services, or a mark or designation applied to labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature used in connection with such goods or services, of which the manufacturer or producer was, at the time of the manufacture or production in question, authorized to use the mark or designation for the type of goods or services so manufactured or produced, by the holder of the right to use such mark or designation.”.

(4) Section 2320 is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) Nothing in this section shall entitle the United States to bring a criminal cause of action under this section for the repackaging of genuine goods or services not intended to deceive or confuse.”.

(c) SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—

(1) REVIEW AND AMENDMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Sentencing Commission, pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this subsection, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and policy statements applicable to persons convicted of any offense under section 2318 or 2320 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) AUTHORIZATION.—The United States Sentencing Commission may amend the Federal sentencing guidelines in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (28 U.S.C. 994 note) as though the authority under that section had not expired.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.—In carrying out this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission shall determine whether the definition of “infringement amount” set forth in application note 2 of section 2B5.3 of the Federal sentencing guidelines is adequate to address situations in which the defendant has been convicted of one of the offenses listed in paragraph (1) and the item in which the defendant trafficked was not an infringing item but rather was intended to facilitate infringement, such as an anti-circumvention device, or the item in which the defendant trafficked was infringing and also was intended to facilitate infringement in another good or service, such as a counterfeit label, documentation, or packaging, taking into account cases such as *U.S. v. Sung*, 87 F.3d 194 (7th Cir. 1996).

## SEC. 2. TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Protecting American Goods and Services Act of 2005”.

(b) COUNTERFEIT GOODS OR SERVICES.—Section 2320(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ means to transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose of, to another, for purposes of commercial advantage or private financial gain, or to make, import, export, obtain control of, or possess, with intent to so transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose of;”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) the term ‘financial gain’ includes the receipt, or expected receipt, of anything of value; and”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SOUND RECORDINGS AND MUSIC VIDEOS OF LIVE MUSICAL PERFORMANCES.—Section 2319A(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of this title.”.

(2) COUNTERFEIT LABELS FOR PHONORECORDS, COMPUTER PROGRAMS, ETC.—Section 2318(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of this title;”.

(3) ANTI-BOOTLEGGING.—Section 1101 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of title 18.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 32 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act. This legislation, which is substantially similar to legislation that passed the House by voice vote in May of 2005, contains important provisions to facilitate efforts by the Department of Justice to prosecute those who exploit the good names of companies by attaching counterfeit marks to substandard products.

As amended by the other body, H.R. 32 includes changes to the definition of “traffic” contained in Federal counterfeiting statutes to permit the prosecution of persons who import or export counterfeit products or possess counterfeit products with the intent to transport, transfer, or distribute such products.

Counterfeiting is a serious problem. Legitimate businesses work hard to build public trust and confidence in their products. When a legitimate company’s name is attached to counterfeit products, that company may suffer financial losses and may also have its reputation tarnished as a result.

In addition, counterfeit products are often purchased unwittingly by consumers who have come to rely on the quality of a product from a company they know and trust. What

unsuspecting consumers of counterfeit products often receive is a low-quality, and potentially dangerous, imitation. Some of these products are such poor imitations of the original that they have caused physical harm to consumers.

The FBI has identified counterfeit goods in a wide range of products including pharmaceuticals, automobile parts, airplane parts, baby formula, and children’s toys. The U.S. automobile industry has reported a number of instances of brake failure caused by counterfeit brake pads manufactured from wooden chips. Counterfeits of other products, such as prescription or over-the-counter medications, may have serious health consequences if consumed by consumers.

Under this legislation, section 2320 of title 18 would be expanded to include penalties for those who traffic in counterfeit labels, symbols, or packaging of any type knowing that a counterfeit mark has been applied. Additionally, H.R. 32 would require the forfeiture of any property derived directly or indirectly from the proceeds of the violations as well as any property used, or intended to be used, in relation to the offense. It also requires that restitution be paid to the owner of the mark that was counterfeited.

In fiscal year 2003, the Department of Homeland Security reported 6,500 seizures of counterfeit-branded goods including cigarettes, books, apparel, handbags, toys, and electronic games with an estimated street value of \$94 million. According to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the number of seizures for violations of intellectual property rights increased by 11.8 percent between fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 to 7,255 seizures for an estimated value of \$139 million. Fortune 500 companies are spending between \$2 million and \$4 million a year each to fight the counterfeiters.

The counterfeiting of manufactured goods produces staggering losses to businesses across the United States and around the world. Counterfeit products deprive the Treasury of tax revenues, add to the national trade deficit, subject consumers to health and safety risks, and leave consumers without any legal recourse when they are financially or physically injured by counterfeit products.

In addition, established links between counterfeiting, terrorism, and organized crime have made this a priority for Federal law enforcement agencies. H.R. 32 will help the Federal Government stop the wave of counterfeit products flooding the marketplace.

Before closing, I would like to thank and congratulate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the author of the House-passed legislation, for his tireless efforts to address the counterfeiting problem. He has crafted a good piece of legislation that has broad bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I support this bill with great enthusiasm. I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). No one has worked harder on the committee than this gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act.

The bill amends existing law in a matter designed to intensify the effort to prevent counterfeiting of goods. Counterfeited goods victimize the manufacturer and shortchange purchasers with substandard products. They also expose all of us to risks from unsafe products and deprive Americans of jobs and other benefits from commerce when the authentic goods are not sold.

The sale of counterfeit goods is illegal. This bill clarifies any ambiguity there may be in present law. Madam Speaker, when we began working on this bill on a bipartisan basis at the subcommittee level, there was a concern when drafted that the bill went too far and actually criminalizes current legitimate, time-honored practices by law-abiding merchants who legally purchased authentic goods and repackaged them in various ways to enhance sales of such goods.

We forged an agreement which addressed this potential problem to the satisfaction of all those who had expressed concerns about it. So this bill addresses the problem of counterfeiting of manufactured goods in a manner that should now be considered non-controversial.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I support the bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the author of the bill.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, thank you very much for allowing me to speak on my bill, H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act. I sincerely want to salute the chairman, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for the effort he has made. And I also wanted to thank the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT and anybody else that wants to rise. I appreciate very much all the hard work and the support you have given this bill.

I introduced this bill last year in response to the concerns of many manufacturing companies about the proliferation of counterfeit products, especially auto parts. Simply put, counterfeit parts and goods cost American jobs. Every year, counterfeiting costs the U.S. an estimated \$200 billion, and that is climbing. Counterfeit auto parts alone cost the automotive supplier industry over \$12 billion annually.

To put it in more tangible terms, it is estimated that if these losses were eliminated, the auto industry could hire 200,000 additional workers.

Counterfeit products not only damage our economy, as the chairman just mentioned; they compromise the safety of all Americans. Counterfeit auto parts, including brake pads, have been found in taxi cabs; fake prescriptions drugs have been confiscated; babies have been fed fake formula; and even, and this is serious, military combat vehicles have received counterfeit parts.

Oftentimes there is no way, virtually no way of telling the difference between a legitimate and a counterfeit product. That is why H.R. 32 prohibits trafficking in also counterfeit labels, patches, and medallions.

This legislation also requires convicted counterfeiters to not only surrender confiscated counterfeit goods but also, more importantly, the equipment used to make those products. H.R. 32 will help to dig up the counterfeiting networks by the roots, to stop criminals from reusing machinery and defrauding the American people.

I do just want to briefly address why we have to pass H.R. 32 again, when the House passed it last year by voice vote. First, the Senate added a technical clarification to address the concerns of some Internet marketplace companies that this bill would unfairly punish them for crimes committed by third parties. I support this technical change. The intent of this bill is not to punish the victims of counterfeit schemes but, rather, to penalize those that blatantly and consciously pursue the sale of counterfeit products.

Second, the Senate added additional anticounterfeit provisions that broaden the activities deemed criminal under current law to include international property violations, and I fully support the addition of these provisions.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to again thank Judiciary Committee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER for his work on this bill. His committee has been tasked to do so many things over the last several months, so many pressing issues; and it took some time to bring this about. I sincerely appreciate everything he has done to bring this along. I also want to thank everybody else who was involved in bringing this bill to a final legislative finish.

We should all be proud of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise proudly in support of this legislation and thank the chairman of the committee and his staff and others for working with us to ensure that this bill does not overreach.

The measure was designed to target illegitimate actors who trade in counterfeit trademarks, ranging from auto parts to fake labels for handbags or cologne. We all agree that manufacturers have a right to ensure that fake goods are not marketed in their names and that their own goods are not marketed under fake names.

The bill as originally written, however, went further than that. It was vague on the issue of whether someone other than the manufacturer could affix marks to goods that correctly identify the source of the goods. This struck at the very heart of the parallel market in which third parties lawfully obtain genuine goods and make them available in discount stores without deception. Not only has this practice been upheld by the Supreme Court, but it also saves consumers billions of dollars each year.

Through negotiation with the majority and affected parties, we have been able to revise the legislation to protect manufacturers, target illegitimate actors, and leave a legitimate industry unscathed. More specifically, because the bill amends the definition of a counterfeit trademark to include packaging and labeling formats which can be used lawfully by a variety of businesses, the new language clarifies that the repackaging of goods that were made under the authority of the United States trademark owner is not prohibited.

□ 1545

Such repackaging can include combining single products into gift sets, separating combination sets of goods into individual items for resale, inserting coupons into original packaging or repackaged items, affixing labels to track or otherwise identify products, removing goods from original packaging for customized retail displays, and moving products from large end caps or display modules into smaller cases.

In deciding whether to bring a cause of action under the new law in situations involving the repackaging of genuine goods, it is expected that the government will consider evidence that clearly shows an intent to deceive or confuse. Such evidence could come in the form of altering, concealing or obliterating expiration dates or information important to the consumer use of the product; for example: safety and health information about the quality, performance or use of the product or service; statements or other markings that a used, discarded or refurbished product is new; or statements or other markings that the product meets testing and certification requirements. Also relevant to a decision to bring a criminal action would be a meaningful variance from product testing and certification requirements, placing seals on product containers that have been opened or otherwise adulterating the genuine product.

Finally, the bill was modified to clarify that it was not intended to allow criminal actions against persons who, with no intent to deceive or confuse, traffic in goods or services that were originally manufactured under the authority of the United States trademark owner. In this regard, the phrase "the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive"

is not intended to create a new element for this cause of action but, instead, reiterates what is already reflected in the definition of "counterfeit mark."

So I congratulate the bipartisan effort that made this measure far more useful and appealing, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GILLMOR. Madam Speaker, as an original co-sponsor of H.R. 32, I am proud to rise in support of this important legislation.

Each year, counterfeit manufactured goods cost American companies billions in lost revenue and exacerbate the global challenges that this sector of our economy already face on a daily basis. Madam Speaker, in my district alone, manufacturing accounts for 50 percent of all jobs. This legislation will make a significant impact in ensuring that northwest Ohio's long and vibrant manufacturing history is not lost as a result of criminal actions designed to make a quick profit and deprive consumers of high-quality manufactured goods. Finally, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for his leadership on this legislation as well as my colleague from Wisconsin, the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for ushering it to the floor just two weeks before National Manufacturing Week is set to kickoff.

Madam Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to show their support for the manufacturing community by voting in favor of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 32, the "Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act." This legislation responds to a serious and growing problem: the trafficking of counterfeit goods.

We've all seen movies in which someone buys what looks to be an expensive Rolex watch from a street vendor, only to find out later what they've really purchased is a cheap imitation that doesn't even keep proper time. Lately, it's the DVDs of the movie themselves that are increasingly likely to be counterfeit. In the area of pharmaceuticals, counterfeit drugs are now being sold in this country and around the world. The packaging makes them look like the real thing, but the pills inside often lack the active ingredient people are relying on to treat their illnesses, or contain the wrong active ingredient altogether. According to the Food and Drug Administration, upwards of ten percent of the drugs worldwide are counterfeit. In some countries, it is estimated that more than half the drug supply is made up of counterfeit drugs.

The trade in counterfeit goods has also had a negative impact on the automobile industry, including the auto parts industry. People buy what they believe are name-brand parts, like brake pads and spark plugs, only to find that they spent good money on counterfeit goods that do not meet safety and performance requirements. Beyond the obvious safety problem for consumers, the trade in counterfeit parts costs the automotive parts industry an estimated \$12 billion a year. This is a heavy loss to a U.S. auto parts industry that already faces immense challenges.

The fact of the matter is that—whether it's counterfeit DVDs, video games, medicines, auto parts, or handbags—the United States economy is losing millions of dollars in tax revenue and tens of thousands of jobs because of the manufacture, distribution, and sale of

counterfeit goods. We need new tools to deal with this growing problem, and that's what this legislation does. This bill expands criminal penalties to include those who traffic in counterfeit labels and packaging, setting fines of up to \$2 million and a prison sentence of up to ten years for those who intentionally sell or distribute counterfeit labels and other false packaging. It also requires the offender to make restitution to the owner of the mark. In addition, the bill requires the forfeiture of any property derived from the proceeds of the violation, as well as any property used in connection with the offense.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this needed legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I yield back my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 32.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 681) supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 681

Whereas engineers use their scientific and technical knowledge and skills in creative and innovative ways to fulfill society's needs;

Whereas in just this past year, engineers have helped meet the major technological challenges of our time—from rebuilding towns devastated by natural disasters to designing an information superhighway that will speed our country into the next century;

Whereas engineers are a crucial link in research, development, and demonstration and in transforming scientific discoveries into useful products, and we will look more than ever to engineers and their knowledge and skills to meet the challenges of the future;

Whereas engineers play a crucial role in developing the consensus engineering standards that permit modern economies and societies to exist;

Whereas the recent National Academy of Sciences report entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" highlighted the worrisome trend that fewer students are now focusing on engineering in college at a time when increasing numbers of today's 2,000,000 United States engineers are nearing retirement;

Whereas the National Society of Professional Engineers through National Engineers Week and other activities is raising public awareness of engineers' positive contributions to our quality of life;

Whereas National Engineering Week activities at engineering schools and in other forums are encouraging our young math and science students to see themselves as possible future engineers and to realize the practical power of their knowledge;

Whereas National Engineers Week has grown into a formal coalition of more than 70 engineering, education, and cultural societies, and more than 50 major corporations and government agencies;

Whereas National Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's birthday to honor the contributions that our first President, a military engineer and land surveyor, made to engineering; and

Whereas February 19 to 25, 2006, has been designated by the President as National Engineers Week: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) will work with the engineering community to make sure that the creativity and contribution of that community can be expressed through research, development, standardization, and innovation; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week and its aims to increase understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers and to promote literacy in math and science.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 681, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 681, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

In 1951, the National Society of Professional Engineers established National Engineers Week. The purpose of the week is to increase understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers and to promote K-12 literacy in math and science. It also showcases the contributions that engineers have made to our society. Co-chairs of the 2006 week are the Society of Women Engineers and Northrop Grumman Corporation.

Historically, Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's actual birthday, February 22, as he steered our new Nation toward technical advancements, invention and education. His many credits include an order given at Valley Forge for more engineers and engineering education, an order which led to the creation of the U.S. Army Engineers School.

There is no doubt that we have worked very hard and come a long way

since the days of President Washington to become the world's leader in innovation, and there is no doubt that engineers have been there every step of the way. From landing a man on the Moon to providing new colors in our children's crayon boxes, engineers play a role in nearly every facet of our lives.

I applaud the National Society of Professional Engineers for having this week to raise public awareness of the role engineers have to play in American prosperity. If we are to remain competitive and a world leader, however, it is not only important, but imperative, that we continue to attract young people to this profession. It is imperative that we provide them with the education and tools necessary to excel in this demanding and rewarding profession. It is also imperative that we see that the teachers have not just the knowledge but also the enthusiasm to inspire and stimulate students to excel in math and science.

It is my pleasure to join with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) as an original cosponsor of H. Res. 681, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 681, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week. Engineers have helped make our country great, from their service in the American Revolution to developing key modern industries such as aerospace and energy. I would like to honor and recognize the more than 2 million engineers in the United States and the contributions that they have made to our country.

Engineers combine imagination and creativity with math and science training to solve problems. Engineers in the past have helped us to build boats to cross the seas, railroads to take us West, and the Internet to communicate with the world. Today, we need the innovative capabilities of engineers to confront the new challenges before us. Engineers will help America develop energy independence, find solutions to confront global climate change, and make our Nation more secure.

But there is a growing concern that America is falling behind other countries when it comes to engineering. U.S. students continue to score below international averages on math and science tests. In 2004, China graduated more than six times the number of engineers that graduated in the United States. The National Academy of Sciences recently released a report entitled, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," which raised questions about America's future technological competitiveness. This report, echoed by President Bush in his State of the Union address, emphasized the need for government to take a number of actions, including addressing the poten-

tial shortage of engineers. We must act quickly to take up this challenge. We cannot afford to let our future falter, and that future requires that we continue to lead the world in technological innovation. This innovation is supplied by engineers.

National Engineers Week seeks to raise public awareness about engineers' contributions to our society and our quality of life and has inspired future engineers for more than 50 years. Founded by the National Society of Professional Engineers, and including more than 100 society, government, and business sponsors and affiliates, including Boeing, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the American Society of Civil Engineers, National Engineers Week draws upon local and regional experts to promote high levels of math, science and technology literacy. Annually, it reaches thousands of parents, teachers and students in communities across the country. From national and regional engineering competitions, such as the Future City Competition, to events such as Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, this week helps inspire the next generation of engineers and scientists.

The Future City Competition is a great example of how National Engineers Week has touched students across the country. The competition encourages seventh and eighth grade students to use problem-solving skills, teamwork, research and presentation skills, practical math and science applications, and computer skills to present their vision of a city of the future.

The team from St. Barnabas Catholic School in Chicago recently won first place in the regional competition. This team included several students who come from my district. These students then went on to the national competition. At the national competition, they also won an award for their work in aerospace engineering.

These students had a great opportunity to learn more about the many factors that go into building a city. They then applied this knowledge to a real problem. Working with teachers and mentor engineers, they solved problems ranging from energy supply to waste removal to transportation needs. These students are the ones we will rely on in coming years to help us address these challenges in the real world.

If we are going to produce more American engineers, one step that we need to do is to improve our STEM education, that is, science, technology, engineering and math education, but we must also do more to inspire our children to become interested in engineering.

When I was a kid growing up in Chicago, I was fascinated by the way things worked, as most kids are. I had a physics teacher in high school at St. Ignatius. His name was Father Fergus. He took this fascination that I had and got me interested in engineering, just

as I hope that the events of National Engineers Week will do for more children.

I went on to earn a bachelor's of science degree in mechanical engineering at Northwestern and a master's degree in engineering-economic systems from Stanford University. I am one of only nine Members of this body who has an engineering degree, but people come up to me often and ask me how does the training as an engineer help you. Certainly it helps in understanding science and technology issues, math and science education, and transportation and manufacturing issues.

But engineering is more than that. Simply put, engineering is problem solving. Training as an engineer teaches you how to analyze a problem and how to put the steps together to solve that problem, no matter what the problem may be. It helps teach the type of analytical and innovative thinking that has made America a world leader technologically, militarily and economically. We must do everything we can to encourage and inspire future engineers so that America continues to be a leader in this increasingly competitive world.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) for his involvement with the National Engineers Week resolution. I would especially like to thank the engineers who have contributed so much to America, to honor them for their commitment to their continuing work for the betterment of our society.

I ask my colleagues to pass H. Res. 681 in deserved recognition.

□ 1600

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

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to close, and note that my distinguished colleague from Illinois referenced his engineering education. You notice he stopped short of talking about his Ph.D. in political science. That is where he went to the dark side. He could have fallen into the law after that, even worse. But he came to Congress instead, so we are happy to have him here and happy to have the expertise he offers.

As one of those political scientist undergrads myself, I would point out there are some national security implications to what we are describing here. The United States graduates in order of magnitude something like 60,000 engineers a year. China graduates perhaps north of 200,000. India as well north of 200,000 engineers a year. That has implications for us as a society.

Also, the U.S. Department of Labor predicts that in the future new jobs will require math and science training and technical ability four times more often than other jobs. In other words, there is a growing need, as Mr. LIPINSKI was saying, for people trained in science and math and engineering, in

spite of the fact that out of 100 high school students only two of those students will typically go on to ever get a degree in engineering or science. That is of concern.

And that is why I join with the gentleman from Illinois in urging my colleagues to adopt this resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 681, a resolution recognizing the importance of engineers and supporting National Engineers Week.

From the grandest of skyscrapers to microchips and the smallest of medical devices, engineers continue to design and construct products that are vital to our daily lives and our Nation's economy. Unfortunately, American students today are losing interest in engineering. The National Academy of Sciences report, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," notes that, "after secondary school, fewer U.S. students pursue science and engineering degrees than is the case of students in other countries. About 6% of our undergraduates major in engineering; that percentage is the second lowest among developed countries." We need to get American students at all levels back into science and engineering classes. Our Nation's continued global and economic leadership depends on our ability to inspire the next generation of engineers.

H. Res. 681 recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week as an important part of educating and building a competitive workforce for the 21st century. For example, National Engineers Week exposes students that might otherwise never dream of a career in a technical field to opportunities in engineering through programs such as the "Future City Competition" (a contest for middle school student teams to design a visionary city) and the "Global Marathon For, By and About Women in Engineering" (a 24-hour long series of presentations intended to attract young women into the engineering workforce). During this week, students and professionals at all levels will be motivated to explore the vast opportunities open to them in the field of engineering.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the National Society for Professional Engineers for its ongoing efforts to educate children and adults about the importance of engineering. I would also like to thank Congressman INGLIS and Congressman LIPINSKI for their leadership on this important issue. I ask that you join me in recognizing the importance of engineering in our daily lives and the positive impact of National Engineers Week by voting in favor of H. Res. 681.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my strong support of H. Res. 681, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

Engineers put ideas into motion. They must possess the creativity and analytical skills to innovate.

Texas is our Nation's energy State. Its roots are in big oil and big skies.

These days, much of the wealth generated by Texas oil is being put to good use to "fuel" the technology economy. Engineers are a critical part of that effort.

Our State is investing millions of dollars to develop cleaner-burning alternative fuels that are more efficient and better for the environ-

ment. Engineers, working behind the scenes, are involved at every stage.

I am proud that my State is showing leadership at a time when this Nation desperately needs to invest more in research, particularly in energy research.

Texas's tenacity and frontier spirit is strong, and I commend engineers in Texas and all over this Nation for the wonderful work they do.

Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues on the House Science Committee in support of H. Res. 681 and National Engineers Week.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 681.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 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. ADERHOLT) 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. 4054, by the yeas and nays;

S. 2271, by the yeas and nays.

#### DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4054.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4054, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—413

Ackerman	DeLay	Kanjorski
Aderholt	Dent	Kaptur
Akin	Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly
Allen	Dicks	Kennedy (MN)
Andrews	Dingell	Kennedy (RI)
Baca	Doggett	Kildee
Bachus	Doolittle	Kilpatrick (MI)
Baird	Doyle	Kind
Baker	Drake	King (IA)
Baldwin	Dreier	King (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	Kingston
Barrow	Edwards	Kirk
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	Kline
Barton (TX)	Emanuel	Knollenberg
Bass	Emerson	Kolbe
Bean	Engel	Kucinich
Beauprez	English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)
Becerra	Eshoo	LaHood
Berkley	Etheridge	Langevin
Berman	Everett	Lantos
Berry	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Biggert	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Billirakis	Feeney	Latham
Bishop (GA)	Ferguson	LaTourette
Bishop (NY)	Filmer	Leach
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lee
Blackburn	Flake	Levin
Blumenauer	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Blunt	Forbes	Lewis (GA)
Boehrlert	Ford	Lewis (KY)
Boehner	Fortenberry	Linder
Bonilla	Fossella	Lipinski
Bonner	Fox	LoBiondo
Bono	Frank (MA)	Lofgren, Zoe
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Lowey
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Boswell	Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel
Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	E.
Boustany	Gerlach	Lynch
Boyd	Gibbons	Mack
Bradley (NH)	Gilchrest	Maloney
Brady (PA)	Gillmor	Manzullo
Brown (OH)	Gingrey	Marchant
Brown (SC)	Gohmert	Markey
Brown, Corrine	Goode	Marshall
Brown-Waite,	Goodlatte	Matheson
Ginny	Gordon	Matsui
Burgess	Granger	McCarthy
Butterfield	Graves	McCaul (TX)
Buyer	Green (WI)	McCollum (MN)
Calvert	Green, Al	McCotter
Camp (MI)	Green, Gene	McCrery
Campbell (CA)	Grijalva	McDermott
Cannon	Gutknecht	McGovern
Cantor	Hall	McHenry
Capito	Harman	McHugh
Capps	Harris	McIntyre
Capuano	Hart	McKeon
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	McKinney
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Carnahan	Hayes	McNulty
Carson	Hayworth	Meehan
Carter	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Case	Hensarling	Melancon
Castle	Hergert	Mica
Chabot	Herseth	Michaud
Chandler	Higgins	Millender-
Chocola	Hinchee	McDonald
Clay	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Cleaver	Hoekstra	Miller (MI)
Clyburn	Holden	Miller (NC)
Coble	Holt	Miller, Gary
Cole (OK)	Honda	Miller, George
Conaway	Hoolley	Mollohan
Conyers	Hostettler	Moore (KS)
Cooper	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Costello	Hulshof	Moran (KS)
Cramer	Hunter	Moran (VA)
Crenshaw	Hyde	Murphy
Crowley	Inglis (SC)	Murtha
Cubin	Inslee	Musgrave
Culberson	Israel	Myrick
Cummings	Issa	Nadler
Davis (AL)	Istook	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Neugebauer
Davis (KY)	(TX)	Ney
Davis (TN)	Jefferson	Northup
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Norwood
Davis, Tom	Jindal	Nunes
Deal (GA)	Johnson (CT)	Nussle
DeFazio	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Delahunt	Jones (NC)	Oliver
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Ortiz

Osborne Ryan (OH) Tanner  
 Otter Ryan (WI) Tauscher  
 Owens Ryun (KS) Taylor (MS)  
 Oxley Sabo Taylor (NC)  
 Pallone Salazar Terry  
 Pascrell Sánchez, Linda Thomas  
 Pastor T. Thompson (CA)  
 Paul Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (MS)  
 Pearce Sanders Thornberry  
 Pelosi Saxton Tiahrt  
 Pence Schakowsky Tiberi  
 Peterson (MN) Schiff Tierney  
 Peterson (PA) Schmidt Towns  
 Petri Schwartz (PA) Turner  
 Pickering Schwarz (MI) Udall (CO)  
 Pitts Scott (GA) Udall (NM)  
 Platts Scott (VA) Upton  
 Poe Sensenbrenner Van Hollen  
 Pombo Serrano Velázquez  
 Pomeroy Sessions Visclosky  
 Porter Shadegg Walden (OR)  
 Price (GA) Shaw Walsh  
 Price (NC) Shays Wamp  
 Pryce (OH) Sherman Wasserman  
 Putnam Sherwood Schultz  
 Radanovich Shimkus Waters  
 Rahall Shuster Bonilla  
 Ramstad Simmons Bonner  
 Rangel Simpson Watt  
 Regula Skelton Waxman  
 Rehberg Slaughter Weldon (FL)  
 Reichert Smith (NJ) Weldon (PA)  
 Renzi Smith (TX) Weller  
 Reynolds Smith (WA) Westmoreland  
 Rogers (AL) Snyder Whitfield  
 Rogers (KY) Sodrel Wicker  
 Rogers (MI) Souder Wilson (NM)  
 Rohrabacher Spratt Wilson (SC)  
 Ros-Lehtinen Stark Wolf  
 Ross Stearns Woolsey  
 Rothman Strickland Wu  
 Roybal-Allard Stupak Wynn  
 Royce Sullivan Young (AK)  
 Ruppertsberger Tancredo Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Abercrombie  
 NOT VOTING—18

Brady (TX) Gonzalez Reyes  
 Burton (IN) Gutierrez Rush  
 Costa Hinojosa Solis  
 Cuellar Johnson, Sam Sweeney  
 Davis (FL) Meeks (NY) Weiner  
 Evans Payne Wexler

□ 1856

Ms. CARSON changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2271.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2271, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 138, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]  
 YEAS—280  
 Aderholt Garrett (NJ) Ney  
 Akin Gerlach Northrup  
 Alexander Gibbons Norwood  
 Andrews Gilchrist Nunes  
 Bachus Gillmore Nussle  
 Baird Gingrey Ortiz  
 Baker Gohmert Osborne  
 Barrett (SC) Goode Pascrell  
 Barrow Goodlatte Pearce  
 Barton (TX) Granger Pence  
 Bass Graves Peterson (PA)  
 Bean Green (WI) Petri  
 Beauprez Green, Gene Pickering  
 Berry Gutknecht Pitts  
 Biggert Hall Platts  
 Bilirakis Harman Poe  
 Bishop (GA) Harris Pombo  
 Bishop (NY) Hart Pomeroy  
 Blackburn Hastings (WA) Porter  
 Blunt Hayes Price (GA)  
 Boehlert Hayworth Pryce (OH)  
 Boehner Hefley Putnam  
 Bonilla Hensarling Radanovich  
 Bonner Herger Ramstad  
 Bono Herseht Regula  
 Boozman Higgins Rehberg  
 Boren Hobson Davis (CA)  
 Boswell Hoekstra Davis (IL)  
 Boustany Holden DeFazio  
 Boyd Hostettler DeGette  
 Bradley (NH) Hoyer Reynolds  
 Brady (TX) Hulshof Rogers (AL)  
 Brown (SC) Hunter Rogers (KY)  
 Brown-Waite, Hyde Rogers (MI)  
 Ginny Inglis (SC) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Israel Issa Ross  
 Burgess Issa Rothman  
 Buyer Istook Royce  
 Calvert Jenkins Ruppertsberger  
 Camp (MI) Jindal Ryan (WI)  
 Campbell (CA) Johnson (CT) Ryun (KS)  
 Cannon Kanjorski Salazar  
 Cantor Kaptur Saxton  
 Capito Kaptur Schiff  
 Cardin Keller Schwartz (PA)  
 Cardoza Kelly Schwarz (MI)  
 Carnahan Kennedy (MN) Scott (GA)  
 Carter Kind Sensenbrenner  
 Case King (IA) Sessions  
 Castle King (NY) Shadegg  
 Chabot Kingston Shaw  
 Chandler Kirk Shays  
 Choccola Kline Sherman  
 Coble Knollenberg Sherwood  
 Cole (OK) Kolbe Shimkus  
 Conaway Kuhl (NY) Shuster  
 Cooper LaHood Simmons  
 Cramer Langevin Simpson  
 Crenshaw Larsen (WA) Skelton  
 Cubin Latham Smith (NJ)  
 Culberson LaTourette Smith (TX)  
 Davis (AL) Leach Smith (WA)  
 Davis (KY) Levin Snyder  
 Davis (TN) Lewis (CA) Sodrel  
 Davis, Jo Ann Lewis (KY) Souder  
 Davis, Tom Linder Spratt  
 Deal (GA) Lipinski Stearns  
 DeLay LoBiondo Strickland  
 Dent Lungren, Daniel Sullivan  
 Diaz-Balart, L. E. Tancredo  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Marchant Taylor (MS)  
 Dicks Marshall Taylor (NC)  
 Doolittle Matheson Terry  
 Drake McCarthy Thomas  
 Dreier McCaul (TX) Thornberry  
 Edwards McCotter Tiahrt  
 Ehlers McCrery Tiberi  
 Emanuel McHenry Turner  
 Emerson McHugh Udall (CO)  
 English (PA) McIntyre Upton  
 Etheridge McKeon Van Hollen  
 Everett McMorris Walden (OR)  
 Feeney Melancon Walsh  
 Ferguson Mica Wamp  
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Miller (FL) Weldon (FL)  
 Flake Miller (MI) Weldon (PA)  
 Foley Miller (NC) Weller  
 Forbes Miller, Gary Westmoreland  
 Ford Moore (KS) Whitfield  
 Fortenberry Moran (KS) Wicker  
 Fossella Murphy Wilson (NM)  
 Foyx Murtha Wilson (SC)  
 Franks (AZ) Musgrave Wolf  
 Frelinghuysen Myrick Wynn  
 Gallegly Neugebauer Young (FL)

NAYS—138  
 Abercrombie Honda  
 Ackerman Hooley  
 Allen Inslee  
 Baca Jackson (IL)  
 Baldwin Jackson-Lee  
 Bartlett (MD) (TX)  
 Becerra Jefferson  
 Berkley Johnson (IL)  
 Berman Johnson, E. B.  
 Bishop (UT) Jones (NC)  
 Blumenauer Jones (OH)  
 Boucher Kennedy (RI)  
 Brady (PA) Kildee  
 Brown (OH) Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Brown, Corrine Kucinich  
 Butterfield Lantos  
 Capps Larson (CT)  
 Capuano Lee  
 Carson Lewis (GA)  
 Clay Lofgren, Zoe  
 Cleaver Lowey  
 Clyburn Lucas  
 Conyers Lynch  
 Costello Mack  
 Crowley Maloney  
 Cummings Manzullo  
 Davis (CA) Markey  
 Davis (IL) Matsui  
 DeFazio McCollum (MN)  
 DeGette McDermott  
 Delahunt McGovern  
 DeLauro McKinney  
 Dingell McNulty  
 Doggett Meehan  
 Doyle Meek (FL)  
 Duncan Michaud  
 Engel Millender-  
 Eshoo McDonald  
 Farr Miller, George  
 Fattah Mollohan  
 Filner Moore (WI)  
 Frank (MA) Moran (VA)  
 Gordon Nadler  
 Green, Al Napolitano  
 Grijalva Neal (MA)  
 Hastings (FL) Oberstar  
 Hinchey Obey  
 Holt Olver  
 Otter Owens  
 Oxley  
 Pallone  
 Pastor Paul  
 Pelosi Peterson (MN)  
 Pence Price (NC)  
 Peterson (MN) Rahall  
 Peterson (PA) Rangel  
 Petri Rohrabacher  
 Pickering Roybal-Allard  
 Pitts Rush  
 Platts Ryan (OH)  
 Poe Sabo  
 Pombo Sánchez, Linda  
 Pomeroy T.  
 Porter Sanchez, Loretta  
 Price (GA) Sanders  
 Price (NC) Schakowsky  
 Pryce (OH) Scott (VA)  
 Putnam Serrano  
 Radanovich Slaughter  
 Rahall Solis  
 Ramstad Stark  
 Rangel Stupak  
 Regula Tanner  
 Rehberg Tauscher  
 Reichert Thompson (CA)  
 Renzi Thompson (MS)  
 Reynolds Tierney  
 Rogers (AL) Towns  
 Rogers (KY) Udall (NM)  
 Rogers (MI) Velázquez  
 Rohrabacher Vislosky  
 Ros-Lehtinen Wasserman  
 Ross Schultz  
 Rothman Waters  
 Roybal-Allard Watson  
 Royce Watt  
 Ruppertsberger Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Burton (IN) Gonzalez Payne  
 Costa Gutierrez Reyes  
 Cuellar Hinojosa Sweeney  
 Davis (FL) Johnson, Sam Wexler  
 Evans Meeks (NY)

□ 1916

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. DAVIS of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate 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. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was regrettably unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 19 and 20, final passage of H.R. 4054—the “Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office Designation Act” and S. 2271—the “USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006,” respectively.

Had I been here I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 19, and “yea” on rollcall vote 20.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was ill today and, therefore, missed votes in this chamber. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall 19 and “nay” on rollcall vote 20.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4167, NATIONAL FOOD UNIFORMITY ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-386) on the resolution (H. Res. 710) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 415

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415.

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

There was no objection.

REMEMBERING KIRBY PUCKETT

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, baseball fans everywhere, and in Minnesota in particular, mourn the passing of Kirby Puckett. Kirby Puckett was born to play baseball. He lived for the game. In an era of oversized egos and greed gone mad, he was a throwback to an earlier time.

Kirby was the ultimate underdog. Born to humble beginnings, he related to kids that could not afford to buy an autograph. Like a bumblebee, he did not know that his stubby body could not fly. Propelled only by an infectious enthusiasm, he amazed us with leaping catches that mere mortals would have conceded to the bleachers.

We always knew that with Kirby in the game the underdog Twins always had a chance. With his bat, his glove or with his smile, he made everyone around him play better.

He embodied the essence of all that baseball is supposed to be. The game will go on, new heroes will emerge, but there will never be another Kirby Puckett.

PATRIOT ACT REAUTHORIZATION

(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, I hold the Constitution dear and I also believe that we can secure our homeland and we can find the right way to do the PATRIOT Act, but it concerns me when we have allowed the expansion of this act to expand the surveillance of Americans.

We did not do what we should have done today because, in fact, national

security letters can be issued to any American without showing any culpability or affiliation with terrorist acts or terrorists. In addition, our libraries are not protected because if you have one Internet service at your library, national security letters can be issued, and the gag order that could have been issued under the old bill immediately now has to wait a year. So that means that you are going to be raided with any materials that the government asks for and you cannot even have a gag order issued.

I know that we can protect the Constitution, the rights of Americans and still protect national security. Why did we not do it right? This is not the right PATRIOT Act, and for that reason, I had to vote "no." I hope we get it right some day and protect the Constitution.

VENEZUELA'S DICTATOR

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that the President of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez, is neither a friend of democracy nor a friend of the United States. Mr. Chavez has consistently rattled the anti-United States sabers. He made best friends with Fidel Castro and Cindy Sheehan, and he supported radical revolutionaries in Latin and South American countries.

Mr. Chavez has also radically altered his own country's political institutions, creating a disgusting and disgraceful dictatorship that does not deserve our support.

Why is it then, Mr. Speaker, that the United States gives Mr. Chavez's government millions in direct aid each year? As our friend and Congressman, LOUIE GOHMERT says, "Why do we pay them to hate us?"

Mr. Speaker, it is absolute hypocrisy to fund this corrupt communist dictator on Monday and then complain about his antidemocratic actions on Tuesday.

Do we give money to Venezuela because we need them as a source for crude oil? If so, this is another reason we should become energy self-sufficient and not depend on Third World dictatorships for oil.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be.

NEW MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM A SUCCESS IN FLORIDA

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the very first time in American history, every senior will now have access to prescription drugs.

In my district on the gulf coast of Florida, we have seen the huge success of the program, within many of the counties over 60 percent of the seniors

signing up for the new benefit in just the first month and a half.

As my constituents know very well, one of the strongest supporters of the new Medicare prescription drug benefit has been AARP, the leading advocate for seniors in America.

Like AARP, I have long been going out into my local communities and encouraging seniors to sign up for one of the programs offered in their home area.

Just 10 days ago, I hosted a Medicare outreach bus in Spring Hill. It was there that I heard from a man named Joseph Drexler, who was able to drastically reduce his yearly prescription drug costs. Skeptical of the program when he arrived, Mr. Drexler left the help station saying this about his CMS enrollment counselor: "She deserves a medal or something."

Mr. Speaker, it is the experiences of men and women like Joseph Drexler across America that have proven the new Medicare prescription drug plan to be a rousing success.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

METHAMPHETAMINE EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, this evening, legislation to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act came before the House, and something attached to the PATRIOT Act that sometimes has escaped notice is the fact that legislation to address the methamphetamine epidemic spreading across the country was included.

This legislation provides a uniform, national standard for the regulation of precursor chemicals which are necessary to the manufacture of methamphetamine. Currently, we have a hodgepodge of State laws and regulations. This provides a national standard that is uniform and this is very important.

Key provisions are as follows: limits the amount of pseudoephedrine sales, and pseudoephedrine has to be an ingredient to make methamphetamine. They cannot do it without it.

It requires that pseudoephedrine and other precursor chemicals are sold from behind the counter. In many cases now you can go in and pick them up.

Requires purchasers of these chemicals to show I.D. and sign a logbook.

Restricts Internet sales of precursor chemicals.

So if we look at this, Mr. Speaker, we see that in 1990 there were only two States that had 20 clandestine meth labs each. California had 20 or more and Texas had 20 or more. Then you see

the spread of this epidemic. By 2004, practically the whole Nation was blanketed by small meth labs. The only exception would be in the New England States in the Northeast, and that is rapidly being taken over as well.

So this is something that is spreading rapidly. However, it is important to realize that 70 to 80 percent of the methamphetamine in the United States is now coming from super labs, mostly in Mexico, in the form of crystal meth. So these small, clandestine meth labs are no longer quite so relevant because almost all of the meth coming into the United States is coming out of Mexico.

This legislation does something that is really critical. It seeks to cripple the super lab meth production by tracking large international shipments of pseudoephedrine. As I mentioned earlier you have to have pseudoephedrine to make methamphetamine.

It requires the five largest exporting countries of pseudoephedrine and the five largest importing countries of pseudoephedrine to report and track shipments of pseudoephedrine and report to the United States. Failure to comply would lead to a reduction in U.S. foreign aid to that country by as much as 50 percent.

We think this is the best regulation we have been able to come up with yet to track the international sale of pseudoephedrine and superlab production.

Additional provisions toughen penalties against meth producers and traffickers, improves and authorizes new funding for the drug courts program, provides help to States to protect drug-endangered children.

In Nebraska in 2005, nearly 6,000 children were living in foster care situations. This is a State with only 1.7 million people. An estimated 50 percent of foster care children in Nebraska, roughly 3,000, are in the foster care system because their parents are meth users or abusers.

An Arkansas study indicates that the average meth addict costs the State and local agencies \$47,500 per year because of crimes, child and spouse abuse, incarcerations, et cetera.

One recent study indicated that a prenatal child exposed to meth can cost as much as \$250,000 in health care just for the first year alone and can cost up to \$1.7 million to get that child to age 18.

It is a hugely important problem and very stressful. I believe this legislation is a critical first step to ridding our communities of this plague, and I urge support of the conference agreement.

I would like to just show one last picture. This is a young woman who was photographed each year from 1979 until her death in January of 1989, and as you see these pictures, you see her steady deterioration and what looks like an aging process of maybe 50 years in a period of 10 years, and it culminated in her death. This is something we have to get rid of.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2320. An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3199) entitled "An Act to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes."

□ 1930

#### NATIONAL INTEGRATED BALLISTIC INFORMATION NETWORK PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, once again we are threatened budget cuts that affect our local law enforcement agencies' effectiveness. Not only is the COPS program facing cuts and the criminal background check system for firearm purchases underfunded, but now the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network program is also in jeopardy.

The NIBIN is used by forensic experts to analyze the unique marks made on bullets and cartridge cases when guns are fired. The images of these markings can be compared with other images in more than 200 Federal, State, and local law enforcement laboratories. By tracing and comparing these markings, police can track the history of a gun used in a crime. They can determine which crimes are related and make sure the appropriate law enforcement agencies are working together to find the criminals responsible for these crimes.

NIBIN makes law enforcement agencies more efficient by making sure that two agencies are not duplicating their work. In large part, NIBIN has been a success. Last year, the Los Angeles Police Department arrested a man for vandalism and possession of a firearm. The gun was tested and identified as being used in an attempted murder only a month before. If not for ballistics testing, this individual would have gone free and the attempted murder case would still be unsolved.

In my own State of New York, an individual was arrested for unlawful possession of a weapon. The gun was entered into the NIBIN database and was discovered to have been used in an unsolved assault with a deadly weapon incident that occurred in a different jurisdiction. Again, a violent criminal was taken off the streets because of ballistics testing. This is happening on a daily basis.

There are countless other success stories throughout our Nation; but, unfortunately, NIBIN's future is in doubt. Budget cuts are jeopardizing the future of this program. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms administers NIBIN and may be forced to cut spending unless Congress acts. Cutting funding of this great program would be a tragedy resulting in more criminals getting away with horrendous acts of violence. ATF needs more, not less, funding for this particular program.

A Department of Justice report last year said the ATF needs to better promote and improve NIBIN. Many law enforcement agencies do not participate in NIBIN simply because they do not have the resources to enter the information into the database. The Justice Department report suggests purchasing equipment for high-crime areas and developing a plan for lower-incidence areas to share ballistics technology.

The report also states it is imperative that we deal with the backlog of ballistic evidence not yet entered into the database. A similar problem exists in the National Instant Background Check system, and I have introduced legislation to give States grants to make sure that data is entered.

We must also fund new ballistic technologies that can provide matches on portions or fragments of bullets found at crime scenes. Mr. Speaker, since 9/11 our law enforcement officers have accepted new responsibilities in the war on terror. But this current budget wants to cut programs that staff local police forces and provides them with bullet-proof vests. Let us work together to make their jobs easier, not more difficult. Let us fully fund the ATF's National Integrated Ballistic Information Network. This will catch repeated offenders before they commit another crime and make sure our law enforcement agencies are on the same page when it comes to investigating crimes that have been related.

#### A VISIT TO AREAS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE KATRINA

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment or two to talk about the trip that we had with Speaker HASTERT and Leader PELOSI on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. With grateful thanks to Speaker HASTERT, he took us down to Mississippi, Louisiana and Alabama, mainly to see the disaster areas 6 months later and what is happening in those States.

The American people, I know, tend to forget what is going on; but when you go to these States, they need our help desperately. I have been watching CNN and certainly have followed what is going on down there; but when you see it with your own eyes, it is more than anyone can ever imagine: to see whole trailer trucks just thrown into the wetlands due to force of this hurricane; to see the housing just collapsing on a daily basis; and to see our local government officials trying to make ends meet but without a budget because there are no businesses that provide a

tax base. There are no homes there. And the people certainly have to come back to bring back the communities.

In my opinion, it is up to the Federal Government. I know we are trying, but we have to do a little bit better. It is our moral responsibility to help these people. We never know when a disaster will happen in our own back yard, so I hope the American people do not forget the people of Hurricane Katrina. There is still much work to be done.

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

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4808, UNFAIR CHINESE AUTOMOTIVE TARIFF EQUALIZATION ACT

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, on March 1, Mr. KILDEE of Michigan, a Member of Congress, joined me in a bill, H.R. 4808, which would prevent imports of passenger cars from China until the United States and Chinese tariffs on these items are equal.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that our trade deficit with China is well over \$200 billion. We all agree that we live in a world where we have to work with each other and trade with each other. The problem is that under the current agreement, these cars that will be coming in from China put us at a disadvantage, our workers and our car companies.

Let me just share with you that if we ship a car from America to be sold in China, the Chinese Government slaps a 28 percent tariff on American-made cars. If those Chinese cars come into America, we charge them a 2.5 percent tariff on their cars. That is not a level playing field.

I think China has enough advantages, quite frankly. They manipulate their currency, violate intellectual property rights, utilize heavy equipment, government subsidies, pay their workers just pennies a day, and they do not have to worry about the labor and environmental standards that Americans must abide by. The tariffs just give China another unfair advantage, an advantage that threatens the job of every worker in the United States auto industry.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in this fairness issue. That is all this is about, fairness, because our workers work hard to produce a quality product. When we send it to China, they, again, put a 28 percent tariff on our cars going to China, while we only put a 2.5 percent tariff on passenger cars coming to America.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that we fail to realize. With that \$200 billion trade deficit, in *The Wall Street Journal* this week it said: "China defends outlay to increase by 17.4 percent, the most in 4 years." The Chinese are making money off the American people, and they are taking that money and, in many cases, they are putting it into their military.

Now, I am not so concerned about China and America going to war, but I do know this: China is trying to build one of the strongest militaries we have ever seen in this world, and what they want to do is to dominate Southeast Asia.

What Mr. KILDEE and I are asking for is just a simple matter of fairness. If we are going to sell their cars, let us charge them the same tariff they are going to charge us to sell our cars in China. I would hope that my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, would join us in this effort. This, again, is nothing but an issue of fairness.

In fact, the Economic Policy Institute has said that since 1989 through the year 2003 we have lost 1.5 million jobs to the Chinese. Here, again, on this floor tonight I am announcing H.R. 4808, a bill introduced by a Democrat and Republican, that says that we need to charge the same tariff for American cars going to China as Chinese cars coming to America. We should all pay the same. That is a simple matter of fairness.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I shall be speaking on this issue quite a few times, but I will tell you that we need to be aware of what is happening to the jobs that have been going overseas, and particularly those jobs going to China. So I hope tonight that my colleagues will look at the letter that is signed by Mr. KILDEE and myself asking our colleagues in the House to join us on H.R. 4808. All it is is a tariff fairness issue.

I will close by saying this again: American cars that go to China to be sold have to pay a 28 percent tariff, Chinese cars coming to America later on this year will pay only a 2.5 percent tariff. That is not fair to the American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform; to please bless their families; and, God, please continue to bless America.

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

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

#### IN SEARCH OF A COMPETENT CONSERVATIVE

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, last week, a number of Americans were able to see the President on the videotape on Katrina and see also what has happened down in New Orleans since that time, or the lack of action there. We also witness every day the civil war that is engulfing Iraq and a policy of failure to bring stability to Iraq, the chaos that has engulfed our Medicare prescription drug plan, and also the flare-up over our port security and selling major assets of America's infrastructure to foreign countries.

In 2000, President Bush ran as a compassionate conservative. At this point, I would settle for a competent conservative. From Iraq to Medicare to port security to the deficit to Katrina, this administration has mismanaged the situation to the point where even die-hard supporters are acknowledging their incompetence. And this Congress has been a rubber stamp to the administration's policies and has refused to do its job, which is oversight, on every one of these issues.

On Iraq, we have \$10 billion out of \$480 billion totally missing. Not one hearing about what happened to the \$10 billion. Nobody has asked a single question. Nobody can account for it. We have soldiers over there without KEVLAR vests, where parents are left to literally do bake sales to raise the money for their children so they can have the protection that their government and their taxpayers expect and are responsible for, yet nothing. We have literally members of the armed services running around like scrap metal collectors trying to solder their Humvees, yet nobody has asked a single question as to how that happened; why is that happening?

We have Paul Bremer, the President's ambassador, who now writes a book and says that he had asked for 500,000, or doubling the size of the troop level; yet for 3 years the President of the United States said nobody ever asked for more troops. If they want more troops, we will send more troops. General Abizaid and Paul Bremer, the President's ambassador, have said that he had asked for more troops, and neither the Secretary of Defense nor the President of the United States acknowledged that memo. Yet what do we have? Nobody is holding them accountable. Nobody is holding anyone accountable in the administration.

We have a great deal of incompetence. We are at \$480 billion in Iraq, with 2,300 Americans, our fellow citizens, having lost their lives. Well over 15,000 are wounded, permanently many of them, yet not a single question of what happened here. What is the competency here?

Now, take a look at this on Medicare. It is not just isolated to Iraq. We have now had that policy, and that policy has run its course. We now have a civil war that the American people find themselves in the middle of, between the Sunnis, the Shiites and the Kurds all fighting each other, and nobody has

asked the questions of what happened to the troops, the amount of troops, what happened to the KEVLAR vests, the Humvees; how come there are not enough men and women that the ambassador and the general had asked for.

Not a question. Nobody is responsible. Nobody ever got fired, let alone the questions about the intelligence going into it.

Take Medicare. We debated here on this floor, and I voted against that bill and said it was going to lead to great confusion to seniors. Rather than a simple plan, letting negotiations happen, letting reimportation happen, and letting generics hit the market, which all would drive the price down of prescription drugs and save money, Members here said and the administration said it will only cost \$390 billion over 10 years. Before the ink was dry, it rose to \$790 billion. So all the taxpayers are going to have to pay double what they were told and everybody in the administration knew.

One person who said, here is what the report said, was under threat of being fired if they let that information out. Yet now, with 2 years to prepare, 2 years to get ready, the Web site, run by HHS, had the information wrong. The catalogue they sent out to every senior had it wrong. It has led to massive confusion where seniors now are sometimes double enrolled, cannot get enrolled, and where States are having to step in for the poorest of the poor because they cannot get their plan. It is run like, as some people say, they couldn't run a one-car parade if they tried.

Again, that massive incompetency and the inability of this Congress to have oversight and keep people's feet to the fire and hold them accountable, to ask the questions and get the answers the American people want are not being done today.

□ 1945

And the incompetency is not isolated to Medicare or Iraq. Take the response to Hurricane Katrina: when we saw that tape, we now learn that, in fact, Mr. Brown, or known to the rest of us as Brownie, was doing a heck of a job, and he gets fired, and yet it is Chertoff who is still head of the Homeland Security Department, had no idea what was going on, no line authority, never involved himself, and we had a massive disaster.

When you run through the economy, Iraq and the deficit, what this President has done, I would settle, and I think the rest of the country would be quite happy if we had a competent conservative rather than the compassionate conservative that we were promised. The American people are not looking for a compassionate conservative, a fiscal conservative, or a social conservative. A competent conservative would do America well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### HONORING FIRST SERGEANT BRAD KASAL

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to deliver the story of an American hero, Marine First Sergeant Brad Kasal, to this Chamber and to the American people.

Sergeant Kasal was born in the small town of Afton, Iowa, where he was raised on a small family farm and where he learned Midwestern values which would later serve him very well in his service in the United States Marine Corps. Sergeant Kasal is 39 years old and has served three tours of duty in Iraq and Kuwait. He is a member of Weapons Company, Third Battalion, First Marine Regiment, also known as "Thundering Third."

When you hear Sergeant Kasal's story of courage and sacrifice, it is not surprising that he comes from a solid family of patriots who have also served our country.

Brad Kasal's brother Jeff is a retired Army paratrooper who served our country in Operation Desert Storm with the 82nd Airborne and now works in Iraq. Brad's brother Kelly served in the United States Army, and his brother Kevin also served in the United States Marine Corps. And 50 years ago, their father, Gerald, served in the Iowa National Guard.

But even among the patriotic Kasal family, Sergeant Brad Kasal's experiences set him apart. During his three tours of duty in Iraq and Kuwait, Sergeant Kasal has received two Purple Hearts. His first was awarded for an incident in August 2004 for shrapnel wounds to the face, neck and shoulder from a rocket-propelled grenade.

His second Purple Heart came from events which took place on November 13, 2004, when Marines were in their fifth day of Operation Phantom Fury, which was a battle to free Fallujah from the grip of the terrorists.

Sergeant Kasal was patrolling the streets and had the duty of clearing terrorists from buildings when he saw a fellow marine wounded and leaving a building. He told him that three more of their men were still inside and under attack.

Without regard for his own life and safety, Sergeant Kasal charged into the

building to defend and rescue his men. It was then that he saw several dead Iraqis, the wounded Marines, and a terrorist confronting him with an AK-47 rifle less than 2 feet away. While he managed to dodge the bullets and kill that terrorist, another terrorist was able to sneak up behind him and open fire. Sergeant Kasal was hit by those bullets and fell to the ground. He was dizzy and disoriented from his wounds, but he immediately began caring for another wounded marine. Sergeant Kasal knew he had to stay alive to save himself and the others. As he struggled to remain conscious, a grenade dropped onto the ground next to a wounded marine.

Responding to his instinct to protect his comrade, Sergeant Kasal threw his own body over Private First Class Alexander Nicoll. Thankfully, Sergeant Kasal's helmet and body armor protected his vital organs, but he took the full brunt of shrapnel to his back, shoulders and legs. For the next 45 minutes as he lay grievously wounded, Sergeant Kasal used his 9 millimeter handgun to defend himself in a prolonged shootout where he suffered another bullet wound.

This picture shows Sergeant Kasal being helped from the building still clutching his trusty 9 millimeter handgun. He explained that he kept the gun because he was being evacuated through a kill zone where he knew a number of terrorists remained, and he feared his weapon might be needed to fend off more potential attackers.

Long after he was rescued, Sergeant Kasal learned the full extent of his injuries. Ultimately, he lost 60 percent of his blood. He took 40 pieces of shrapnel wounds, and suffered seven bullet wounds.

Despite his wounds, Sergeant Kasal said his efforts and wounds were worthwhile. The marine whom he shielded, Private Nicoll, had survived the battle.

Sergeant Kasal must undergo constant medical procedures and therapy, but his ultimate goal is to recover so he can resume his service in the Marine Corps to defend you and me and the people of our country.

Marine First Sergeant Brad Kasal does not think of himself as a hero. He is a model Marine and hero for Americans.

In all wars, there are stories of bravery and heroism. The story of Marine First Sergeant Brad Kasal stands out among them. There is no doubt that Sergeant Kasal's actions on November 13, 2004, prove he is an honorable marine with a bigger passion for his fellow marines and our country than his own life and safety.

Sergeant Kasal believes the values he learned in his Iowa upbringing, as well as the strong spirit of the Marine Corps, gave him the strength and will to persevere in an otherwise unsurvivable situation.

Sergeant Kasal makes me proud to be an Iowan and an American; and I thank him for his bravery, honor, and patriotism.

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

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

#### MILITARY DISCRIMINATES AGAINST GAYS

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time of declining morale, when we are barely able to maintain a volunteer force, the sign on the Army recruiter's door might as well say: "Openly gay Americans need not apply."

Here is the military, struggling to meet its recruitment goals and in some instances even lowering its standards as a result, but still they are turning away and actively weeding out an entire group of people for no other reason than raw prejudice. How dumb is that.

But yesterday, the Supreme Court ruled that universities receiving Federal funding could not ban military recruiters from their campuses in protest over the military's discrimination against gay Americans. I am not going to relitigate that case here on the House floor, but I do think and I sincerely hope that this case can shine a national spotlight on the absolute folly of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Because of their sexual orientation and their unwillingness to conceal it, selfless patriotic Americans are forbidden from serving their country. They cannot serve even though their skills are desperately needed, even though there are available slots, even though they are volunteering for duty that most of their peers have opted against.

How does the Army expect its people to be all they can be when it will not allow them to be who they are. What can be more un-American? Yet another example of a Nation preaching the rhetoric of freedom and self-determination around the world while undermining those very values here at home. It is a civil rights outrage to be sure.

But on a purely practical note, it is just plain bad national security policy. Is this any way to defend a Nation, by purging the military of talented and dedicated soldiers because they are unashamed of their love for members of the same sex? It is arbitrary, irrational, and dangerous.

A GAO report, released about a year ago, concluded that 10,000 Americans have received military discharges under a policy of "don't ask, don't tell" at a cost to taxpayers of roughly \$191 million.

In recent years, since the launch of wars against Afghanistan and Iraq, the military has purged several Farsi and Arabic translation specialists because they were discovered to be gay. This shocking and incomprehensible personnel decision has prompted my friend and colleague, Barney Frank, to relabel the Pentagon policy: "Don't ask, don't tell, don't translate."

How is that for a forward-looking national defense strategy? At just the moment when we need to understand Mideastern culture and win over hearts and minds of its people, the military dismisses the people who speak their language. The 9/11 Commission cited a shortage of Arabic speakers, and, thus, an inability to translate key intelligence as a handicap in our ability to predict the September 11 attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I have been outspoken in my opposition of the Iraq war and my belief that now is the time to bring our troops home. But I am antiwar, not antisoldier, not antimilitary. I want us to have the strongest possible national defense, a goal that is in no way incompatible with rooting out intolerance and protecting equal rights.

There is no trade-off, no balance of competing interests in this case. If "don't ask, don't tell" fails the social justice test and detracts from national security, what possible use could it have?

I would have thought that a 3-year \$250 billion war that is stretching the military to its breaking point would compel the Congress and the Pentagon to reexamine this block-headed policy. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will.

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

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

#### FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS INFILTRATING OUR U.S. PORTS

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at this time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, in the world we live in today, there is nothing more important than American security. This is one reason I was surprised to learn there is a plan to let a foreign government, through its government-controlled company, run major ports throughout our country, including part of the port of Beaumont in my district in southeast Texas.

We hear that the UAE ports deal will not jeopardize national security be-

cause this government company will actually help us with homeland security. My question is: Are we now going to outsource national security as well?

The recent disturbing decision to allow the United Arab Emirates to have a stake in operations in U.S. ports is a dangerous decision that defies common sense.

History has shown that friends of the United States come and go. Those who are our friends today may not be our friends tomorrow. The UAE, although alleged friends today, have not been our friends in the past; and there is nothing that proves that they will continue that friendship in the future.

The UAE recognized the Taliban. It laundered money that financed the 9/11 terrorists, and it continues to participate in the Arab boycott against our ally, Israel. This country harbored terrorists that played a role in killing 3,000 people on September 11. We cannot ignore their perilous past.

Mr. Speaker, last time I checked, we were at war against the Taliban. I find it extremely hard to believe that we would want to give a country that supported our enemies access to our ports. If this deal were to go through, these same foreign entities would have access to U.S. manifests showing what cargo is being shipped and where and when it is going. According to a recent Zogby poll taken in October 2005, it found that over 70 percent of those who live in the UAE do not even like the United States. If this arrangement goes through, who is going to stop a potential terrorist from posing as someone else, going to work for one of these ports, and gaining access to information with the intent to harm Americans? We do not need to take this risk with national security.

Currently, only 5 percent of the more than 14 million containers entering through our Nation's ports are screened. Clearly, our ports are already vulnerable. In a day and age where we are allowing 95 percent of the cargo to come and go through our ports without inspection, it is hard to believe that we are willing to give security to a foreign entity, much less one that has anything but a strong record in preventing terrorism. Even the U.S. Coast Guard, which is in charge of port security, seems uneasy about letting this take place.

Many Americans across our land are opposed to this foreign operation in our homeland. The port of Beaumont in Texas, one of the operations proposed to be run by this UAE deal, ships one-third of the military cargo going to Iraq and Afghanistan. This is more than any other U.S. port. Now we want to give a foreign government access to U.S. military shipping information? I think not.

We cannot allowed our ports to be infiltrated by foreign governments. And this is not a partisan issue; it is an issue of national security. For this reason, I have joined colleagues from across the aisle in introducing a bill

that will stop this UAE operation from going through. I have joined the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) in introducing legislation to prevent this dangerous and deceptive deal. This deal should become a "no deal" before it becomes an ordeal.

Mr. Speaker, just last week we introduced the Port Security Act of 2006. This is the House version of legislation already introduced in the Senate. This bipartisan legislation will prohibit foreign state-owned companies from controlling operations at U.S. ports and stop the UAE deal by mandating a congressional review of existing foreign state-owned companies that are operating in American ports. There is an innate and inherent problem, not to mention a serious national security risk, with letting state-owned foreign companies buy interests in American ports.

I am not opposed to foreign privately owned companies operating in our country. I understand we live in a global economy. Foreign ownership of a hotel or car company is one thing, but foreign government ownership in port operations, especially those that handle military cargo, is absurd.

There are entirely too many issues that need to be ironed out before we start offering our ports and our national security up to foreign governments for sale or for lease. This decision is unwise. It is a risky business. This ought not to be. And that is just the way it is.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). 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.)

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS REQUEST

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007 proposes 20 percent more military aid to Azerbaijan than to Armenia. This request is a clear breach of an agreement struck between the White House and the Congress in 2001 to maintain parity in U.S. military aid to Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, the parity agreement is unfortunately a battle that the Armenian people have had to fight in the past. The fiscal year 2005 Presidential request was similar in that it called for more military funding to Azerbaijan.

However, the Congress reversed the President to ensure military parity in the fiscal year 2005 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. After that battle and the President's 2006 budget request

that included parity, I thought the President's fiscal year 2007 budget would continue that policy. But unfortunately that was not the case. A lack of military parity would, in my opinion, weaken ongoing peace negotiations regarding Nagorno Karabakh, among other things.

It will also contribute to further instability in the region, and it undermines the role of the United States as an impartial mediator of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. Mr. Speaker, the government should not be rewarding the Government of Azerbaijan for walking away from the organization for security and cooperation in Europe's Key West peace talks, the most promising opportunity to resolve the Nagorno Karabakh conflict in nearly a decade.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the administration's budget also calls for drastic cuts in economic assistance to Armenia. I was discouraged to see that the President requested a 33 percent decrease in economic aid from \$74.4 million last year to \$50 million this year. Technical and developmental assistance and investment is essential to Armenia. This funding is key to democratic stability and economic reform in the country.

Mr. Speaker, is this the message we want to send to our friends in Armenia? Do we want to cut economic aid to a country that is terrorized by its neighbors and is shut off on its eastern and western borders due to an illegal blockade by Turkey and Azerbaijan?

Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks I will advocate to the Foreign Operations Subcommittee to restore military parity, to increase economic assistance to Armenia and to provide for humanitarian aid to the people of Nagorno Karabakh. It is incredibly important to reward our allies and to send a message to Azerbaijan and Turkey that ethnically charged genocides, illegal blockades of sovereign nations, and the constant harassment of the Armenian people will not be tolerated.

#### AMEND THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, and I have just introduced a bill, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit the provisions of the United States military assistance and the sale, transfer or licensing of United States military equipment or technology to Ethiopia.

The bill requires that before the United States provides military equipment to the regime in Addis Ababa that our President certifies that the Government of Ethiopia is not using our equipment or assistance against prodemocracy advocates or peaceful civilian protesters in Ethiopia. Is that too much to ask?

It is an outrage that in Ethiopia that over 80 opposition leaders and human rights activists and journalists have been recently charged with treason, violent conspiracy and genocide. These prisoners of conscience face brutal captivity and the possibility of death sentences. They include 10 newly elected members of the Parliament and other officials of the opposition Coalition for Unity and Democracy Party, that is the CUD.

These brave souls face charges filed against them by a corrupt and repressive government. This same government blatantly stalled the last election, making a sham out of the democratic process. Five of those being charged with criminal behavior work for the Voice of America. One of those being held is Dr. Berhanu Nega. He is an American citizen and mayor of Ethiopia's largest city. Dr. Nega is an advocate of democracy. He faces the death penalty for his involvement in mass protests over the election fraud that took place in Ethiopia during their last election.

Now, in January, the British Government cut the equivalent of \$88 million in aid in support to Ethiopia. This was due to its concerns about the governance and human rights issues arising from this disputed election. Other international donors have taken similar measures.

My legislation requires certification by the President of the United States that our military equipment provided to Ethiopia is not being used to beat down those who would bring honest and democratic government to that troubled land. In Ethiopia, it is incumbent upon us as Americans to be on the side of those struggling for honest and democratic government, not on the side of their oppressor.

No pragmatic strategy can justify the United States backing a regime that stole the last election and has brutalized their own people and will, at some point, disintegrate from its own corruption and incompetent ways. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and supporting the democratic movement in Ethiopia, just as we did with a similar movement in Ukraine just 2 short years ago and in other countries throughout the world where the future was in play and human freedom was in the balance.

That is what being an elected representative of the American people is all about, standing for our ideals and our principles. And nowhere could that be made more clear than to stand with the people of Ethiopia, who are struggling to make a democratic government, to form a democratic government, and to have honest government and the recognition and respect for people's rights within their own country.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE STATE OF HEALTH CARE: REPUBLICAN EFFORTS FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I will be joined in a little bit by my friend and my colleague, Dr. PHIL GINGREY of Georgia, for this next hour. It is important that we lay out a large segment of what we believe is a critically important agenda to reform health care in America.

We know that few things are more valuable to us than the health of our families. When the health of our families is threatened, we feel frightened, we feel vulnerable, and we desperately search for help. I think few would challenge that the United States provides, as available, the best health care in the world, dedicated and caring physicians and nurses and hospitals and professionals, and we have made huge technological advances in fighting disease and prolonging life. Our research and medical technology is second to none. It significantly advances every year.

However, despite these many accomplishments, the American health care system is burdened by severe problems that lower quality and increase costs and too often make this system unaffordable and inaccessible for millions of Americans. Too many families, unfortunately, are only able to window-shop for health care coverage, and they feel as though they cannot go into the store.

Tonight, those colleagues of ours on our side of the aisle, who are part of our health care team, will be talking about a number of important issues to advance this cause. Mr. Speaker, before I go into this, let me pause, if I may, for a moment, and say usually when I have been here for Special Orders to talk about issues, I traditionally was walking up to the Capitol to make a call to my mother to let her know. She then would get on the phones and call

all her friends. My mother was a nurse, worked for many years at hospitals in Cleveland, as well as in industrial settings.

I am sad to say that since I last spoke in the Chamber, my mother had died, but I am sure she is still doing her own method of notifying her friends, and meeting my father now to talk to him and to say, make sure you pay attention to this message.

It is a message that I hope Americans will attend to as well. Because while there are those who talk about the costs of health care, what we are going to be talking about tonight is ways of changing health care and not simply shifting the burden of health care to one or the other.

Let me talk about a few of the costs that we need to pay attention to. Health care costs are skyrocketing. In 2005, the Federal Government spent over 45 percent of mandatory spending on health care programs, including almost \$300 billion for Medicare and \$181 billion for Medicaid. Medicaid costs now consume about 70 percent of States' budgets, and it is rising more than the rate of inflation. This, nearly half a trillion dollars, does not even include the billions that we spend at the Federal level in discretionary health care spending for Department of Veterans Affairs, \$31 billion; the National Institutes of Health, which has increased over 100 percent in the last 10 years under President Bush, to \$28.5 billion; the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, \$8.2 billion; the Indian Health Services, \$4 billion; Early Head Start, \$6.8 billion; and the Women, Infants and Children program, \$5.3 billion.

□ 2015

When we add to this also the costs paid for by employers and paid for by families across the Nation, the numbers are staggering.

The Federal Government has made a number of attempts over the years to deal with some of these increased costs, such things as dealing with the budget, where we try and increase co-payments on prescription drugs, or we deal with premium costs in private or federally or State-funded health care programs, which have all been geared towards trying to share the costs.

This higher cost-sharing requirement, in many cases, is designed to not only reduce some of the overall costs to the Federal budget, but also to help encourage patients to change some behaviors, such as not going to expensive emergency room settings for common ailments, such as colds and flu and scrapes and bumps, but instead to see their doctor. These increased copays are usually enacted to change these behaviors, and yet we need to be doing other things in order to actually change some of the flaws in our health care system.

But let us make a point of this: whenever Congress has enacted those important issues to try and change

some behaviors and actually save money, unfortunately, the Congressional Budget Office, which is there to tell us how much we are spending and give us some accurate numbers, simply is unable to do this at all.

The Congressional Budget Office can only talk about savings when more money comes out of pocket, but they cannot and are unable to talk about savings that come from trying to prevent the problems we are talking about tonight.

Since the CBO does not provide what is called dynamic scoring, a potential cost savings, the Federal Government in essence ties its own hands so we can only focus on cost sharing and not directly change efficiency and reduce errors in health care. We do not deal with the biggest drivers of these costs. We did not have a way here to look at this.

Let me give you an example. If we were to ask the Congressional Budget Office how much it costs to immunize children in America or to inoculate them with several important inoculations that they receive in their infancy and young childhood, the CBO could give us that number. But ask them what this saves, what this saves in reduced hospital visits and the other medical complications, and they simply are not able to tell you.

Ask the Federal Government CBO what treatment programs for alcohol and drug abuse save, and they cannot tell you.

Ask them what Early Head Start's medical programs save when we get children to the doctor early. They cannot tell you.

Ask also what would happen if we made our medical records system more efficient and eliminated many of the costly errors in the system. They cannot tell you.

The CBO can tell us that, in the Deficit Reduction Act passed by the House, that \$150 million was placed in there, through efforts of my office and others, in order to help hospitals in high Medicaid areas use electronic medical records in order to reduce costs. But, unfortunately, the CBO cannot tell us what those costs are.

I am going to be talking a little bit more about these costs, but first I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PHIL GINGREY, to lay out some general outlines of some other things we are going to be talking about tonight. Dr. GINGREY, a friend and colleague, who we often are on the floor together talking on these health care aspects, will lay out in general some of the things we will be talking about.

As I said, I opened up naming some of the huge cost increases in health care, but Dr. GINGREY will lay out the general plan of where we need to go to make some substantive reforms in the health care system so that we are no longer talking about cost shifting, but really talking about saving money, and, more importantly, saving lives.

I yield to Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Dr. MURPHY, thank you so much and thank you for starting this Special Hour and allowing me to get over, as we have a great line-up of members, I think five members, of the Republican Healthcare Public Affairs Team that we formed, with Dr. MURPHY and I cochairing that subcommittee of the Republican Conference at the beginning of this 109th Congress. We have been talking about a number of issues during the past year relating to health care, the Medicare Modernization Act, Prescription Drug part D, tort reform, which we passed in this House many times and are still laboring to finally get that into law.

But this gives us, really, a great opportunity to follow on to what our President said in the 2006 State of the Union address in regard to health care. Now, he did not spend a lot of time on health care, but what he said in just a couple of pages was significantly an important part of his address to the Nation.

This Presidency and this Republican majority are fully, fully committed to making sure that we bring health care into the 21st century and we continue to maintain the edge that we have in regard to health care. But we are not going to maintain that edge if we continue to use a 20th-century model. It is just like the radio and the television set and the computer. We have to do this. We absolutely have to do it.

Dr. MURPHY probably in his opening remarks talked a little bit about one of the issues that I want him to address in regard to electronic medical records, or health IT, if you will, information technology.

I was recently in Antarctica, and I was able to take my American Express card, actually, no, one of my bank cards, and swipe it and get U.S. dollars to buy some souvenirs. But God help me if I had been hit in the head in Antarctica by a snowball and couldn't speak to the doctors, because they wouldn't know a thing about my health care record. I know that Dr. MURPHY and others have taken a leadership role on this particular issue.

So I want to just go ahead at this point and begin allowing my colleagues to talk about some of these issues that are so hugely important. Dr. MURPHY has already made some remarks and will speak further about health IT. Dr. MURPHY is on the Energy and Commerce Committee, where the Health Subcommittee does so much work on Medicaid and other issues, as I previously have co-chaired the Healthcare Public Affairs Team.

Dr. MURPHY, I would be happy to yield back to you, or we can go to the long-term care issue and come back, whatever you would prefer.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to talk a little bit, if I may, about some of these issues about errors in hospitals.

I opened up by saying we clearly have the best health care available in America, but I would like the Speaker and others to imagine this: when you go

into a hospital or doctor's office, generally you will see filing cabinets packed with paper records of a patient's care. Now, imagine also if the patient has seen multiple doctors, there are multiple files, and probably stacked somewhere on top of those filing cabinets are reports waiting to be filed, and chances are pretty good that the records between doctors offices are disconnected, that is, one doctor may not know what the other physicians or treatment specialists have seen. Perhaps the patient has not gone for the lab tests or consultations they have been asked to do. Perhaps they have, and those records have not been returned, x-rays have not come back over, whatever that is.

But you have a situation of voluminous paper records, oftentimes scattered within a hospital in different departments or between different offices, and that results in the likelihood that important medical records could be lost or not retrieved at that moment when someone needs to be making decisions.

Having worked in both neonatal intensive care units, pediatric units, and my own private practice as a psychologist, it was often critically important to be able to access records and review them quickly. But a simple statement one was looking for in a file that was multiple volumes and oftentimes multiple inches thick, it could take hours to retrieve critically important data.

The risk of that is that some information may be missing. The risk is that important information may be missed. One study even found that one in seven medical records was missing vital information, and this could then lead to redundant tests or misdiagnoses, redundant treatments or inappropriate treatments.

Health administration paperwork costs almost \$300 billion annually, equal to about \$1,000 per person in America, or actually 31 percent of all health care expenditures in the United States; and yet we have hospitals with 21st-century technology that can use a 64-cut CT scanner that can give us three dimensional films of patients' hearts, but we are still using an 18th-century paper system to keep track of these things.

The RAND Corporation reported that these critical errors that come from redundant, unnecessary, and missed information adds \$162 billion in health care costs per year, a huge avoidable expense. Part of our move as the Republican conference here is to make sure that we encourage and fund through incentives hospitals and doctors' offices to move towards health information technology.

Medication errors alone cost Medicare about \$29 billion in costs. Whenever we talk about cost savings in programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, it is not slashing care, it is improving care; it is not denying access to care, it is bringing access to care. And that is vitally important.

Anyone who has ever had a prescription that could not be read or the pharmacist had to call back or the patient wasn't sure if it was duplicating another medication recognizes how these errors cost the system. The best, the best doctors and the best hospitals and the best specialists have their eyes blindfolded when it comes to trying to deal with these.

In the Deficit Reduction Act, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, \$150 million was put in there for hospitals to use grants in high Medicaid populations, but throughout the Nation we see many health information technology companies emerging at hospitals and insurance companies investing billions of dollars, a critically important issue.

So next time when one goes to the doctor's office and sees the papers gone, but to see, for example, in VA hospitals now the doctor putting records on a computer, calling up x-rays on a computer, looking at CT scans and MRIs, and, yes, even watching films of surgery on their computer screen, recognize that this is part of where we need to go with 21st-century medical technology.

But also know this: the physician who did the test or radiologist who did the x-ray can immediately send it over secure and confidentially to one's physician, who can then review the record.

In fact, I have been in physicians' offices, since, unfortunately, a few months ago I had an accident in Iraq and then had a CT scan in Baghdad and an MRI done in Germany, and found that what could happen here is the records could then be spent over on computer disk to physicians in Washington, D.C. and Bethesda who could then review those and easily consult, without having to call for new tests and repeat those. It wasn't just the wording that they had of what was taking place in the medical test. They could actually see it themselves.

Repeat this story millions of times a day across America, and you can see why the RAND Corporation says we could have savings of \$160 billion; and in addition to that, when you look at the savings that comes from otherwise lost days in the workplace, another \$150 billion in savings.

Let me mention one other area that we can track with electronic medical records, and that is infection rates. A bill that I am working on to actually give incentives to hospitals and medical practices to reduce infections is critically important.

Health care-acquired infections cost the United States about \$50 billion in annual medical costs. Now, these infections are such things as staphylococcus, methacycline-resistant staphylococcus aureus, urinary tract infections, pneumonia, et cetera, where what happens is through such low-tech issues as hand-washing or cleaning equipment, because we take these things for granted so much, they are not done. Sadly, this leads to somewhere up above 75,000, some estimates

even as high as 90,000, deaths per year, so says the Center For Disease Control, and these, in many cases are preventable. Now, in some cases they are not, if someone comes in with an open wound or someone is taking immunosuppressant drugs.

But what we need to do here is actually help patients get better care. We can save massive amounts if we use Medicare and Medicaid to provide incentives and pay for performance for hospitals that reduce these.

But this is where, again, using electronic medical records helps, by having this information available that hospitals can review and pull up information and saying what is happening? Are we seeing trends within the hospital? Should we take action? Information that can come up as an immediate alert to the hospital medical staff, to medical directors and hospital personnel, hospital administrators, to say infections are now detected within the hospital, we need to take affirmative, aggressive, and thorough action to isolate and deal with this. That being the case, we can save tens of thousands of lives a year and tens of billions of dollars.

Now, we point these out because it is so critically important. I hear time and time again people misleading the American public that somehow we are trying to cut Medicare and Medicaid. That is not true.

□ 2030

What we are trying to do is improve the system. And any American family knows that whether it is your car or your house, that when you deal with using inefficient and cheap ineffective ways, you can end up paying much more because the tools you use may break or the system you are trying to use to fix the problem may actually be ineffective, and it is going to cost you more in the long run.

Doing poor health care, making wrong decisions in health care, is what is expensive. Making the right decisions in health care and making sure we have the highest quality is what lowers costs. And once and for all, we have to put these tools back into the hands of health care providers across the Nation, give them the information that is needed on every patient, every time, making sure those records are secure and so that physicians are competent and hospital personnel are competent.

Dr. David Brailer, the President's appointee to take many of these actions in the area of health information technology, and Secretary Leavitt, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, are leading the charge in some of these advances along with us in Congress.

This is something that we want the American people to know, Mr. Speaker; that in so doing, we will actually be saving tens of thousands of lives and tens of billions of dollars. These are efforts we will not yield on, because we recognize that the number of deaths

that occur per year from us having our eyes blindfolded and our hands and not being able to do the best in health care is actually more that occur in a single year than died in all of the Vietnam War.

We have the tools to do this, and we as a Republican Conference will continue to lead this Nation in moving forward to save lives and save money.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. Gingrey, to control the balance of my time.

#### THE STATE OF HEALTH CARE: REPUBLICAN EFFORTS FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) will control the remainder of the hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Dr. Murphy, thank you so much for bringing that expertise in regard to health IT and health care quality. In fact, I wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues one of the posters in regard to this.

The Rand study that Dr. Murphy mentioned, a potential savings of \$162 billion annually by going to that system, and also at least 90,000 lives, and possibly more. I wanted to close out that portion before I call on some of my other colleagues to discuss other pertinent issues.

We do have legislation introduced from the Republican Conference to incentivize physicians, particularly small group physicians through our Tax Code, in the 179 section of the Code, to let them rapidly depreciate indeed up to \$250,000. We do this for businessmen and women currently up to \$100,000, but it is so critically important, this cost savings that I point out, that we want to make sure these physicians can afford to do this, because we need every one of them to participate in health IT.

At this point, the next issue that we wanted to talk about, and the gentleman from Florida, my colleague, and classmate, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE, a member of Financial Services, Homeland Security, Veterans' Affairs, a Member of the Health Care Public Affairs Team, as most of us are; in addition to that she leads the Women's Issue Team of the Republican Caucus. She wears many hats.

But tonight the gentlewoman is going to talk about long-term care. And I hope she will include a little bit about the issue of health savings accounts and how they can be rolled into that. I think the President may have mentioned that a little bit.

At this point I gladly yield to my colleague from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that Mr. GINGREY is holding these to help inform people of exactly what Congress is doing on the issue of health care. I am sure when every Member

here goes back into their district, people ask them about health care.

In my district, of course, the issue is always not only just health care for seniors, but also veterans. And Dr. Murphy was absolutely correct that the VA was the first entity to begin computerizing their records, which is the reason why a veteran can go from New York at a VA facility down to one in Florida, and virtually with a few key strokes, they pull up his or her record. That is a good way to make sure that we have continuity of care.

In Florida, of course, we have many, many nursing homes. People move to Florida, and as they age in Florida, the nursing home industry is a very, very vital part of our economy. When I was a State senator, I worked long and hard on nursing home issues. We did nursing home reform.

And one of the reasons that we did nursing home reform was because we wanted to increase the staffing and make sure that nursing homes provided the kind of quality care that we all want for our seniors who are in nursing homes. But, you know, one of the issues clearly is the cost not just for those living in a nursing home, but also for younger families who have got to care for older parents or loved ones, very often termed the sandwich generation.

You know, long-term care costs can be very, very stifling. And I agree about having them be able to roll into a medical savings account. It is certainly a very important component of what we are trying to do long term.

You know, you do not fix health care forever. The need for health care reform continues as technology improves, as we all age, and also as we take into consideration all of the new pharmaceutical products that are out there that prevent people from going into hospitals, and, many times, nursing homes.

You know, that sandwich generation I was just speaking about, they are the ones who are very often helping to care for their parents. You know, nursing home costs can be upwards of \$60,000 if a person does not have insurance. And home health care costs can sometimes reach \$20,000 a year.

When we look at the demographics, those who are 85 years of age or older are the most likely candidates for long-term care service. But age is not the only indicator. Actually people of any age with limited self-care or mobility issues are candidates as well.

For the average person over age 50, home health care can cost over \$5,800 a year. Even families who have long-term care insurance are facing hefty costs. Kind of base plan premiums run between \$564 a year for a 50-year-old, for example, to \$5,300 a year for someone who is 79.

When families can no longer cover these costs, Medicaid has to pick up the tab for those who do not have long-term care insurance. And when we look at the spending in Medicaid, one-third

nationwide of all Medicaid spending goes toward long-term care.

Moreover, two-thirds of these funds are used for institutional care, even though consumers prefer to remain in their own homes and communities. I am sure, Dr. GINGREY, that in your State as well as in my State, that they have applied for waivers, kind of all efforts possible to keep people in their own homes.

People prefer to be in their own homes, but there are times when they do need to be in long-term care. One of the bills that I recently introduced that I know many of my colleagues are on, is the Qualified Long-Term Care Fairness Act. We want to encourage people to participate in long-term care insurance.

This bill provides the same tax deduction available to those who itemize as those who do not. Currently only people who itemize on their income tax can take off the cost of long-term care insurance. This was obviously overlooked when they passed the bill, in that they only allow people who itemize.

We want to make sure that this tax deduction may be used for long-term care insurance premiums, activities of daily living, diagnostic, preventative or rehabilitation services, and certainly other services prescribed by a licensed health care practitioner.

My bill also, by the way, covers home health care expenses. By taking out a policy, it really and truly helps the family so very much. We want to make sure that this additional tax deduction can be claimed by people who take that extra care to be sure that if they need nursing home care that they have the insurance to cover it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in 2001, spending for long-term care services for persons of all ages represented 12.2 percent of all personal health care spending. This was almost \$152 billion of \$1.24 trillion spent for health care.

Congress should encourage all Americans to purchase long-term care insurance. And certainly this is but one way that we can encourage our constituents to spend that money for a long-term care policy.

If I may take a moment just of personal privilege to tell a story about a very dear gentleman that everyone thought he was my dad; he was not. He had three daughters and he cared about those daughters.

Because he lived in the same community that I did, and because we were very close, people just thought that Arne was my father. Well, let me tell you, Arne was a very, very thoughtful father, because he took out long-term care insurance.

He developed Alzheimer's, and needed to be in a long-term care facility. His wife had passed on and the progression was very, very fast. Arne passed away last year, but I can just tell the Members in the Chamber tonight and those who may be watching in the audience, that Arne's children truly appreciated

the fact that he took out that long-term care insurance. Because that way, the insurance paid for all of the time that he had to spend in the nursing home. And he was able to preserve his life's savings to leave to his children, which is really what he wanted. And he also wanted to make sure that he was not a burden on the taxpayers.

I would ask as many people as possible to consider that kind of insurance to make sure that they are cared for and that their children or whoever they want to leave the rest of their savings to, that they are also provided for. I think it is an excellent way to do it.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentlewoman would yield for a second. This is such an important item, long-term care, and the anecdotal case that you just presented to us is touching and very personal, but very real and very practical, as you point out.

And we are going to talk a little bit later about, and I point out on this chart, health savings accounts; but I think the gentlewoman would agree that the opportunity to utilize money out of a health savings account to purchase at some point, maybe not when you are 35 years old and you just had the plan and you are building it up for a couple of years, but as you mentioned, I think you said in your fifties, it probably is certainly time to start saying not only do I pay for an annual physical, and maybe a mammogram or colonoscopy out of my health savings account, but maybe I need to look very closely at purchasing long-term care insurance to protect my assets, Mr. Speaker, so that they are not all used up, as I or anybody else who suffers from some debilitating illness that lasts for a long time, in a nursing home, they have no insurance, they have exhausted all of their assets.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Florida, too, in thinking outside of the box. I think that is part of why we as Members of the Republican Conference as a health care team, want to bring to our colleagues on a regular basis that we are thinking of ways to get the job done.

We are not just sitting back and accepting the same old, same old. And your bill, and I was not aware of the specifics of it, but that allowance for someone who does not itemize to actually get a deduction for the purchase of long-term care insurance I think is a great idea.

I commend the gentlewoman for that.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman. And certainly the use of any funds from a health savings account for this purpose accomplishes the same thing. It gives people a tax incentive to save, to also save and preserve their assets for the future.

And, you know, I recently, this past weekend, ran into a young man who was all of 55 years old. He was injured, and spent some time in a rehab center.

And, you know, he said to himself, you know, he did not have insurance. When he told me the cost of that rehabilitation, it was astronomical.

So, you know, we all want to believe that we are going to be as healthy tomorrow as we are today. But, that is not always the case. And I remember when I reviewed the policy with Arne, because I was a little skeptical, he was 75 when he first started looking at it, and I was amazed what it did cover and how reasonable the cost was. And, you know, I looked on every line, looking for a loophole. And it ended up being something that I did recommend to him, never realizing that a few years later he would need to have this.

So I commend the gentleman for promoting the health savings accounts and any other way that we can help seniors to better prepare for their future.

□ 2045

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing us this information on long-term care.

At this time, we have an opportunity to hear another issue discussed by my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from West Virginia, Representative SHELLY MOORE CAPITO. And Representative CAPITO is going to talk tonight about something that, and she knows the numbers, she has been here a little longer than I have in regard to how many times we have addressed this issue of tort reform, of trying to level the playing field. Not take away anybody's rights to a redress of grievances if somebody has injured them by practicing medicine below the standard of care. That could be the provider of the care, it could be the physician, or the hospital.

In any regard, at this point I would like to turn the program over to Representative CAPITO and have her talk to us about the issue of medical liability reform.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee, not only for talking about issues that are important to us but his service on the Rules Committee as well. And also the fact that we are taking this time to talk about an issue that is probably the most-talked about issue in my district and that is health care in a general sense, but in a broader sense health care for our future.

I come from the State of West Virginia, and I think this is a great topic for somebody from West Virginia to speak on. We have passed out of the House medical liability reform I think in excess of seven times and I have lost count. I do not know exactly. But I would like to talk a little bit about what happened in the State of West Virginia and how that legislature there and the Governor there joined together to answer a desperate cry from a lot of West Virginians.

In the summer of, I think it was, 2002, the only trauma center in the largest metropolitan area of our State, CAMC

Trauma Center, closed because they were unable to staff the trauma center because people of the specialty and the hospital were having difficulty meeting the high cost of medical liability insurance. They could not get it. That traumatized our area. We live in a rural State; but this area, Charleston, was the magnet for all of southern West Virginia and eastern and western sides to come in case of a high-level trauma.

During this time, a young boy of 4 or 5 years old got a penny stuck in his throat, and he lived about 10 minutes away from the trauma center, but the trauma center was not there. It was not open. So his parents, along with their physician, had to take him to Cincinnati, Ohio, to have this extracted from his windpipe. It had a happy ending. He was fine, but if they had not had to take that amount of time to go to Cincinnati to have the work performed, I do not know what would have happened to this young boy.

Throughout 2002, I met more constituents who were telling me that their doctors, even though they were not old retirement-age doctors, middle age, in their fifties, in the peak of their profession, were moving. They were moving to other States. They were retiring out of the practice of medicine and into administration because they absolutely could not afford to continue practice. We were losing our specialty physicians. I know there is a problem nationwide with neurosurgeons, certainly orthopedists, OB-GYNs are one of the highest problem areas, and it was just cascading across our State.

We are known in our State as being one of the best places for trial lawyers to set up shop. We are very, what do I want to say, generous and we have a very good litigious society.

Mr. GINGREY. We like to use the expression in those situations: "it is easier to sue your doctor than it is to see your doctor."

Mrs. CAPITO. Right and we were reaching that point in West Virginia. We had our doctors leaving.

Another thing, I spent Sunday night with a group of physicians here in Washington, D.C., and one of the things they told me repeatedly, no matter what State they were practicing in, is that more and more they have got to practice defensive medicine. Are you going to do the MRI, Doctor?

And even though they do not think it is called for, it is not medically necessary, they go ahead and do it because if they do not do it, there is that small fraction of a chance that something might have shown up or that they could come back and be sued because they did not proceed with a procedure that they did not feel was medically necessary.

And what happens when you practice defensive medicine? The cost goes up and up and up. And this was happening in West Virginia. Again, our large medical centers, we could not recruit our doctors. We would have residencies

throughout our State and as soon as the physicians were trained, educated, and ready to practice, they would leave the State. And this was really very difficult because the word was out across the Nation: West Virginia, if you want to practice medicine, do not go to West Virginia.

So we had all of this coupled with just the out-of-control lawyer compensation that this breeds, this medical liability breeds.

So we had this kind of situation in West Virginia and what happened? It was not the doctors. It was not the hospitals. It was not the health professionals. It was the everyday citizen in West Virginia coming to policy-makers, coming to their State legislators, coming to their Governor, coming to their Congresspeople and saying, you have got to do something. You have got to pass something. And by golly, in the State of West Virginia they have passed one of the leading, cutting-edge medical liability bills that exists now in any States in the Union.

And what has happened? Confidence is back in the health professions, more specialties are being recruited into our State. And just today I had a young man in my office who was just finishing his residency at Lexington, Kentucky. He said, I am coming home to West Virginia because that is where I want to raise my family and practice medicine.

So medical liability does work. It does go to providing higher-quality care, refreshing your physician and health profession supply. It does go to bringing about an era of confidence that good-quality health care is going to be there for you. And so I would say in terms of, I know Dr. Gingrey has introduced the HEALTH Act again, and we are hoping that we will pass it out of the House of Representatives again, we will do that because we know it is important. But more and more what is happening in West Virginia is happening in other States across the Nation. And they are hearing from their everyday citizens, their folks who want to see their doctor when they want to see them, the doctor they have seen their whole life. And this is an extremely important issue to have before the American public.

The problem has been we have passed it here, and we have not heard anything more about it. It had faded out there across the Hall. I think the stronger the voices are at the local level, just like they were in West Virginia where we did not think it could ever be done, the stronger those voices are, the more optimism we can have, we can meet the demands of a good and solid medical liability reform bill.

I want to join with my colleagues here on the Health Affairs Team who think it is something we need to talk about quite a bit.

If I could take just 2 more minutes here to talk about another health issue that is extremely important to me, and that is the prescription drug bill for

seniors. It is something I worked on, and it is probably the number one issue as I have moved across the State over the last 5 years.

I was sitting in a dinner the other night after reading all the political rhetoric about the prescription drug bill and how it does not serve people, and actually one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle in my own State called it a national disaster. I sat down next to a gentleman. He said, I want to talk to you about the prescription drug bill. I almost thought I had to put a helmet on to hear what he had to say. I said, What is that? He said, I am going to save \$4,000 this year. Thank you, Congresswoman, for passing that. Thank you for providing that first-time availability of a prescription drug bill through Medicare.

I want those who are watching to know this is an extremely revolutionary bill and an availability of a prescription drug bill for our seniors.

Doctor, I would like to yield back my time to you. I appreciate your efforts in this area, and I join with you in seeing that we get that medical liability reform bill passed once again.

Mr. GINGREY. Thank you. As you point out, it could be seven times. We had passed it just last year, and I guess we will have to do it again this year maybe for the eighth time.

I just have got a little poster here, Mr. Speaker, that I want to call my colleagues' attention to here. The gentlewoman from West Virginia talked about it a little bit in regard to these issues of the need for tort reform, the cost factor, Federal outlays for health care on the rise. Yes, indeed. Nearly one-third of all Federal spending goes towards health care. And that is what she is talking about.

A lot of this spending is defensive medicine. It is unnecessary. She is talking about the trauma center in West Virginia that had to close because they could not get coverage. They could not get the neurosurgeon to take the liability or a thoracic surgeon to see that youngster with the penny lodged in his windpipe.

These are the issues; and, yes, everybody that comes into the emergency room anywhere in the country with a headache, doctors know physical diagnosis and ability to examine by looking in the eyes and checking the blood pressure. But they are not sending that patient home with a couple of aspirins and careful instructions to call the next day. They get a CAT scan and the most expensive one that is coming along for that particular year.

She did such a great job. Finally, in her last two minutes and I am so glad that she did that in regard to the Medicare Prescription Drug Act, part D. We have heard all of these naysayers. I am sure they were out there in 1965 when we had the optional Medicare part B which 98 percent of seniors are paying upwards of \$90 a month to be part of because it is a good program. This is a good program.

I thank Representative SHELLY MOORE CAPITO for giving us some information, personal anecdotal statistics from West Virginia. It is absolutely true.

At this point it is a pleasure to have as part of our team tonight, and actually my co-chair of the Policy Committee, the Republican Policy Committee on HealthCare Reform, another physician, a freshman who does not seem like a freshman because of his knowledge and skill and ability. I am talking about the gentleman, Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY, cardio-thoracic surgeon from Lake Charles, Louisiana.

Before I yield him most of the remaining time in this special hour, I want to thank him for the work that he did on the gulf coast during not only Hurricane Katrina but Rita that hit his area, his district, and devastated over 125 miles of that great part of our country and what he has tried to do in regard to going forward to work on issues, like making sure in a catastrophe like that in the future that we would have a data bank of physicians by specialty so that we would be much more organized and could respond like he did, personally, in an efficient fashion.

So at this point it is indeed a pleasure to call on the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative BOUSTANY. He will talk a little bit about competition in health care and some of the hallmarks for reform.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend and colleague from Georgia for yielding time to me. Also, I thank him for putting on this program this evening. It is very important that we inform the American public about these issues in health care.

It is undeniable that the United States has the finest health care system in the world, and I have seen it firsthand as a cardio-thoracic surgeon. I have had the great privilege of saving many lives in the practice of cardio-thoracic surgery. At the same time, I also learned firsthand about the difficulties that families go through and the high cost of health care incurred by families and small businesses.

Particularly, when my son was involved in a terrible car accident that required months of hospital care and the stress it put on my family and the financial pressure really awakened me to many of the problems that we have in our health care system. So I come here with strong determination to try to do something to help American families with the ever-rising cost and burden of providing health care.

Health care costs have doubled between 1993 and 2004, growing to nearly \$1.9 trillion and representing 16 percent of the United States gross domestic product. When you look at health care, we have to make sure that it is affordable, it is available and accessible because I commonly say, I often say back at home, All health care is local. What good is health care if you cannot access it and get it where it is affordable

where you live? That is where you need it. It does not do you any good if it is available in New York or Boston if you cannot get it at home in Lafayette, Louisiana.

So with this unsustainable rise in cost, we have got to do something to bring the cost down and make it more affordable and available. Competition is the key.

I think there are three words that really describe the principles for health care reform: information, choice, and control.

□ 2100

First of all, with regard to information, we need a free flow of information about prices, about cost to families, about cost of hospital care, cost when you go to see the doctor, the cost you incur when you go.

We also need a free flow of information about quality and outcomes, because if we have this flow of information, and information technology was mentioned earlier this evening, information technology is a critical part in providing this kind of information to the consumer and to ultimately the patient, to the family.

I often say what good is it if you do not have this information. If I go to the store to buy soft drinks or sodas for my family, I can go down the aisle, and there is a wide range of products, different quality, different flavors, different prices, and I make an informed decision. But in health care, we cannot do that. So we need information.

Choices, that is the other one. If we had a wide range of choices in health care, wide range of insurance products, then we could create this competition that will bring the cost down. It is one of the things we hope to see in the Medicare prescription Part D program, where we create competition to drive the cost of pharmaceuticals down for our seniors in these plans.

Another way of providing choice is certainly the health savings accounts that were mentioned earlier, associated health plans which is something we passed in the House. And there is also a bill that I am a proud cosponsor of; this is a bill by Representative SHAD-EGG, H.R. 2355, the Health Care Choice Act of 2005, which will allow people to shop for insurance products, health care insurance, across State lines, again creating more competition and hopefully bringing the cost down.

The final piece of this is control. We do not have portability and control. I want to put health care destiny back in the control of families and individuals because I believe by doing so we create true portability in health care, and if we do this, then we will solve a lot of the problems. We will free up our businesses, let them do what they do best, by providing work and wages and so forth, but let us let families have that portability in health care.

Those are the keys to health care reform. It is important to recognize, if you look at our health care system, 45

percent of all health care spending is in the form of Medicare and Medicaid and other Federal programs. Fifty-five percent of it is in the so-called private sector, and yet what we have is a price control system where everything is set by basically paying at the Medicare rates, which creates some degree of rationing in health care. Yet, on the other side of the coin, when you look at what is happening to providers, providers are having to deal with the free ranging, inflated cost of supplies, pharmaceuticals, surgical equipment, and this has created major distortions in our health care system. This also needs to be addressed.

So, again, if we can create competition by using those three principles I mentioned, then I believe we can truly start to bring the costs down in health care and make it more affordable, available and accessible for American families.

I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding to me, and I appreciate this opportunity to comment on health care.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank Mr. BOUSTANY so much for being with us this evening and for pointing out the rising cost of health care and what we need to do about it. I particularly appreciate what you said about transparency.

In the final few minutes, I am going to talk a little bit about the health savings accounts that the President has promoted and increased the amount of money that can be put aside, very much like an IRA, but this would be an IRA for health care. Because you are absolutely right; we use the expression, and maybe it is really apropos for health care, skinning the game. They are going to be better consumers. People do a great job shopping for an automobile or an appliance or new flat-screen television set, and they may go to eight different stores, discount big box stores, trying to save an extra fifty bucks on a plasma TV. And people do that, and I do not blame them. We can do that in health care, too.

I think Mr. BOUSTANY is absolutely right. There will be a day when we do have electronic medical records throughout the system. Secretary Leavitt is totally committed to this, and Dr. Brailer, as our good friend Mr. MURPHY said at the outset of the hour, but will also need to be done as everybody is interconnected, every medical office, every clinic, whether it is the size of Mayo or Rochester or whatever, or maybe just a two-doctor shop, everybody's information about their patients is interconnected so that we know what their needs are and also the information that physicians, their pricing information, what does an OB/GYN typically charge for a routine hysterectomy or delivery or cesarean section; what does a vascular surgeon charge for the procedures that they do. We call those endarterectomies, put in a graft to go around a blocked vessel. What does a general surgeon charge to

take out a gallbladder through laparoscopic, or appendix or thyroid? There are more than one good doctor in each community. I do not know about cardiothoracic surgeons. They are in short supply, but there are lots of us OB/GYNs and general surgeons that do a good job.

People will one day in the near future, because of what we are doing, the efforts of this Republican majority and this President, who is totally committed to making sure that we continue to have the best health care system in the world, we will see the day that in a secure environment, people can look on a Web site and know exactly what the differences are and shop economically for not the cheapest health care but the best-priced health care and good health care.

We talked a little bit at the outset of the health savings account issue. I think that this is a wonderful opportunity. I wanted to show maybe one last poster in regard to that, because we hear a lot of criticism sometimes here on the floor of this Chamber, and sometimes out in the halls and maybe indeed sometimes back home in our districts, say, oh, you know, the health savings account, they are just, here again, something for the rich, and you Republicans only care about the people that have lots of money. Well, look, Mr. Speaker, at this health savings account, not just for the healthy and wealthy.

Seventy-three percent of those who have established, and there are about 3 million now and we predict within the next couple of years 10 million, and it is growing rapidly, 73 percent have families with children. Fifty-seven percent of these holding health savings accounts are over age 40; 35 percent are from households with four or more people; 40 percent are high school graduates or have technical school training as the highest level of education. Also, I might say parenthetically, some of these folks are the most successful because they are hardworking and work by the sweat of their brow; 40 percent did not indicate any prior coverage.

So this is something for everything, and for those who do not want that, the President has talked about refundable tax credits to purchase health insurance for an individual. When I say refundable tax credits, I mean somebody that, because they are a lower economic earner and they do not typically pay taxes, they do not get any advantage from a deduction. So we actually give them money. A refundable tax credit means you give them money for the sole purpose of purchasing health insurance. These are some of the things that we wanted to talk about.

The gentleman from Louisiana, I would be glad to yield to him for a comment.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also point out another feature of health savings accounts and it is something very important to think about;

and that is, as we get a large part of our generation to sign on to these health savings accounts, as our generation moves up into the Medicare years, that money will accrue and could be used for health care costs incurred at that time. It will help take some of the burden off the Medicare system in the future potentially. So it is a good, good feature as we look at these. Again, it helps the individual, it helps the family to control their own health care destiny.

So I just wanted to point that out, in addition to these very good facts that you pointed out as well.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and just in the closing minutes, I would say that also it is important for people to know that while people maintain these health savings accounts and add to them each year, they enjoy the miracle of compound interest as these accounts grow. They can only be spent on health care, but typical insurance does not cover dental care or a lot of eye care. It certainly will not pay for a hearing aid, no cosmetic surgery. It does not help women who have infertility problems who need assisted reproductive technology so they can achieve the wonderful joy of childbirth and raising a child or children. All of those things can be paid for out of these health savings accounts.

We talked about purchasing long-term health care insurance, and when a person turns 65, they can actually use some of this money for other things.

Well, that wraps it up. I see my time is drawing to a conclusion. I think the Speaker has tapped that gavel a little bit, and I do not want to cut into my good friend's, the gentleman from Georgia on the Democratic side, and his special hour. So at that we will conclude.

#### BLUE DOG COALITION

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the United States House of Representatives this evening as a member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, a group of 37 fiscally conservative Democrats who are outraged, absolutely appalled by these record deficits, record debt and the lack of common sense and fiscal discipline that we are seeing in our Nation's government these days.

I come to the floor and raise these issues not out of partisan politics because, Mr. Speaker, I do not know about you, but I am sick and tired of all the partisan bickering that goes on at our Nation's Capitol. It does not matter to me if it is a Republican idea or Democrat idea. My people back home want a commonsense idea, the kind of ideas that make sense for them in their everyday lives.

So I raise these issues, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly because I am concerned about the future of our country.

As you walk the halls of Congress, it is easy to spot one of the Blue Dog Coalition Members' offices, because we all have this poster beside our front door. Today, the U.S. national debt, just as I got ready to come up here this evening, the U.S. national debt is \$8,270,909,436,190. For every man, woman and child in America, including those being born as we speak, the amount of money that each person in America shares in the national debt is \$27,000 and some change.

It is hard now, Mr. Speaker, to believe that from 1998 through 2001, our Nation for the first time in 40 years had a balanced budget; and yet, this administration, this Republican Congress, has given us the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history for what amounts to 6 years in a row.

This is the budget that the President of the United States has presented to Congress. It is always presented under a lot of fanfare; a lot of publicity surrounds this budget. This budget for fiscal year 2007 totals \$2.8 trillion, but what is alarming about it is that the deficit totals \$423 billion.

If that is not disturbing enough, Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we spend about a half a billion a day simply paying interest on the debt we already have, and on top of that, our national debt is increasing to the tune of about \$1 billion a day. Our Nation is spending about \$1 billion more a day than it is taking in; \$260 million a day going to Iraq, \$33 million a day going to Afghanistan, and a whole lot more going not to fund programs that matter to people because there are record cuts in this budget.

Just yesterday in Booneville, Arkansas, I was at the Dale Bumpers Research Center, one of 26 agriculture research centers that are not being cut, but being eliminated, under the President's budget for fiscal year 2007. Only in America can the President give us a budget that cuts the programs that matter to people, Medicaid, Medicare, veterans benefits, agricultural programs, and also give us the largest deficit ever in our Nation's history at the same time.

□ 2115

So as an American, I rise this evening out of concern. As a small business owner, I rise this evening out of concern about these record debts and these record deficits. And at the end of this hour, Mr. Speaker, we will change this number to show how much the national debt has risen just in the hour we have been on the floor this evening trying to talk about accountability and fiscal responsibility.

The numbers I have presented to you are bad enough. Lord knows we don't need to make them any worse. They are already the largest budget deficits in our Nation's history that this Republican leadership has given us, but

what we have recently learned is, actually, when you look at America, the way that America requires corporations to look at accounting, the deficit is even worse than what we thought.

At this time I would call on the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), the co-chair for policy in the Blue Dog Coalition, who has helped discover this little-known publication, which is very, very disturbing.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend from Arkansas, and I appreciate his yielding to me. I am about to say something that very few people in America know. Hardly anyone in Congress knows it. This is not a partisan comment. I am about to reveal a document printed by this administration that received less distribution than the secret NSA domestic wiretapping activities of the administration.

This is a document that coincidentally was revealed sometime close to Christmas Eve last December. It is a document that was issued without a press release. There was no press notification about this at all. Instead of being like the budget that my friend from Arkansas showed, that was distributed to every Congressman, every Senator's office, with great fanfare, this document was distributed to fewer than 20 Members of the House and Senate. It probably went to about a dozen. It was mailed in. It was not noticed, apparently, by anyone.

And what does the document reveal? Well, first of all, this is it. When I called the Department of the Treasury, they laughed when I asked for multiple copies. This is the Financial Report of the United States Government 2005. This is the closest thing our Nation has to an annual report. Most Americans are familiar with those. All public companies are required to issue an annual report so that the shareholders can find out how the company is doing. Well, this is the annual report for America, and yet it was hidden in plain sight. Hardly anyone knows about this document.

The first page is signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow, and the first page reveals a pretty shocking fact. It reveals the fact that for all that Mike Ross was talking about, about our terrible debt and deficit situation, situations that are driving up interest rates and putting a terrible debt burden on the backs of our kids and grandkids, according to that green document my colleague from Arkansas held up, the deficit last year was \$319 billion. That is a lot of money. That is "b" for billion, or "b" as in, boy, that is a lot of money. Well, guess what this document shows on its first page, signed by Secretary of the Treasury John Snow? The real deficit last year for 2005 was not \$319 billion, it was, get this, \$760 billion.

So there are two big questions here. Why did the administration try to hide this from Congress and the American people? Why was there no press re-

lease? Why did it receive minimal distribution? And, second, why is the Secretary of the Treasury so heavily at odds with another part of the administration, the Office of Management and Budget and the director there, John Bolton? How could one gentleman say that the deficit was \$319 billion last year and another gentleman say it was \$760 billion?

Well, the difference is this: the budget of the United States uses what is called cash accounting, and only the tiniest businesses in America are even allowed to use cash accounting. Why? Because it gives you a very distorted picture of a business or of a government. This annual report for America, the financial report signed by Secretary of the Treasury Snow, uses real accounting. It is called accrual accounting, and it keeps the books in a much more accurate way.

So I think most Americans would be shocked, as my colleague from Arkansas knows, that the U.S. Government, Uncle Sam, is keeping two sets of books. One has relatively good news, the other has terrible news in it. And guess what, they are trying to hide the second set of books from the American people.

I would encourage people to go to the Blue Dog Web site. We can allow you to download this document, or you can go to the U.S. Treasury Web site and download the document. It will not be obvious, though, on the Treasury Web site. It is pretty well hidden on that Web site. It is pretty clear on the Blue Dog.com Web site. So I would encourage people to check this out and see what it says in cold hard print and ask the logical question of why the President's budget is so radically and totally different from the document issued by his own Treasury Department.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding to me.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing this to the attention of America, the "Financial Report of the United States Government for 2005," printed by our government, signed by our President's appointed Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow.

And as the gentleman from Tennessee has explained quite well, when our government says we have a \$319 billion deficit for 2005, that is based on a form of accounting known as a cash-basis form of accounting. Now, I am a small business owner; and as a small business owner, our government does not allow me to base my business on a cash-basis form of accounting. I am required by our government to use an accrual-based form of accounting. And if I do not, I am in a lot of trouble with the IRS and will probably end up in jail.

However, our government, when we talk about the budget and the debt and the deficit and we talk about it in terms of this \$319 billion, we find in this publication, the "Financial Report

of the United States of America for 2005," that it does not use a cash-basis form of accounting. It uses an accrual-basis form of accounting, and we know this only because the government, by law, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to print this document. He does not print tens of thousands of copies the way he does the budget. Only a handful are printed because they do not want the taxpayers of this country to know what is really going on here.

The truth is this: when we look at our government, the way our government requires businesses to report their dealings with the IRS, our deficit was not \$319 billion in 2005. Again, there is no reason for us to try to make these numbers any worse than they already are. They are already as bad as they have ever been in the history of our country. And these are not our numbers. These are numbers from the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow. The deficit for 2005 was not \$319 billion when using the accrual-basis form of accounting; it was \$760 billion. That is a difference of \$441 billion.

Now, John Snow, Secretary of the Treasury, in this report said: "Including these future financial responsibilities in this report gives a more complete and long-range look at the government's finances." That is the Secretary of the Treasury, appointed by President Bush. That is John Snow, in his words, which can be found on page 1 of this report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield once again to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because there are probably some listeners who are confused about cash-basis accounting versus accrual accounting. The simplest way to explain it is this way. If you were to look at giant U.S. companies like General Motors or Ford, they would be just fine today if you look at them on a cash basis because they are generating cash. But if you look at them on a more accurate basis, the way the stock market does and the way investors do, you will see that a cash basis ignores future obligations. For example, for retirees, for health care, for other benefits and obligations that should be kept and that have to be acknowledged.

That is what accrual accounting does. And lest people be confused, accrual accounting is not cruel, the way it may sound. Accrual accounting is actually the most compassionate form of accounting, because cash-basis accounting forgets the retirees and the sick. Accrual accounting remembers them. And it is vital we remember all of our retirees and our sick because their health benefits matter, and we have to take them into account in this country.

I know the gentleman is about to show the rule for business. This is a tough rule, and I look forward to the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. ROSS. Well, every business in this country is required to use the accrual method if the business has inventory, if the business is a C corporation,

or if gross annual sales exceed \$5 million. So for any corporation, any business that meets one of these criteria, our government says you must use the accrual method of accounting.

Our own government, however, though requiring businesses to use the accrual method of accounting or you go to jail and get in a lot of trouble with the IRS, that is what the government says to businesses, but the government says, well, that makes us look like we are being even more fiscally irresponsible than we want, so we will not use this accrual business. We will go back and trick the taxpayers by using the cash basis of accounting.

At this time, I want to recognize a real leader within the Blue Dog Coalition, my friend and colleague from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. It is great to be with you, Mr. ROSS, and with my colleagues from the Blue Dogs and our distinguished cochairman.

I think this startling information that you have just made known to the American people speaks to the fundamental issue at hand, and it is, in one word, security. Financial security. We cannot have national security if we do not have financial security. We cannot even have homeland security if we do not have financial security or health care security. Whatever our security is, it is anchored in financial security.

With security comes the word "confidence," and you have just shattered that realization by bringing this information to the forefront and revealing how badly we need to restore the confidence of the American people for this government's ability to handle their financial security.

But I will tell you something that really adds and complements what you have brought to the American people tonight, because I have a bit of information that ought to be startling as well. As we look at this report, as we basically see firsthand that the books have been cooked, so to speak, by this revealing document, which almost doubles the \$319 billion deficit, because now we know it is \$760 billion deficit by the words of the Treasury Secretary, but let me add this to this important discussion we are having this evening.

I do not believe the American people know that this President, President Bush, has borrowed more money from foreign governments in his 5 years than all of the preceding 42 Presidents in the history of this country.

□ 2130

I know the American people are shaking their heads and asking, is he saying what I think he is saying? Let me repeat it.

President Bush has borrowed more money from foreign governments in his 5 years, since 2000, since he first took office, than all of the preceding 42 Presidents from 1789 to 2000, 211 years. Here are the figures. From 1789 to the year 2000 of our Nation's history, 42 U.S. Presidents borrowed a combined

\$1.01 trillion from foreign governments and foreign financial institutions, according to the Treasury Department.

And now, just in the last 5 years, President Bush has borrowed a staggering \$1.05 trillion, larger than the total from all the previous 42 Presidents. If that does not tell you we have a crisis here, I do not know what does. And you combine that with this information that our co-chairman has brought to us about how the books were cooked; and, in fact, according to the more accurate accounting procedure, it is more than \$760 billion.

It is remarkable. It is phenomenal. The American people deserve the truth. We have got to give it to them because, as the Bible says, you should know the truth. It is the truth that will set you free. We are going to set America free tonight.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for his knowledgeable input about this debt and deficit and budget process. I might add, in defense of the President, the President, during his tenure in office, it is true that he has borrowed more money from foreign central banks and foreign investors than the previous 42 Presidents combined. But in fairness to the President, he could not do that alone. It took this Republican majority in this Congress to give him a budget to allow him to continue to raise the debt limit to allow him to borrow more money in the last 5 years than the previous 42 Presidents combined.

I think the American people are starting to get it at the youngest of ages. My teenage daughter was reading the paper today and she sent me an e-mail, and I will just read to you what my teenage daughter said after reading the paper this morning. She wrote, "I read that they are wanting to increase the limit of the debt. Please do not let them do this. Make them start paying it back." That is a message from a 17-year-old junior in high school who is concerned about the reckless spending, the fiscal irresponsibility going on in our government because it is her generation, it is our children and grandchildren's generation that gets saddled with these bills.

I encourage folks every Tuesday night, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we are here on the floor talking about fiscal responsibility and about our ideas to balance the budget. We have a 12-point plan for meaningful budget reform that will allow us to have a balanced budget and allow us to get our fiscal house in order.

For folks that are interested in e-mailing us their thoughts, opinions or questions, I encourage them to do so at [BlueDog@mail.house.gov](mailto:BlueDog@mail.house.gov). We are the Blue Dog Coalition, 37 members strong, fiscally conservative Democrats that are here to hold this Republican Congress responsible for a record deficit and a record debt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, let me say amen to my friend's comments from Georgia. That was outstanding.

I have the pleasure of serving on the Budget Committee and this week, probably on Thursday, we will start marking up the budget for the United States of America. That is one of the most serious responsibilities that we could ever undertake. It is an incredibly complex document and process. You are talking about \$2.7 trillion. You are talking about not only all the defense programs, you are talking about Social Security and Medicare and a world of other programs, parks, agriculture, you name it; everything that the Federal Government is involved in.

In the span of a few short hours, we will be able to offer a few amendments, and we try to do this on a bipartisan basis. It is hard, but let me report on what happened last year in last year's markup.

I offered a number of the Blue Dog amendments as part of our 12-point plan for reform. They were individual, commonsense measures such as, for example, getting a cost estimate on every bill here so we know the cost of what we are voting on; having a recorded vote so that the members of this body go on record when large amounts of money are spent. We were one of the first groups in the country to go ahead and require transparency for earmarks so the public, everyone, would know what individual spending items were being requested. But probably, most importantly, we favored domestic spending caps so budget spending could not keep going up and up, and a pay-as-you-go approach so expansion of government was paid for, so that this generation paid our obligations, so we did not saddle future generations, including our men and women in uniform, with these terribly burdensome debts.

I offered that last year in the Budget Committee markup. My amendment passed on a 19-17 vote because four brave Republicans were willing to cross over and endorse a commonsense measure like that. But then the chairman of the committee realized that common sense had prevailed, and he leaned over and twisted the arm of a freshman Member of Congress and forced that gentleman to change his vote right in front of everybody. So then it was not a 19-17 victory for our side and common sense, suddenly it turned into an 18-18 tie, and, under the rules of the committee, you lose on a tie vote.

That was as close as we came last year to getting some of these commonsense principles involved. Even most State legislatures have rules like the ones I am describing. Most Americans would be outraged to learn we do not have these rules here.

We are going to try a similar approach on Thursday. I hope we prevail, and I hope Americans will tune in to see what happens, because we do try to work on a bipartisan basis. The Blue Dogs are Democrats and we are proud of that, but we reach across the aisle.

In fact, tonight, most of the Special Order is devoted to revealing the Republicans' Treasury report, because they did not want it to get the publicity that it deserves. This is one of the most important documents of government, and I have yet to meet another Member of Congress who knew about the existence of this document. It has been required by law to be published for over a decade now. Senator John Glenn of Ohio was the first person to author a bill to get this done. The former Secretary of Treasury, Bob Rubin, and the Clinton administration, championed this document. Back then the news was good. We were headed toward surpluses, and we achieved surpluses. But in the last 5 years, this document has been buried deep underground. I think it is high time we brought it above surface.

Mr. ROSS. I appreciate the co-chair for policy of the Blue Dog Coalition and a very important member of the Budget Committee bringing to the taxpayers' attention this little-known document, the financial report of the United States Government. Again, our debt is \$8,270,909,436,190.

Now, as members of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, we do not come here on Tuesday nights to simply complain about how this Congress is out of control with its spending without also offering a solution. As the gentlemen from Tennessee and Georgia mentioned, we have a 12-point reform plan to cure our Nation's addiction to deficit spending. And I can tell you, one of the problems that taxpayers in this country have with this debt and with these deficits is the lack of accountability. I want to talk about that for a moment.

Some of you have heard this before and I am going to continue to talk about it until every one of these 11,000 fully furnished, brand new manufactured homes sitting in a pasture in Hope, Arkansas, get to the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

Mr. COOPER. Are those the famous FEMA trailers?

Mr. ROSS. Those are the FEMA trailers. FEMA has spent an estimated \$431 million of our tax money purchasing some 11,000 brand new, fully furnished, manufactured homes.

Mr. COOPER. Who is living in those homes?

Mr. ROSS. Nobody. Here is the story. FEMA shows up in Hope, Arkansas, my hometown. I now live 16 miles down the road in Prescott, Arkansas. They show up at city hall and say, we understand you have these inactive runways as a result of World War II. We want to use them as a so-called FEMA staging area.

The idea was these manufactured homes were going to come into Hope and then go to the people who lost their homes and everything they owned as a result of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. They started coming. They started coming in October, and they came and they came, but they never went.

So as a result of that, 25 percent of them now sit on these inactive, closed military runways, and 75 percent of them are sitting in a cow pasture. That is 11,000 brand new, fully furnished, manufactured homes sitting in a pasture in Hope, Arkansas, and FEMA owns them, they have already bought them. And FEMA at the same time is spending our tax money to provide housing in hotels and motels for some 12,000 storm victims.

If that is not enough, we all know about the tent city that is set up near Pass Christian, Mississippi, where families in the winter are living in a tent while FEMA has 11,000 brand new, fully furnished manufactured homes sitting in a cow pasture in Hope, Arkansas. That is an aerial photo of some of the 11,000. There is the barbed-wire fence, and there are the manufactured homes. Most of them are 14 feet wide, 60 feet long. Some are 80 feet wide. And now that the drought is about to end and the rains are starting to set in, I do not have to tell you that they are going to be sinking. They are going to be sinking. They are going to be damaged.

What is FEMA's response? Oh, no, not to get them to the people that need them, the people living in hotels and motels and tents 6 months after the storm. Their response is we are going to spend \$6-8 million graveling this 290-acre cow pasture so we can store these manufactured homes for a future disaster. FEMA refuses to move these manufactured homes into a flood zone.

Normally I would say that makes sense, but the reality is in this instance, everybody that lost their home as a result of Hurricane Katrina lost their home because they lived in a flood zone. FEMA says if you have land, we will give you a manufactured home. Everybody that lost their home as a result of Hurricane Katrina, they had land but it is in a flood zone. That is why they lost their home.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the President and to the director of FEMA, what is worse, to have 11,000 brand new, fully furnished manufactured homes spread out over Mississippi and Louisiana and Alabama with the storm victims who lost their homes and everything they owned in a bunch of different flood zones, or have them all grouped together in a cow pasture at the Hope airport, an area prone to tornadoes, an area that is going to have a tornado warning probably about every 10 days for the next 3 months?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to come to the floor of this Chamber and talk about this until FEMA gets moving, until FEMA comes to Hope, Arkansas, picks up these 11,000 manufactured homes they have purchased, and gets them to the people who desperately need them, people who for the sixth and seventh month in a row are living in hotel and motel rooms, people who are living literally in tents in Pass Christian, Mississippi.

This ran on the front page of the Arkansas Democratic Gazette back in De-

ember. I do not know if this gentleman is still living in this tent or not. He was in December. I can tell you about 100 families are living in tents in Pass Christian right now. It is appalling to know as a country we are allowing people to live in tents. He has found a job. He is back at work, doing the best he can for himself and his family. He is waiting on housing, and yet we have 11,000 brand new, fully furnished, manufactured homes purchased by FEMA, sitting in a cow pasture in Hope.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that as a member of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, this is the kind of government waste that turns people off. I grew up in a little country church outside of Prescott, Midway United Methodist Church, and I heard a lot of sermons about being a good steward, and I can tell you FEMA is not being a good steward of our tax money with what they are doing. It is a total disgrace. It is an outrage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ROSS has so eloquently stated the great failure in our American government today. The whole situation of Hurricane Katrina marks one of the darkest spots in American history. But there is a pattern here of a lack of response. There is a pattern of whatever it goes through, security, homeland security, national security. Hurricane Katrina is just one example. We need look no closer than our port security. What a debacle.

That same kind of lack of proper research, proper debate, and you are absolutely right, a lackadaisical congressional leadership, a Republican leadership that simply has just bent over for this administration. We have made a mockery of what our Founding Fathers said we should be doing as checks and balances. That is why they set three branches of government: the judicial, executive and legislative branches.

□ 2145

It is our job to provide the oversight, the investigation, the enforcement arm, to be able to make sure that there is a proper check and balance. But this House of Representatives under this Republican leadership has all too often just caved in and caved down, and that is why we are in the shape that we are in today.

Now, if we can talk just for a moment, which I want to do, about this port security situation that again points up the same fallacies.

Mr. ROSS. It is about accountability.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. It is about accountability, and it is also about our budget. For example, if you remember, after 2001 Congress appropriated a total of \$765 million for port security programs, including \$173 million for FY 2006, to help our seaports adopt important security enhancements.

The Coast Guard came and told us they needed more like \$6 billion. Yet, like last year, the President's budget

once again proposed terminating funding dedicated to port security, and then turned right around and takes that \$6 billion and says let's give it over here to a company that is owned by a country that has direct financial ties to terrorist organizations.

How do you figure this, that the President's budget would propose terminating that funding that our Coast Guard, the one main element we have checking our ports, asked for, advocate terminating it, and then turn right around and okay a deal that he says he did not even know about?

Now, the truth is plain here, and we owe it to the American people. There are some of us in Congress who are willing to stand up and tell the truth and deal with this, because our financial security is vital, is extraordinarily important.

I want to just touch upon one additional thing. I want to talk about just for a moment, as my good friend from Tennessee pointed to, this budget and the meanness of these cuts, but where they hurt the most are with our military families, are with our veterans.

I do not believe that the American people quite understand this or quite are aware that this budget would increase the health care costs for 1 million veterans. For the fourth year in a row, the budget raises health care costs for 1 million veterans by imposing new fees for veterans, costing them more than \$2.6 billion over 5 years, and driving at least 200,000 veterans out of the system. That is what this budget does to our veterans.

It would double the copayment for prescription drugs from \$8 to \$15. That is what this budget does to veterans. It imposes an enrollment fee of \$250 a year for category 7 and category 8 veterans, those who make as little as \$26,000 a year. If increases health care costs for military retirees. The budget increases TRICARE health premiums for 3.1 million of the Nation's military retirees under 65. The premiums will double.

It fails to address the strain on our troops. I just returned from Iraq and Afghanistan. I was there talking with the troops. Despite recent reports of the tremendous strain that the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have placed on our troops, the President's budget fails to fund and plan adequately to recruit the number of forces that are authorized under the law to help with that strain. The budget would fund 17,000 fewer Army National Guard and 5,000 fewer Army Reserve than are authorized by law. But it does not just stop there. It goes on and on.

You talk about your folks in Hope, Arkansas, and what they are faced with. Let me tell you what my people are faced with so much in Georgia, in one county, Cobb County alone, just from the cuts in the Community Development Block Grant program.

This is what the President has proposed cutting: one center that is in great need of help in terms of being

built and being sustained through the Community Block Grant program of \$3.1 million, the Ron Anderson Center over in Powder Springs in Cobb County. Another center for senior citizens where they need it the most, cut out of this budget, another \$2.5 million. Those community block grants are the lifeblood of many communities in Hope, Arkansas; in Tennessee; and all over.

Now, I mention this, as we will mention a few other things. There is so much in this budget that goes at the heart of cutting out almost the heart and the hope of our people.

You showed an extraordinary picture there a moment ago, Mr. ROSS. You showed a victim down there under just a cover, all he had, just sitting there. It showed great hurt, great need. There is a great hurting and a great need of the American people, and we do not need to pass this budget that cuts the very programs that will help our people in need.

Mr. ROSS. Again, it takes a lot of skill for this administration, this Republican-led Congress, to give us the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history while also managing to cut all the programs that matter to people at the same time. How do they do that? By tacking on tax cut after tax cut.

Following us this evening, I am pretty confident that the other side will show up, which I think probably is an indication that we are making progress here in getting our message out about trying to restore some fiscal discipline and common sense to our Nation's government, and they will probably talk about how we had an opportunity to cut, to cut, \$40 billion in spending and how we voted against it.

But what they will not tell you is that it was \$40 billion in cuts to the most vulnerable people in our society. Medicaid, eight out of 10 seniors in Arkansas are on Medicaid. One out of five people in Arkansas are on Medicaid. Cuts to Medicaid, cuts to student loans to the tune of \$40 billion, followed by what are we doing this week and next week? About \$90 billion in additional tax cuts for those earning over \$400,000 a year.

I wasn't real good at math back in high school or college, Mr. Speaker, but the last time I checked, \$90 billion in tax cuts from borrowed money because we don't have a surplus and \$40 billion in cuts from the poor, the disabled, elderly and college students equals \$50 billion in new spending. Only in Washington would you entitle a bill that increases the national debt by \$50 billion the Deficit Reduction Act. Yet that is exactly what we will probably hear more about tonight, just as we did last week.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman makes an excellent point. I would like to challenge those who speak after us, if they even know about the existence of this "Financial Report for the United

States in 2005." I bet that no Republican in the House even knows this report exists, even though it is signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, it is an official U.S. Government document, and it reveals the true deficit for America last year as being \$760 billion.

If my friend would put back up the Blue Dog debt and deficit sign, please, I think it is very important that people compare that. Those numbers are truly staggering, \$8.2 trillion debt; and your individual share back home is \$27,000 for every man, woman, and child.

But, guess what? That is the good news. If you look at this document from the Department of Treasury, guess what our real debt is? It is not \$8.2 trillion. I wish it were. It is a staggering \$46 trillion. That is an unimaginable figure, \$46 trillion. That is an unimaginable sum of money.

But get this: every American's share, every man woman and child in this country, the share isn't \$27,000 like you have on your sign; the share is \$156,000 apiece. For every full-time worker's family, the share is \$375,000 apiece.

Mr. ROSS. If the gentleman would yield, the point is we are not trying to make this any worse than it is. We wish it wasn't bad. We wish we had a balanced budget. We wish the debt was being paid down. We wish we were not deficit spending. We don't have to try to make the numbers any worse than they already are. They already are setting records.

Just to clarify, the difference between these numbers and your numbers, the difference between the numbers in the budget and the numbers in the financial report of the United States Government is basically this simple: our government, our budget uses a cash-basis form of accounting, which gets you to these numbers.

Mr. COOPER. Which is illegal for most every business in America.

Mr. ROSS. Yet our very government, which uses a cash-base form of accounting, requires every business in America for the most part to use an accrual base of accounting.

Mr. COOPER. This is real accounting, and people back home need to know that for every working family, it is a \$375,000 obligation already. So what the gentleman is talking about, this \$27,000, that is the price of a pretty nice car. This is the price of a luxury home. This is what every working family already owes to pay for the promises this Congress and this administration have already made for our Social Security beneficiaries, our Medicare beneficiaries, so many other good and worthy programs.

As my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, pointed out, today we are having to borrow most of this money from foreign countries. President Bush has borrowed more money himself from foreign nations than all previous Presidents in American history combined. That is a staggering thing to comprehend.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. ROSS. Based on the accrual-basis form of accounting, the real United States deficit in 2005 was \$760 billion.

Mr. COOPER. Over twice as large as the administration will admit.

If the gentleman will yield for one more moment, the Director of Office of Management and Budget, Josh Bolton, says the deficit is only \$319 billion; it is actually getting smaller, it is turning up. He says the President in just a few years will cut the deficit in half.

That is according to the cash basis. According to accrual, according to real accounting, guess what? The deficit is \$760 billion, and getting bigger all the time. So it is going in the opposite direction from what Director Bolton says. So who do you believe, Director Bolton of the OMB, or the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow?

I think the American people need to know that both of these documents exist, both of them are official U.S. Government documents, put out by the Republican administration; but this is the one they have tried to keep hidden from the American people.

Mr. ROSS. A highlight from the financial report of the United States Government, this official government publication, you can find this on page 23, of the 26 agencies scored under the President's management agenda, 17 of them were deemed to have "any of a number of serious flaws when it comes to financial performance."

Then you go on to page 28, and this is a quote from David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States of America: "The current financial reporting model cash-basis accounting provides a potentially unrealistic and misleading picture of the Federal Government's overall performance, financial condition and future fiscal outlook," which is exactly why our government requires businesses to not use the cash-based form of accounting, rather accrual-based form of accounting.

Yet when you hear from our government, they never want to quote this report. They want to report the budget which uses what the Comptroller General of the United States refers to as an unrealistic and misleading picture, through the cash-based form of accounting.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. When you combine this with the startling revelation that half of this debt is being held by foreign countries, I go back to that word "security." Is it in our best security interest to have our financial well-being held in the hands of foreign countries? That is about as ridiculous as holding our port security in the hands of a foreign company owned by a country that had terrorist dealings, that provided nuclear materials to Iran, a country where two of the hijackers came from. This word "security" needs to reverberate throughout the American psyche.

□ 2200

We are depending too much on our financial security and our national security and port security from foreign interests. We Americans need to control our ports, and we need to have Americans at ports where they are originating shipments coming in.

And we need to check 100 percent of our cargo. Mr. ROSS, if Hong Kong can check 100 percent of its cargo coming into its ports, and it checks 22 million cargo pieces a year, we check only 11, Hong Kong is not even a terrorist target and we are. Hong Kong checks 100 percent.

They are not a terrorist target; we are a terrorist target, do not check but 5 percent. As Ethan Hunt said in Mission Impossible, the NOC list is out. It is out in the open. They know that we do not check but 5 percent of our cargo.

But the point I wanted to make in terms of the foreign lenders is, because I think it is important, Mr. ROSS, that the American people know who is holding our debt. Let me just tell them for a minute. Japan holds \$682.8 billion of our debt.

Communist China, Communist China holds \$250 billion of our debt. Great Britain, \$223 billion. The Caribbean banking centers, \$115 billion; Taiwan, \$71 billion; OPEC countries, \$67 billion; Korea, \$66 billion; Germany, \$65 billion; Canada, \$53 billion; Hong Kong \$46 billion.

This is not in the best interests of the security of this country and it has to change.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman is so right in his assessments. We do need to be borrowing money from foreign central banks and foreign investors. And, in fact, I believe it should be an American company that manages our ports. And with the cuts, we know what has happened in terms of our country becoming way too dependent on foreign oil.

And yet, if we are not careful with the proposed cuts to agriculture, we are going to become dependent on foreign countries like Brazil for our food and fiber. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that having a safe and reliable source for food and fiber here at home from America's farm families is every bit as much critical to our national security as oil is.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia made some good points. And, you know, this is not partisan debate. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. It may be the first time in 50 years the Republicans have controlled the White House, House and Senate. It may be the Republican leadership that has given us the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history for the sixth year in a row.

But it is not a Democrat or Republican issue, it is an American issue, because this debt, this reckless spending, affects all of us as citizens of this country and as taxpayers. And, Mr. Speaker, we are all citizens of this country, first and foremost.

But to validate what the gentleman from Georgia is saying, again I quote from David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States of America, found on page 28 of the Financial Report of the United States Government for 2005, "Continuing on this unsustainable path will gradually erode, if not suddenly damage our economy, our standard of living, and ultimately our national security."

He goes on to say, "More troubling still, the Federal Government's financial condition and long-term fiscal outlook is continuing to deteriorate."

And I cannot thank the gentleman from Tennessee enough for making the people of this country aware of this little-known document. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, you know the 9/11 Commission did a great job in their report. It became a best seller. It was in bookstores all over America, because everybody in America wanted to find out what really happened on that terrible day.

You know, this is a lot like the 9/11 Commission report, because it is very readable, and it needs to be in every bookstore in America. And yet hardly anyone in Congress has seen it, hardly anyone in the Senate has seen it. Everybody needs to read this document, because it is the annual report for America.

It reveals the terrible truth that the real 2005 fiscal deficit for America was not \$319 billion, it was \$760 billion. And every living American worker already today owes \$375,000 apiece. That is what this document says. It is not thick. If you do not find it in the bookstore yet, and it will be months probably before that happens, take it off the Web site.

Look at the BlueDogDemocrats.dot.com. If you do not trust our Web site, go to [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov), that is the Government Accountability Office, or download it from the U.S. Treasury Web site. But this is a truly startling and amazing document, and hardly anybody even knows it exists.

So I encourage folks not to take our word for it, go look at it yourself and see what you think about the fiscal finances of our country after you read this book.

Mr. ROSS. Now we have about 6 or 7 minutes left this evening to talk about being good stewards of our tax money, about being good stewards of the public trust.

But as I promised at the beginning of this hour, our national debt, about an hour ago, was \$8,270,909,436,190. In the last 60 minutes, our national debt has gone up approximately \$41,666,000.

Mr. COOPER. Forty-one million dollars in an hour?

Mr. ROSS. In 60 minutes, in 1 hour, our national debt has increased to the tune of approximately \$41,666,000 and some change. And so you can see an hour ago what the debt was: \$8,270,909,436,190. That is no longer true. It is now \$8,270,951,102,190.

Mr. COOPER. That much damage was done to our Nation's future just in 1 hour.

Mr. ROSS. In the last hour.

Mr. COOPER. And that will continue every hour, every night.

Mr. ROSS. Again, we have got to be good stewards of our tax money. We have got to be good stewards of this country. We have got to get our Nation's fiscal house back in order. We must restore fiscal responsibility to our government. It affects every one of us in a lot of different ways.

For example, our Nation is spending a half a billion dollars a day with a "B," 500 million, a half a billion every day, simply paying interest on the national debt.

We could finish I-69 in Arkansas, creating all kinds of jobs and economic opportunities, just with 3 days' interest on the national debt, or I-49, again with 3 days' interest on the national debt.

Many of America's priorities are going to continue to go unmet. Many of America's needs are going to go unmet, from health care to education to veterans to infrastructure, until we get our Nation's fiscal house back in order.

The Blue Dog Coalition has a way to do that. It is a 12-point plan, and the first and foremost of all of those 12 points is require a balanced budget. Forty-nine States do. My wife requires one in our household in Prescott, Arkansas.

The family business my wife and I own, our banker requires us to have a balanced budget. And it is time for this Nation, it is time for the politicians in Washington to have a balanced budget for our Nation.

I yield to the gentlemen from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is very important to point out, and you touched upon it, that just the interest, just the interest alone, is nearly \$200 billion.

Now just think about that. This money that we are borrowing, we have to pay for. You got to add in the \$200 billion in interest on top of that, which is more than five times the amount that we spend on education, the environment, and veterans care put together.

I submit to you, my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition, I just hope that the American people have been listening to us tonight, and I believe that they have. I hope that we have awakened a sleeping giant. Because, like I say, we are here and we are gone tomorrow.

The President does not have to run anymore. He does not have to go out and face the people. I believe, quite honestly, if he had to go out and face the people, I do not think he would have made that deal with the Arab immigrants. I do not think he would have done that.

But the fundamental question we have to go back to is from this star-

ting information that you have brought to us, the question has to be, why? Why are we just discovering it and why is this great discrepancy there?

There are some serious questions that have to be answered by this administration. But you know what? They are not going to answer these questions unless and until we in Congress stand up and represent the interests of the American people and put their feet to the fire. Once we do that, then we are truly standing up for America, and America deserves that.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for joining me this evening as we try to hold this Congress accountable and urge a good dose of common sense and fiscal responsibility.

For folks with questions or comments or concerns, I encourage them to e-mail us at [bluedogs@mail.house.gov](mailto:bluedogs@mail.house.gov), we are members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, [bluedogs@mail.house.gov](mailto:bluedogs@mail.house.gov). That is [bluedogs@mail.house.gov](mailto:bluedogs@mail.house.gov).

And, Mr. Speaker, we are here this evening for a simple reason and a simple cause; that is, to try and be good stewards for this Nation of the tax money and the trust that has been placed in us for the people.

We think this Congress is letting the American people down. I yield back.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

#### ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, you know, last week I was sitting in the Chair when some of this same material was being presented here on the floor. And I jotted down some notes, thinking, well, one of these days I hope I am going to have a chance to make some comments about some of those things that are being said, not knowing I was going to be asked tonight to come over here and use some of the Special Order, because a couple of my colleagues were called away who had planned to be here tonight. So I am doing this at sort of the last minute.

But I found my notes from last week, and I wanted to talk a little bit about some of the comments that were made last week, again on this issue, and some of the comments that are being made tonight. I am astonished again at the hypocrisy that is evident here on the floor of this House every day.

We have our Democratic colleagues standing up all of the time talking

about how we need to cut spending, cut spending, cut spending, and how we have got a debt. But when we bring in bills and give them the opportunity to cut spending, they vote against them.

Much of the spending that is occurring now is the result of Democratic programs that were begun in the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, that have been put on automatic pilot.

One of the first meetings I came to when I was elected to Congress last year, I heard people talking about mandatory spending and discretionary spending, and entitlements. And I got up and I said, you know, I have read the Constitution, and nowhere in the Constitution do I see the words mandatory spending, discretionary spending, or entitlements.

A large part of the problem that we have in this Congress is that we have people who think in those terms. They think in terms of entitlement, and they have helped create in this society an entitlement mentality.

And when the President proposes, and the Republicans propose to try to change that mentality, the Democrats vote against it. The President said last year, "We have got a terrible problem with Social Security. The problem is that we are going to run out of money. There is not enough money in Social Security."

And when the Social Security program was established back in the 1930s, nobody ever thought that anybody would get any money from it to begin with. The average age in those days was 59 years old. So they set Social Security up to be collected when people became 65, assuming nobody would collect from Social Security.

But lo and behold, this country has prospered and people are living a lot longer.

□ 2215

The average age now is about 78 years. People are thinking that they can retire at 65 and live on their Social Security, and that is just not possible. So the process makes a proposal, let us do something about Social Security.

Let us explain to the American people that the Congress controlled by the Democrats for over 40 years, as they admitted tonight, spent that money as it came in, did not put it aside for Social Security. I am ashamed to say that Republicans have done the same thing. They came in and they spent the money on Social Security. But people are waking up to the problem and the President says, let us do something about it. Let us create personal Social Security accounts. Let us put people's Social Security money into an account with their name on it, give them some options about where that money is going to be invested, and let them know what they are going to get when they retire. No more of this fooling the American people into thinking that they have paid in a certain amount of money and it is going to let them live in the style to which they have become accustomed while they worked.

It is a cruel hoax that has been perpetrated on the American people. The average Social Security payment now is \$921. I do not know anybody who can live on \$921 a month; but when we tried to bring in proposals to do something about it, the Democrats shot them down. The Democrats go out and use terrible language to scare people to legislate about what is going to happen with Social Security. They talk tonight about lack of accountability. We really do need accountability in this country. We need accountability for all of us. We have to individually be accountable, and the Congress needs to be accountable. And part of our attempt to be accountable is to explain to people what the problems were with Social Security.

The Democrats just want to hide their head in the sand about it. They want to put the problem off and off and off. They do not want to deal with that. But it is a program that has developed an entitlement mentality in this country, and we have got to change that.

They talk about lack of accountability, and they talk about that in terms of FEMA. And I wonder, all of these people are talking about that and criticizing FEMA tonight for not having a plan and not being accountable, all of them voted for the Katrina money, all of them voted to give that money out with no plan and with no sense of accountability. Just a very small number of us voted against that because we wanted a plan and we wanted accountability.

Again, the hypocrisy is simply unbelievable when it comes to these folks. They talked last week about how local communities have become dependent on the Federal Government, the COPS program, education funding, all of these programs that are being funded at the State level and at the local level. Again, that has developed a sense of entitlement. When the Democrats were in charge of the Federal Government, they wanted people to come to them and ask for the money, and they wanted to be the people with largess in giving out that money. Unfortunately, we have developed that mentality in the country that local and State governments should be dependent on the Federal Government.

There is nothing in the Constitution that says the Federal Government has any business being involved in education. And yet we are funding huge dollars in education and that, again, has developed a sense of entitlement for the local people. They think the Federal Government should be giving them this money. It is a real travesty because those dollars come to the Federal Government and just a portion of them go back to the local and State governments. Whereas, if we did not take that money to begin with and left it at the State and local levels, the folks would be gaining much, much more from it, and they would be able to spend that money the way they want to spend it instead of based on the

ideas of Federal bureaucrats who want to do that or even, perish the thought, some Members of Congress who decide how it should be done.

They went on and on and on about how any potential cuts would be cutting services at the local level. And yet they say we need to cut the deficit. I really hope that the American people are going to be smart enough to see that these folks are talking out of both sides of their mouths. They want to cut the deficit, and yet they want to increase spending. They want to increase spending for things that are constitutionally Congress, things that the Federal Government has no business doing; and yet they want to put us deeper in debt, ultimately to have to raise taxes. They know that that is going to be the net result of it. And it is unbelievable to me how they can get on the floor every night and talk about that.

They talked about Congress is living for today, leaving a burden to our children; we should be paying our own way. Well, again, last fall we had a reconciliation bill that would not only cut spending but cut the growth of spending. Did any Democrats vote for that? No. Not a single one. The only people who voted for that were Republicans and not all Republicans voted for that. But there were many, many of us who understood we have simply got to rein in the appetite of the Federal Government for spending. We simply cannot continue at the level at which we are going. And yet there are many people who are frightened to try to cut the Federal budget because they know that this will be used against them, that the issues will be distorted.

When we cut growth, we are accused of cutting programs. We are not cutting programs. We are trying to cut growth. We made modest, modest changes in the spending for Medicaid in that reconciliation budget. We went from 7.3 percent growth to 7 percent. Modest changes. And what we tried to do was rein in the abuses. We tried to make sure that people would not be able to put their family members on long-term care for Medicaid and avoid paying for that themselves.

Part of that mentality that has developed in this country is that we have an entitlement society. I talk to my colleagues a lot about the use of language, and I have said the words we use are important to us. When we stand up here and we talk about "mandatory spending" and "discretionary spending" as both Republicans and Democrats do, I will have to say then we are creating a mindset for people. We are saying there is such a thing as mandatory spending. And, again, if we look at the Constitution, which ought to be the basis for why we do everything in this country, we never see those words "mandatory spending" and "discretionary spending."

Congress is in charge of spending, and it is entirely appropriate that budget bills come out of the House of Representatives. That is our job and we

should continue to do that. But we have got to break the habit of talking about discretionary and mandatory spending. The only mandatory spending that the Congress should be doing is to provide for a national defense. That is the main role of the Federal Government, and we have to remember that. We have to remember that it is our job as a Federal Government to provide for the defense of this country. State governments cannot do that. Local governments cannot do that. The Federal Government is the only government entity that can do that. That is why we are fighting a war in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and all over this world we are fighting a war on terrorism. We did not create the war. The war came to us. But it is our responsibility as a Federal Government to do that.

I often wonder how we would have been able to have stayed in World War II, to win that war and to defeat the Nazis and to defeat fascism if we had had the kind of press that we have now and the kind of naysayers that we have on the other side of the aisle. They would have gotten us out of that war long before we won that war because of the kinds of approaches that they have.

They do not understand the role of the Federal Government. They do not understand that that is what it is we should be about here. They want to do things that we have no business being involved in, providing 100,000 policemen across this Nation. We certainly do want to help the local governments solve their crime problems, but the way we can do that is get the Federal Government out of the way and let them do that at the local level, not by providing a pittance of money and then holding all kinds of strings attached to it and not allowing them to spend that money the way they need to spend it at the local level, just like we do in education, just like we do in other areas.

Last week when my colleagues were here talking about things that we should be doing and should not be doing, they brought up the issue of health care and talked about how we should not be cutting any kinds of funds out of Medicare. They talked about the Medicare part D plan and how it is not saving taxpayer dollars. They are going out and holding town hall meetings and talking about what a bad program it is and then encouraging the people in their districts to sign up for it. So, again, they are talking out of both sides of their mouths.

They talked last week about let us back up our promises by fully funding health care and education, and yet tonight they are standing up here and they are saying we have got to cut the deficit. We have got to cut back on spending. We are leaving a debt to our children. And I am quoting from last week again: "We back up our promises by fully funding our health care and education priorities."

What does that mean “fully funding” that? As far as I know, that is what socialists do. They fully fund their programs and keep people dependent on the Federal Government or on the type of centralized government that they have. They are saying that if we get out of doing business at the local and State level, then we are going to force the local and State agents or governments to raise taxes. Again, they do not understand the proper role of the Federal Government. It is up to the locals to decide what they want to do in education and what they want to do with policing.

They talked about the Federal Government would renege on its fundamental commitment to community safety by cutting the money going out for the COPS program. Nowhere do I see again in the Constitution “community safety.” I do see where it is up to the Federal Government to provide for an army and for national defense, but it is not our job to be doing that.

They say we are making progress in the battle against methamphetamines. Today in the PATRIOT Act we had the major methamphetamine legislation that is probably going to pass in this session of Congress, very, very important legislation worked on by many Members of Congress. Did they vote for it? No, they voted against it. Did they vote for the PATRIOT Act so that we could have the tools that we need to make sure that terrorists cannot come back here and do to us what happened on 9/11 because of a lack of effective dealing with that under the previous administration, ignoring all the signs that terrorists were going to be doing these kinds of things? No. They voted against it.

They really do believe that nobody is paying attention or that the people who are paying attention are only going to be hearing some of what they need to be hearing. They think that we are not going to call their hand when they are being hypocritical and when they are out and out lying.

Last week they talked about the higher education bill increasing the cost of college loans. That is absolutely wrong. What we are doing in the higher education act is to help students be able to get loans at a lower rate and have to pay back less money than they have had to pay back under Democratic administrations and under Democratic Congresses that want to make these loans more expensive and to keep people unsure of what it is they are paying for.

They talk about the fact that many people in our country are poor because they have not had the opportunities to be as prosperous as others; but what they want to do, they say, is have the Federal Government make them not poor. Again, that is socialism as I understand it.

□ 2230

What we have to do in this country is provide for opportunities to people. We

are the freest country in the world. There is no place in the world where folks have the opportunities that they have in the United States of America. They can choose to go to college. They can choose to do any kind of work they want to do. They can do all kinds of things to create prosperity for themselves. The government is not going to create prosperity.

There is one place last week, and I have to find the point that I was trying to make, where they talked about government investment in programs. Every time I hear that phrase “government investment,” it is like somebody scraping their fingernails across a blackboard for me. The government does not invest in programs. Government spends money. People invest in themselves and invest money, but the government does not do that. We do not get a payback on the money that the government spends. It is spent and it is gone.

Now, the government has certain obligations; we all know that. Again, most of the obligations are at the local and State level, not at the Federal level, but what our colleagues would like you to believe is that the Federal Government can fix anything.

They talk about the problems with Katrina and the problems with FEMA. I would contend that they, again, are talking out of both sides of their mouth. They believe that the Federal Government can fix everything so that what we should be doing is putting more money into FEMA, putting more money into these programs. The Federal Government is not equipped to do that. The Federal Government should not be the first responder.

In the Katrina situation, all levels of government, in my opinion, failed. I think none of them were prepared for what happened, but it is wrong to expect the Federal Government to go in and act like a first responder. The Federal Government should go in and take care of those things that the State and local governments cannot take care of. Leaving all those buses parked in New Orleans, not getting people out when they were told to get out, that was the responsibility of the local and State governments. That was not the responsibility of FEMA. That was not the responsibility of the Federal Government, and yet, all that is lumped into the discussions of the failure of the Federal Government.

I am sorry, but I just do not think we are going to take that blame at this level. There is plenty of blame to go around for what things the Federal Government does not do, but we are not going to take the blame of not being prepared and not taking care of those people in New Orleans. That was the responsibility of those local and State elected officials, and it is a real shame that they did not do that.

I think I will use my glass as an illustration. I have got it just about half full. Some people would say it is half empty. I think that this is an illustra-

tion of the problem that our colleagues see. Everything they see about this country is negative, negative, negative, negative. They have almost nothing good to say about it. You hear them night after night after night talking about the United States and talking about our government. You hear them only condemning, only saying negative things.

I happen to think that we live in the best country in the world and that we are doing a lot of things right. We are not a perfect country. None of us who are in elected office are perfect people, but we work hard at it, and we try to do the kinds of things that will make this country a better place.

I think always talking down the country and talking in negative terms is a very bad thing to do, and our colleagues, along with their willing accomplices, the mainstream media, do that all the time. You never hear the good news about what is going on in the economy, but there are a lot of good things going on in the economy. All they do is talk about negative things, and I am frankly tired of hearing them say that.

I want to point out some facts about the positive things about our economy. It has been growing for 17 straight quarters. You never hear that from the mainstream media. You never hear that from our colleagues.

The National Association for Business Economics predicts the economy will grow at a 4.5 percent rate in the first quarter of 2006. What is responsible for that? It is not because of government spending. The government does not create that kind of prosperity. That is created because of tax cuts and slowing down the rate of spending. But the tax cuts that the President proposed and this Congress instituted in the last 3 years are what is responsible for the positive things that have been happening in our economy.

After inflation, disposable incomes increased 2.2 percent in the last 12 months. You never hear that, again, out of our colleagues.

The Federal Reserve has reported that the median net worth of U.S. households increased 1.5 percent between 2001 and 2004. That is great news. We never read about it in the media.

January's unemployment rate fell to 4.7 percent, the lowest monthly rate since 2001, and lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Those are decades when Democrats were in control in the Congress. The unemployment rate was lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. I think many of us can remember when interest rates in the 1970s were reaching 20 percent. It has been a long time since we have seen high interest rates and high inflation in this country. That has all come about in a Republican administration and a Republican-controlled Congress.

There have been 29 consecutive months of job gains in this country. That has come about not because of

government investment, additional government spending. That has come about because of cuts in taxes, which left the money in the hands of entrepreneurs and the people who create capital and create jobs, not coming from the government.

Our folks on the other side of the aisle can continue to spend. They, again, and their willing colleagues in the media and in Hollywood, they can try to change what are the facts, the people from the left, but the economy is strong, and it is growing stronger every day under Republican leadership.

Do I want to see spending cut even more? You are right. Do I want to see tax cuts made permanent? You are absolutely right. We need to do that. We need to make the tax cuts permanent, and we need to cut our spending so we put more money into the hands of the entrepreneurs and into the hands of business people who can truly create wealth, who can create jobs. The government cannot do that.

I am asked a lot of times by school groups, what is the difference between Democrats and Republicans. Well, there are a lot of differences between us, but usually we are in a time crunch and I do not have a whole lot of time to explain all of the differences. So I tell folks I am going to give them the short version of what is the difference between Democrats and Republicans. It really is sort of at the nub of the issue between what is the difference between us.

Democrats think that government can solve all of our problems: Take all the money you can from the public, give it to the government, let the government solve our problems. Republicans believe that Americans work hard for their money and they should be allowed to keep as much money as they possibly can; the government should only step in to do those things that people cannot do for themselves.

The Democrats have turned that on its head. It would be cradle to grave. Again, socialism. They would do their best to try to take care of everybody. It would not be a very pretty picture, though. We can already see that. The hand of government in so many things in our country now is taking away a lot of the incentive for people to work. It is creating, again, this culture of entitlement, which we have to get away from.

The Declaration of Independence in our country talks about the pursuit of happiness, not the delivery of happiness to the people from the Federal Government. We are free to pursue happiness and pursue prosperity.

There are some other good things about this economy that I want to share. Earlier this week, the Commerce Department reported that consumer spending shot up by nine-tenths of 1 percent in January, the strongest gain in 6 months. In addition, Americans' personal incomes rose by seven-tenths of 1 percent, the highest rate since September. Again, our economy has a posi-

tive momentum, and that momentum is the direct result of a pro-growth agenda from the Republican-led Congress and our Republican President.

□ 2240

It is the Republicans who are proposing that we slow down the rate of spending and that we leave more money in the hands of the American people. We want to have improved fiscal responsibility and at the same time show our commitment to continuing economic growth. We are the party that is working to improve the lives of the American people by lowering taxes, enacting legal reform, decreasing government interference into the lives of entrepreneurs and small business owners. That is what we have to do.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to continue to promote their tax-and-spend policies because they think they know how to spend the American people's hard-earned money better than they do. However, I think the Republicans know better than that and will prevail on this issue.

I hear a lot from my constituents about the high cost of health care, and I have used this analogy before: when I grew up, I grew up in the mountains of North Carolina, extremely poor, no electricity, no running water. My family was very poor. There were no jobs in those days in that part of North Carolina, but my family could afford health care. Even though we had very little money, both my parents worked, and I began working when I was 12 years old; but health care was not as expensive as it is now, and everybody that I knew of could afford health care. But almost nobody had insurance.

In fact, I guess only school teachers maybe who worked in our county, may have had health care through the State of North Carolina; but nobody else that I know of had health insurance, and so people could afford to go to the doctor when they got sick.

Now, we didn't run to the doctor for every little thing; but when we truly needed health care, we could get it, and we could pay our bills for it. I remember that very, very clearly.

However, what has happened in the last 50 years? Why has health care become so unaffordable for people? Why has the cost of health insurance gotten so high? I contend that the reason that has happened is because of the third-party payer. And the biggest third-party payer is the Federal Government. Any time you get the Federal Government involved in something, it is going to drive up the cost of that commodity. We know that. We have seen it happen in lots and lots of cases, but I do not think there is any case where it is more clearly the case than it is with health care.

The fact that we have gotten involved in Medicare and Medicaid is driving up the cost of health care. We also see that Medicare and Medicaid determine what is going to be paid out in other programs, because that is the

benchmark that insurance companies use. And so because people are getting their health care primarily from the government or from a third-party payer, folks are not scrutinizing how much it is costing. They do not care. They just say, okay, if an aspirin costs \$150, that is okay, I am not paying for it. Insurance is paying for it.

It is again a part of that entitlement mentality we have created and taking away the personal responsibility that we used to have so much of in this country. Because of government programs, we are diminishing the sense of personal responsibility and increasing the sense of entitlement. Slowly but surely, we are changing the entire culture of this country.

When I served in the North Carolina senate, I had a good friend from Asheville, North Carolina, who served with me and who used a wonderful analogy many times, and I think it is a great one to use here. What he would say is: if you throw a frog in a pot of hot water, he will jump out of it. But if you put a frog in a pot of cold water and then you gradually turn up the heat a little at a time, pretty soon that frog will be cooked and he wouldn't even notice it.

That is what has happened in this country over the years. We have turned up the role of the Federal Government, we have turned up the sense of dependency on the government, and what we are doing is we are creating major problems for our country. We are creating an entitlement mentality which we have to break ourselves away from or else we are going to find that we have a whole generation of people that think it is the government that should take care of them.

That is what I think my Democratic colleagues want, because they believe in the power of the government. Republicans believe in the power of the individual and of individual responsibility. And I think this is a message we are going to have to keep telling. It is going to take a long time, I think, for it to get out and for it to be absorbed and for people to be able to see the wisdom; but it is something we are going to need to talk about more and more.

And we have to talk about it honestly. We cannot continue the hypocrisy that is being used by our colleagues who talk on the one hand about decreasing spending but on the other hand taking care of everybody from the cradle to the grave and doing everything from the Federal Government level.

#### THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to once again address the

U.S. House of Representatives. We would like to thank the Democratic leadership for the time, Democratic leader NANCY PELOSI, and our Democratic whip, Mr. STENY HOYER, and also Mr. JAMES CLYBURN, who is our chairperson.

Also, we would like to come to the floor once again, Mr. Speaker, to share not only with the Members but with the American people the priorities not only of the Democratic Party, but of this side of the aisle on the Democratic side, and also the priorities of all Americans. Our vice chair, Mr. JOHN LARSON, communicates in the best way to many, many Democrats, Republicans, and Independents about our plan on this side of the aisle.

It would not be a plan, it would actually be action if we were in the majority. I think it is important to come up with a comprehensive approach, Mr. Speaker, and using a team effort to move us in the right direction as a country; whether it be homeland security, innovation, affordable health care, or other initiatives that we all embrace. If we can come together in a bipartisan way, then America will be stronger, and also other countries throughout the world will be stronger based on our leadership.

Unfortunately, we are not providing that leadership right now. When I say "we," I am talking about the Republican majority coming together with Democrats and finding a bipartisan way to approach many of the issues that are facing our country right now. That is very, very unfortunate. The work of the 30-something Working Group is to make sure that we can promote ideas that all Americans embrace, not just Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, but all Americans, even those that are not taking part in the voting process that we have throughout the country.

One may call it apathy of voting, but I think that I would phrase it as a number of Americans having very little trust in this system, very little trust in what goes on here in the Congress, very little trust in what happens over at the White House. And I think it is very, very important that we have a paradigm shift. I will go further and add that we need a shift in thinking here in Washington, DC, so that all Americans feel a part of this process; so that all Americans feel that they are being leveled with; and that all Americans know that the individuals that they elected from their communities, their cities or counties, that they have their best interests at heart when they come here to the U.S. House of Representatives.

□ 2250

Today we are going to talk about a number of issues, issues that are facing everyday Americans and things that we should be promoting here as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, some of the things I think are very disturbing that not only I am reading in the paper but Americans are

reading in the paper and watching on the news.

The whole issue as it relates to port deals, America being sold off not by foreign countries but by the policy that we pass here on this floor that have accumulated more debt in 4 years to foreign nations, foreign nations are buying U.S. debt, unprecedented in the history of the Republic. Ever since we have been a country, no other time such as this time have other countries owned so much of our debt. I think it is important for us to remember because there are a number of my constituents and a number of Americans that have fought hard. Literally, their grandparents have fought hard for them to salute one flag. I think we are putting that spirit, that good history that we have and the future they fought for to allow our children and grandchildren to salute one flag, not to have foreign interests owning our debt. I think it is very, very important that we pay close attention to that.

I am glad to be joined tonight by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from South Florida.

Congresswoman, I am glad we are continuing to have a level of consistency on not only challenging the Republican majority. The gentlewoman knows if we were in the majority, it would not be talk. We would be on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives talking about things that would make the lives better of Americans. I think the only thing that is stopping us from doing that is having enough votes in this House to have that vision turn into reality. I look forward to that day because I believe in this year Americans will have an opportunity to be able to promote their ideas and what they feel. Be it a Democrat, a Republican, a Green Party or an Independent, or a brand new voter, they will be able to have their voice heard.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is a pleasure to join the gentleman for our 30-something Working Group hour.

When I have been home in the community you and I share, I noticed, and this feeling is so palpable among the average voter, the average citizen in America, and I have been to several different cities in the last number of weeks, and to a person, regardless of party, Americana' confidence in their government has been badly shaken, and badly shaken because they look to the leadership here, the Republican leadership, because we do not control a thing. They have the Presidency, the House and the Senate. So when I say that their confidence in their government and leadership is badly shaken, it is essentially the fault of the Republican leadership. It is so disturbing.

I have only been in the Congress a year. I could list countless examples and share with people who have expressed their frustration and their sadness and their angst. My first year in Congress was capped by the bookends, starting 10 weeks into my service here, with the Terri Schiavo case and ending

the year with the confirmation of Judge Alito, now Justice Alito, to the Supreme Court who obviously we fear will further erode the right to privacy that we began the year eroding with the Terry Schiavo case.

If you look in between, sandwiched between those bookends, we have Hurricane Katrina, this port deal, we have the deficit. You have the debt, you have now the debt limit that we are struggling with, the budget reconciliation bill, the countless irresponsible budget cuts and the privatization of Social Security, the Medicare prescription drug fiasco, who the senior citizens that the gentleman and I represent, they are just in tears. They do not know what to do. Just in our community alone, there are 43 different plans offered by 18 different companies. It is pure insanity.

So it is no wonder that our constituents and the American people are frustrated. Their confidence in their leadership is badly shaken. Our responsibility over the next several months is going to be to help restore that confidence because we have that ability. We have an agenda and the things that we would do if we were here would restore that confidence, and those are the kinds of things that we talk about on this floor.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We like third-party validators, and I think it is important for the American people to understand this is not something that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. RYAN or other members of the 30-something Working Group just dream up. I think it is important as an American, leave alone a Member of Congress. I am alarmed and very, very concerned about what is happening. I have children. I pray to God that they have children and the family line continues.

But I am concerned about right now. I am concerned about what is happening as relates to the irresponsible policies that have been passed by the Republican majority.

We are all friends. We all put our pants on one leg at a time, or what have you, but I think it is important that we alert Americans about this unprecedented time in the history of the country. I am saying right now as we speak, this moment.

I want to hold up, this is an article that came out today. It is an AP story. Any of the Members in their office can pull this up from the AP Web site. I think it is important. It says "Treasury Details Its Steps to Avoid Debt Limit." I want to read a couple of paragraphs here. Treasury Secretary John Snow, and this is Secretary Snow, he is a good guy. He is just an accountant for the United States of America. We appreciate his service and what he does in the Treasury Department. But John Snow told the Congress yesterday that the administration has taken all prudent and legal actions, to include tapping certain government retirement funds, to keep from reaching the \$8.2 trillion national debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about this because now we are tapping into funds that not only Federal workers but the people on the United States of America count on us to be able to govern correctly. In a letter to Congress, Snow urged lawmakers to pass a new debt ceiling immediately to avoid the first default on obligations in U.S. history.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about something that I embellished. This is what Mr. Snow said from the Treasury Department.

If I am the Republican majority, leave alone the leadership, I would be alarmed. I would sit up in my bed and say, we have to do something about it. What is unfortunate is that I know, as sure as my name is KENDRICK MEEK, representing Florida's 17th Congressional District, and by that we have been validated to represent the people of the United States of America, I know the Republican majority is going to rubber-stamp what Secretary Snow needs, because it is an outrageous example of the kind of spending and borrowing that this majority has taken us into.

I think it is important to promote what we have been trying to do on this floor as Democrats, time after time again, promoting pay-as-you-go versus borrowing. We are not out of control, the Republican majority is out of control. It is not just me name calling or finger pointing. This is fact, not fiction. I can see if it were fiction and if we were doing what we call in Washington, DC, the Potomac two step. I go left, you go right; no, this is what is printed not only in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when you have the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Republican Senate, we have to be very alarmed. For Republicans and Independents that are paying attention to what we are saying on this floor, and other parties, they cannot say oh, that is just the Democrats glossing over the facts.

□ 2300

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am a freshman, and I have only been here a year, and I see this chart in between us. I am wondering, is this potential increase in the debt limit unprecedented? Is it the first time it has happened? Just illuminate for me what the history of debt limit increases is, if there is one.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, there have been in this Republican House, and I am just going to talk about President Bush being in office, this Republican majority, I am going to point the letters out and let you go ahead and drive your point.

December 29, a letter written, Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of 2005, the closing days, the 29th. Americans think about what they were doing on the 29th. Many Americans were off work, those that had jobs and what have you,

celebrating with their families, thinking about the new year.

Secretary Snow found his way to the office to send this letter to one of our colleagues over in the Congress, over in the Senate, that says, "We must raise the debt limit or we will be unable to continue to finance government operations."

That is just for this round. I mean, I think it is important that we get staff to be able to get the rest of the letters that Secretary Snow wrote.

Here is a letter just written in February, February 16. This letter is to the ranking member, Mr. JOHN SPRATT, who is the ranking member on the Democratic side, again saying, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we must do this now, Mr. Speaker, saying we must raise this debt limit as soon as possible or they are going to have to go into the Federal retirement system and stop paying into that system.

I want to say to the Federal workers, because we believe in third party validators and also believe in telling the truth, the Secretary goes on to say, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, he believes once the debt limit is raised, we will be able to pay back into the retirement system.

These letters are coming so fast and furious, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we can't get them up on the big board. Here is a letter, March 6, that was just yesterday. Secretary Snow, this is alarming, he is saying, did you receive my two letters beforehand?

Then he talks to the press. We have a problem. NASA is also located in Florida, but also in Houston, but Houston, we have a problem. He is saying to the United States Congress, we have a problem.

How did we come about the problem and having to raise the debt ceiling? It is because of the policies of the Republican majority that have rubber stamped everything the President said do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, yes, there are a number of letters and alarms going off.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I have another question. In looking over our third party validators, I am wondering if you have got the Secretary of the Treasury setting off alarm bells and really saying that there is fire in the theater, why is it that we have not seen an increase in the debt limit on the floor? Could it perhaps be that that is something that the Republican leadership thinks is unwise to have their Members vote on? Is it that this is not the first time, as I asked you earlier, that the debt limit has been increased?

In looking at this chart just in the last few minutes, I notice that in June of 2002 the debt limit was increased by \$450 billion. And who was President then?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. President Bush.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I believe President Bush was in office then. In May of 2003, the debt limit was in-

creased by another \$984 billion, with a B. In November of 2004, the year of the election, \$800 billion. We have a \$781 billion increase pending now, with a total increase of \$3.015 trillion.

When President Clinton was in office, I was in the State legislature then, for a time until you were elected to Congress you were too, we had a system in place called PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, which it is my understanding is similar to the way people prefer in America to run their households, where you do not spend money that you don't have, unlike what is going on under the Republican leadership where they appear to enjoy spending like drunken sailors and "no" doesn't appear to be possible under this administration, unless, of course, it is to talk about continuing tax cuts for the wealthiest. We say "yes" to that. We say "yes" to anything politically that they want to advance. The "no" is to people who can't afford health care, cutting Medicaid. The "no" that they propose to say is to people who are struggling to pay for higher education.

So, if we went back to PAYGO rules, which we have proposed time and again and they have rejected time and again, then we would be again in a situation where it wouldn't be necessary to increase the debt limit because we would be only spending money that we have.

Here is another third party validator, which is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In 2006, in this budget resolution, of course it was defeated, 228 Republicans voted against it, it was defeated 264-165 when we proposed to return to the pay-as-you-go rules. Then again last year, it was defeated 232-194 and 224 Republicans voted against it.

So, to me to break this down in more simple terms, because PAYGO and billions and trillions and debt limit is something that if you are not dealing with it on a daily basis, it is somewhat difficult to understand, one of the things we like to do here is break things down for people that may be listening into regular terms, into the things that they deal with every day.

So I thought, Mr. Speaker, it would be a good idea, because a billion is a very big number, a billion is a hard concept to grasp, because most people don't deal in the billions when they are dealing with their everyday normal activity, so let's try to define what a billion is in the way that people think about things in their daily life.

Broken down, a billion hours ago, for example, humans were making their first tools in the stone age. That is how much a billion hours ago was, if you are thinking about what a billion means.

Let's think about what happened a billion seconds ago. A billion seconds ago it was 1975 and the last American troops had just pulled out of Vietnam. That is how big a billion is. We are in 2006. That was 30 years, 31 years ago.

A billion minutes ago it was 104 A.D., Mr. Speaker, and the Chinese first invented paper. That is how long ago it

was, if you think about a billion in terms of minutes.

Then a billion dollars ago, under this administration and under the Republican leadership, a billion dollars ago was only 3 hours and 32 minutes at the rate that the administration and this Republican Congress spends money.

So we have a billion hours ago, it was the stone age; a billion seconds ago, it was 31 years ago; a billion minutes ago, it was 104 A.D. and we were first talking about the invention of paper. But under the Republican leadership and this administration, a billion dollars ago was only 3 hours 32 minutes at the rate of spending under this administration and the Congressional leadership. It is just astonishing, it really is, if you think about it, broken down in this way.

All the American people want is their confidence restored. All they want to see is that the people here in this Chamber are using their heads and applying some common sense and thinking about the budget and the money that we spend in the way they would like to think about their own household budget, spending the money that we have, spending it wisely, spending it on things that they care about, not giving away the store, which unfortunately, it appears to be the direction that we have been going in.

We are giving away the store in so many ways. Like the port deal, for example. We represent Miami, both of us. I represent Fort Lauderdale. I have both Port Everglades and the port of Miami abutting my district.

I went down to the port of Miami, you and I have both been there, it is one of the six ports that the Dubai Ports World deal impacts, and for the people that I have talked to in our community and the calls and communications I have been getting, it defies logic. They really just cannot believe that the President does not understand why people are so deeply concerned that we would have a foreign government-owned corporation running the terminal operations at six of our major ports.

This is not just any government, this is a government that just 5 years ago was involved directly, indirectly, in both tangential and more substantive ways in the 9/11 attacks.

□ 2310

There were 58 references in the 9/11 Commission Report to the United Arab Emirates and their involvement, either through allowing the 9/11 financing to be funneled through their banks, or just the fact that two of the 9/11 terrorists lived in the United Arab Emirates.

But the astonishing thing is that there were no national security reviews triggered under the law when the administration's committee that reviewed these deals took a look at it. There were no alarm bells set off. And that is even more astonishing because it is not even like we are checking the vast majority of containers and goods

that come through our ports. Less than 6 percent, if you take a look at this chart, less than 6 percent of U.S. cargo coming through our ports is physically inspected, Mr. Speaker. Ninety-five percent is not inspected, 5 percent is inspected.

And that is in spite of the fact that Democrats have repeatedly proposed increasing the funding so that we can ensure more of the cargo coming through our ports is inspected. Literally what I learned when I went to the Port of Miami, Mr. MEEK, is that in the last 5 years we have increased our security funding at our airports by \$18 billion, which is a good thing. I mean that is absolutely essential.

And we have increased our port security funding by \$700 million. Now, if you remember, I just went over the difference of what a billion means. So \$18 billion on airport security, less than \$700 million on port security.

I mean, you cannot rest our Nation's security on taking your shoes off as you go through the magnetometer at an airport. That cannot be the sum total of the additional security that we have increased since 9/11. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think the point was, and we were all campaigning during the initial vote for the war. But I remember making the argument as I was campaigning, as I think a lot of other Democrats were here in the House, instead of going off to war, the alternative was, now we are spending a billion and a half dollars a week in Iraq, I think one of the alternative proposals was to fund this stuff, take care of the Nation's security, take care of the ports, make sure that we have enough people to do the kind of real inspection that we think needs to be done instead of spending the money elsewhere.

And when you think about it in a logical way, that this money is going to be spent to hire American workers to protect America, it makes a lot of sense.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It has just been astonishing to me. I literally have had more calls in a shorter period of time on this issue from constituents, and not the organized calls, not the calls that groups generate, that they, you know, send an e-mail out to their members and say, call your Congresswoman, here is her phone number.

This is Joe and Jane Average Constituent who saw the news or read the newspaper or listened to the radio and called me and said, you know, what is going on here? Do these people not get it? How could they not get it? I have had little old ladies crying on the other end of the phone in my district office because the flames that have been fanned so much by this administration on the terror threat and national security, which is understandable because we really needed to raise the level of concern in America about being conscious of our own security. That is understandable.

But for the President to be shocked by the American people's reaction, that is what is so astonishing, that they are really the victims, I guess. Their decision is really the result of their own magnification of this issue. And, you know, that they have not responded with the funding that we need to enhance port security is just truly shocking.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to make this point too, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, we are not saying that when the Democrats take over in January that all of a sudden we are going to inspect every single ship that comes into the United States of America. That is not what we are saying.

But what we are saying, first is because we are going to have to start balancing the budget and start plugging a lot of the holes that the Republican majority will have left us to clean up, what we are saying is, 5 percent of the cargo coming in is a small amount.

And when the Democrats are in charge, we want to refocus our efforts on port security and make a little bit more of an effort. So it may not be 100 percent, but we are saying that it is a priority for us to make this kind of investment.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The question, Mr. Speaker here is, does the Republican majority have the will and the desire to make the kind of change we need to take or make to protect this country? The will and the desire.

Now, the will may be there, but the desire is questionable. And I think it is important, because there are other priorities that the Republican majority, and I would say some of them join in with some of us Democrats, very few, unfortunately, it is in the single digits, because we are not able to promote some of things that we need to promote to protect this country.

Now over the weekend, there were a lot of pundits out there talking about, wow, you know, this thing may very well change, this thing meaning the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, because the Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, has fumbled the ball time after time again.

Since this is now NCAA time, they have lost the ball when they were supposed to shoot a shot on behalf of protecting this country. The other team is taking it the other way. I think it is important to get in the spirit. We have to break this thing down so that we all understand. Some people say we need to put the cookie on the bottom shelf so that everyone can reach.

I think it is important. I am using a metaphor, but I think it is important that everyone understands. Folks are wondering why we are alarmed. Now I can tell you, I speak here with great confidence, Mr. Speaker, because I have the facts here not fiction. I think it is important, Mr. RYAN, that we share with people that on January 29, 2005, during a meeting of the House and Senate conferees, our ranking Member on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY, offered,

along with Senator BYRD, one of the longest-serving Senators over in the Senate, offered an amendment to increase funding for port and container security by \$300 million.

The house conferees defeated the amendment along party lines. When we say along party lines, I want to make sure the Members understand. That means Republicans voted one way against that, increasing the funding so that we can be able to do what was said, secure the containers more.

Can we get that container chart up here, because I want to make sure, just in case the Republican majority, some of the Members have their television turned down, that they are able to see what we are talking about. Because I think it is important. There it is right there. It is already there.

These containers here that are being checked, the 5 percent of them, and I am questioning that as a Member of the Homeland Security Committee if it is really 5 percent. As Democrats, Mr. Speaker, we are not saying that we want to do something about it, we are trying to do something about it. But the Republican majority is not allowing us to do so.

And we want to make sure that we share with them, because we want their constituents to know and we want our constituents to know that we are fighting on their behalf. All of us are Americans saluting one flag.

On October 7, 2005, during a meeting of House and Senate conferees, that is when House and Senate Members come together. When the House and Senate pass their individual bills, they select certain Members to be able to go into a room and work out the differences between that bill.

That goes back to in our generation a cartoon, I am Just a Bill in Capitol Hill. Again, Senator BYRD and Representative OBEY, offered an amendment to increase funding to enhance port security by \$150 million. Republicans defeated it on a party-line vote.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know you are getting on a roll.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I wanted to do a couple more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a point here. The last chart that we had up said that the Coast Guard is saying they need a \$7 billion increase in funding. Now you are reading these amendments.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, wait. Hasn't the President and the Republican majority said, we want to listen to people in the field and give them what they need when they ask for it? Am I correct?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is right. Again this is a third-party validator. This is from the Federal Register. Coast Guard estimate to implement the Maritime Transportation Security Act, how much money do we need to protect ourselves? \$7 billion.

What has the Republican Congress appropriated? \$900 million, .9 billion. So we have got a long way to go here

as you can see. So as Mr. MEEK is going to start reading this stuff, Mr. Speaker, this is billions.

Democrats were trying to put amendments on that were like \$150 million. We are not even trying to increase it all that much. But we are saying we tried a billion. We tried \$500 million.

□ 2320

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We are trying to work in a bipartisan way.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a \$6 billion gap between what the Coast Guard says they need and what the Republican Congress appropriated.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are making a strong point here, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, it is not a point. This is fact, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important that we say June 18, 2004, Democrats supported an amendment to increase port container security by \$400 million. Republicans have refused to allow it to be considered, the amendment to be considered. That means they moved on a procedural way.

June 9, 2004, Democrats supported Obey amendment once again in Appropriations Committee to increase container security by \$400 million. Republicans defeated it on a party-line vote. That is House report 108-541, page 128.

Now, we have all of this stuff that will be on the Web site, Mr. Speaker, so that other Members can get to it, and it goes on and on and on.

Enough of this, the Democrats do not have plans. That is what the majority wants you to believe. We have plans. Unfortunately, they cannot be reality because the Republican majority does not want to work in a bipartisan way. And it is upsetting. It is beyond upsetting because our country is being jeopardized. Meanwhile, we have individuals that are hired by the Republican majority going out here talking to these cable shows and Sunday shows on spend. This is not about spend. This is about making America stronger and more secure.

The bottom line is the reason why, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, many of the Republicans are getting a little shaky now, because on this subject, Mr. Speaker, we have been on top of it. The record speaks for itself. Fiscal responsibility: we have been on top of it. On securing America: we have been on top of it. On innovation: there is not an issue that Americans are looking for that we have not tried to address and continued to try to address even though we are in the minority. Being in the minority is not an excuse for us. It is just something that does not allow us procedurally to allow these American ideas to bubble up and allow the American people to be prepared.

You want to talk about fuel. We can talk about that too. You can talk about energy. We can do all of these things. But until the American people truly understand that what they hear from the Republican majority is not necessarily fact, then we are going to

continue to go in the wrong direction as it relates to the history of this country.

Being a Member of this Congress, I almost feel that we are just as important as the Continental Congress, the first Congress, because now, no other time in the history of the country have we been in this kind of posture as a country, not due to the fact what folks are doing on foreign soil. It is what the Republican majority is doing to us right now based on friends and family and a number of things that have taken place in this Chamber unprecedented.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I am sorry, I wanted to make sure I got that out because I think it is important, not only third-party validators, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and actions we have taken, because it does not upset me, the fact that this stuff is not being reported the way it should be reported; but I am extremely concerned about the fact that we have the Republican majority that is not even shaken by this. Meanwhile, 50 percent of our debt, almost 50 percent of our debt is being owned by foreign interests.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What is amazing, and you are so right, what has happened in the last several weeks is there has been an effort by the Bush administration since this DPW port deal has come to light to portray this as people who have a problem with Middle Eastern countries and even have gone so far as to say, well, why are you concerned, because Federal agencies control and conduct all port security.

I learned and knew this, but it was illuminated even more clearly when I went to the port that that is not the case. Yes, on the external port properties the government body running the port, in our case, in Miami it is the Board of County Commissioners in Miami, they are responsible for external security. But at a terminal in the Port of Miami Terminal Operating Company and under the five other terminals that DPW would take over, they are responsible for their own internal security. They will have intimate knowledge of the external security on the port property, and they are responsible for security internally.

This is a foreign government-owned company. This is not a private company from a foreign country. It is a foreign government-owned company.

Would it be okay with anyone in this country, not the least of which should be the Bush administration, if the same situation occurred in an airport? Would we let a foreign government-owned company run a terminal in our airports? Would we let them control loading and off-loading passengers or cargo coming into an airport? Not in a billion, no pun intended, years. Really.

Why are they so unconcerned about port security?

Let us look at what the Coast Guard is responsible for. Again, third-party

validators. The Coast Guard on a typical day saves 15 lives, assists 117 people in distress, protects \$2.8 million in property, interdicts 30 illegal migrants at sea, conducts 90 search and rescue cases, seizes \$21 million worth of illegal drugs, responds to 11 oil and hazardous chemical spills, and boards and inspects 122 vessels.

There are 361 ports in this country that they are responsible for, and we have 95,000 miles of coastline. And the difference between what the Coast Guard has said they needed, \$7.2 billion to really complete their mission in terms of port security, and what the Republican leadership here has appropriated, \$910 million, is \$6 billion. There is a disconnect from the top to the bottom here. It is shocking.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. When you think about the \$16 billion in corporate welfare that we have given to the energy companies; when you think about the billions and billions and billions of dollars in subsidies we have given to the health insurance industry through the prescription drug program that has been a total debacle, you will see that what the Democrats are saying is that we have a better plan.

We will not give \$16 billion to the oil industry, the most profitable industry in the world, Mr. Speaker. We want to spend that money prudently, in a fashion that best represents the interests of the American people. And that is what we have been trying to do as Mr. MEEK went through, Mr. Speaker. Amendment after amendment after amendment, the Democrats and the minority Republican Party's bills. And we tried to get September 29, and you can get all of this, and we should put all of this on our Web site so everyone can see Democrats have tried and tried and tried to get increased funding for homeland security and for the protection of our ports, whether it was Mr. OBEY from Wisconsin, Mr. SABO, Senator BYRD, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SABO again and again and again. All throughout.

This sheet goes from 2001, 2003, 2003, 2003, 2003, 2004, 2004. Time and time again the Democratic Party has tried to get amendments on spending bills that would increase funding for port security by \$100 million, by \$500 million, by more if we could try to plug this gap.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The thing that we did not mention yet that is the most outrageous is the President in his budget that he just proposed actually eliminates direct port security grants. He literally says, no, no, no, we do not need to directly appropriate grant money to individual ports for port security. I have a bright idea. He has a bright idea. He wants to let ports compete for security grant funding with railway stations and airports and have any one of these transportation-related entryways to our country compete for security grants.

I mean, I do not understand that. He proposed it last year, and the response

from the Republican Congress was a \$910 million appropriations for port security. And now he is proposing it yet again.

□ 2330

Where are their priorities? If we are going to propose cuts to try to get the budget deficit situation under control, do we start with port security? I mean, when they are sitting down around the table in the Roosevelt Room, I really want to be a fly on the wall sometimes. Who in there is saying port security grants, that is what we should, that is how we are going to solve the deficit? Medicaid funding, we have got all the poor people covered with health care; who are the people the most in need, where are our most significant needs, let us cut those. It is astonishing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Again, I just want to make this point because we are not demagoguing this issue. What we are saying is 95 percent of the cargo coming into the country is not inspected. All we are saying is it should not be 5 percent. Should it be 90 or 80 or 70 or 50 or 40? It should be certainly something more than 5 percent, and all we are saying is we are giving corporate subsidies to the oil industry, giving corporate subsidies to the energy companies, giving corporate subsidies, totally, billions and billions and billions, to the health industry. You are giving tax cuts to Bill Gates, and this is going on.

So Democrats, Mr. Speaker, want to say let us increase this gradually as we are able to balance the budget and hopefully make investments in this. You are going to hire American people, hire American worker, protect the country, send a signal across the world that do not even try it, okay. That is the bottom line.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is also specifically related to this Dubai Ports World deal a way to deal with it. There is the bigger issue of port security, and then there is this deal. What is it that is so darn important about this deal that it caused the President to threaten his first veto that if, God forbid, the Congress would do something crazy like pass legislation to stop it, to slow it down to conduct the national security review that should be done? I have the legislation that I have introduced on the House side and Senators MENENDEZ and CLINTON and BILL NELSON from our State that have introduced on the Senate side that would say that we should not allow foreign government companies to own or lease ports from us in this country and we should stop this deal and we should review the other foreign government-owned terminals that currently already are in the United States and give congressional oversight in that area.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a no-brainer, and we called for a vote last week, Mr. Speaker, to stop the port deal, period. Forty-five days for what? What do we have to think about

here? That 45 days later we are going to say it is okay for foreign interests to be able to operate six of our major ports, including New York, that the whole thing, 9/11, should mean something? Our major ports, fine, that is okay, but let me tell you something, we do not have to wait 45 days to not do the deal. You got folks in the Republican majority who say, well, you know, after 45-days we are going to—after 45 days, the facts are still going to be the facts.

The Coast Guard raised the question of security as it relates to this port deal, and deals like this happen every day here in Washington, D.C., under this Republican majority and this White House. The President dared the Congress to pass a bill because he would veto it. That is on the record. I did not say it. He said it.

You know something, I would like to tell the Republican majority to leader it. We are trying to call for a vote, and I guarantee you there will be another attempt to call a vote this week. We want to separate the leaders from the followers. We say we want to balance the budget, which we have done. The Republican majority say they want to cut it in half. You take the choice what you want. Do you want to continue to have foreign countries buy our debt? But that is for individuals willing to be followers. The thing about the United States is we believe in leadership. We want to lead. We do not want to follow.

The bottom line is the Republican majority is fine with following economically, following as it relates to leadership on this port deal. They have a problem because they have been rubber stamping everything that the President has said. The President says let us turn right, okay, let us turn right; okay, let us turn left, they turn left. That is not what the Constitution says.

We did not stand out in front of the precinct saying, hey, I am running for Congress; I am willing to do everything that the President asks me to do, regardless of how you feel about it. That is not what we ran for office for, Mr. Speaker.

So when we look at these deals, I think it is very, very important. Secretary Snow is asking us to raise the debt ceiling by \$82 billion. Who is going to buy that debt? Who is going to buy it?

Can I for a minute talk about who is buying it and who will buy it? Here is my map here again. This is not a weather map. This is a map to talk about who is going to buy this \$821 billion that Secretary Snow is calling for, not because he feels like it. It is because he has to.

I am going to start off with the big one. Japan, \$862 billion of our debt. Japan is not a county anywhere in any of these States. China, Red China, China has all the jobs. China, that has a positive trade with the United States but we do not have positive trade with them, are buying up our country while

the Republican majority is sitting here saying do not worry about it America, trust us. The UK, \$223.2 billion owned of the United States of America debt. Taiwan, \$71.3 billion. Korea, that should ring a bell with some people and especially some of our veterans, \$66.5 billion. Germany, Germany should ring a bell with some of our veterans, \$65.7 billion of our debt, and Canada, just north of, us \$53.8 billion. OPEC Nations, oh, wow, who are they? It happens to be Saudi Arabia, happens to be Iran, happens to be Iraq.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. UAE.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. \$67.8 billion. So, Mr. Speaker, when we start talking about raising the debt ceiling and responsibility, we balanced the budget. We did not have these issues. When I say "we," I am saying the Democratic Congress balanced the budget without a single Republican vote.

The reason why I speak boldly on this issue is the fact that it is fact and it is not fiction and that we are sharing it with them. The real issue, when you talk about the ports, some Members may say the bill that you have and a number of Members signed on to in the Senate, a number of Members who have signed on to it, Mr. Speaker, they are saying, well, you know, I do not represent a port city or a coastal city so I do not have anything to worry about. Well, guess what, these containers that we see here are all throughout America because these containers are loaded on to trucks and trains, and they go through America. If a terrorist wants to put a nuclear device in one of these containers to be put into activation in a certain U.S. city, they have the power to do so because they know that we only check 5 percent. That is not because we cannot check more. It is because we cannot get amendments passed here as Democrats in the minority to check more and protect America. So I think it is important we do it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important for us to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of this chamber that this is brinkmanship now with the debt ceiling. We are on the line here, and Secretary Snow, and I do not know if you went over this before.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I did but go over it again.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. March 6 sent a letter to John Spratt who is our ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee. Today, it was reported in the Associated Press the Secretary told Congress yesterday in this letter, the administration is taking, quote, all prudent and legal actions, end quote, including tapping certain government retirement funds. Now they are tapping retirement funds to keep from reaching the \$8.2 trillion national debt limit, and in the letter to Congress he said that we need to raise the debt ceiling immediately to avoid the first government default on its obligations in U.S. history.

□ 2340

If this outfit hasn't gotten us into a real predicament, I don't know what a

predicament is. If we don't raise the debt ceiling, we are going to default on our obligations. The United States of America, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our history.

I would be happy to yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a very simple solution: we return to PAYGO rules. We return to the days when we spent what we had, like people in American households try to do every single day and struggle to do. But we have the ability to establish a rule. We have the ability to follow a rule that says we will only spend what we have. We have advocated, as Democrats, restoring the PAYGO rule, and we have been repeatedly rejected by the Republican leadership because they just want to continue to borrow and spend, borrow and spend.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So let us look at this. We talked about two things basically tonight. We talked about the ports and the debt ceiling. On the port deal, to try to increase spending, the Democrats offered, I don't know, a dozen different amendments to try to increase funding from U.S. ports, and each time the Republican majority shot our idea down.

We had ideas. We offered solutions. The Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, shot us down. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ just talked about the pay-as-you-go system, where if you pay more for a program, you have to find money somewhere. You have to raise revenue or cut spending, but you have to pay for it so we don't have to borrow from all these foreign countries.

Former Member Mr. Stenholm offered an amendment to try to implement PAYGO rules into the budget process. Mr. THOMPSON from California tried to do it, Mr. MOORE from Kansas tried to do it, and Mr. SPRATT tried to do it on numerous occasions, to implement pay-as-you-go rules to try to constrain the reckless spending from our Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker. And in each instance, Mr. MEEK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, it was the Republican majority who said we will not accept fiscal discipline, we will not accept increased funding for our ports; and the Democrats were the party offering the ideas and offering the amendments time and time and time and time again to prevent this from happening, where we owe Japan \$682 billion, we owe China \$250 billion, and we owe OPEC countries, Mr. MEEK, \$67.8 billion.

Now, that is a shame. And I don't like that. And I don't think the American people like that.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, you are 110 percent right. As we close, Mr. Speaker, since we have only 3 minutes or so left, once again we have seen this chart, and as I have said before, it will be in the National Archives. We are not trying to make history, but just to report what is going on here so the American people will know this.

In 224 years of great history in this great country of ours, 1776 to 2000, 42

Presidents, \$1.01 trillion was borrowed from foreign nations. That is 224 years. And in 4 years, from 2001 to 2005, President Bush, and we don't want to leave out the Republican Congress, borrowed \$1.05 trillion from foreign nations, in 4 years, jeopardizing the financial security of this country.

Mr. RYAN, you are 110 percent right to be alarmed.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You are 110 percent right to be alarmed.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Republican majority to give us a good way to talk about this. They can't. They can't, Mr. Speaker. We hope we can have what we call a paradigm shift, a change in the way we do business here in Washington, D.C., not on behalf of the Democratic Party but on behalf of the American people.

So we are looking for a comprehensive game plan, Mr. Speaker, because we have one. We have one on this side. History is on our side. The precedent is on our side of trying to do something about it. We ask for the majority to join us in this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. MEEK, the point I want to add is this body has openings for people of courage, and we encourage them to apply for those jobs over the next several months.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Job openings.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There are job openings for people of courage. We need a few more people of courage. There are a couple on that side, but we need a whole lot more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, [www.House Democrats.gov/30something](http://www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something). That is [www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something). Members of Congress can go to this Web site and access all of the charts, see our third-party validators, and see why we are so alarmed at what is going on here in our Nation's capital.

I yield to my good friend, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with that we would like to thank not only the Democratic leadership but also many of us here in the House who are trying to work hard on behalf of the American people. I know we all are, but I think it is important that we bring these issues to the forefront.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COSTA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. CUELLAR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.  
 Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 8.  
 Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.  
 Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.  
 Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.  
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2320. An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce 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.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:  
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)  
 Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 8.  
 Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 8 and 9.  
 Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today March 8 and 9.  
 Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and March 8 and 9.  
 Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.  
 The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 8, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the second, third and fourth quarter of 2005 and the first quarter of 2006, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. GERASIMOS C. VANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 20 AND NOV. 28, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Gerasimos C. Vans .....	11/20	11/28	Australia .....		748.00		9,738.62				10,487.62
Committee total .....											10,487.62

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GERASIMOS C. VANS, Dec. 12, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 2 AND DEC. 6, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings .....	12/3	12/6	Slovenia .....	79,357	390.00					79,357	390.00
Committee total .....				79,357	390.00					79,357	390.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 8, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DANIEL SCANDLING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 13 AND JAN. 20, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Daniel Scandling .....		1/13	USA .....				6,457.25				6,457.25
		1/14	Egypt .....		867.00						867.00
		1/17	Lebanon .....								
		1/15	France .....		375.54						375.54
		1/20	USA .....								
Committee total .....					1,242.54		6,457.25				7,699.79

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SCANDLING, Feb. 6, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 16 AND APR. 19, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings .....	4/16	4/19	Denmark .....		546.00						546.00
Fred Turner .....	4/16	4/19	Denmark .....		546.00						546.00
<b>Committee total .....</b>					<b>1,092.00</b>						<b>1,092.00</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Feb. 15, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LITHUANIA AND LATVIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 11 AND OCT. 14, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
John M. Shimkus .....	10/10	10/12	Lithuania .....	255	1,007.36					255	1,007.36
	10/12	10/14	Latvia .....	235.32Ls	405.00					235.32Ls	405.00
<b>Committee total .....</b>					<b>1,412.36</b>						<b>1,412.36</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN SHIMKUS, Nov. 11, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY FALL MEETING IN COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 11 AND NOV. 15, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Michael Bilirakis .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Dan Burton .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. John Boozman .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Ben Chandler .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Paul Gillmor .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Joel Hefley .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Dennis Moore .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Mike Ross .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Tom Tancredo .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. John Tanner .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Hon. Tom Udall .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Melissa Adamson .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Kathy Becker .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Paul Gallis .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Beverly Hallock .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Kay King .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Susan Olson .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Scott Palmer .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,170.00			2,940.11			4,110.00
Patrick Prisco .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Mark Wellman .....	11/11	11/15	Denmark .....		1,664.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,664.00
Delegation expenses:											
Representational functions .....									2,014.14		2,014.14
Miscellaneous .....									342.70		342.70
<b>Committee total .....</b>					<b>36,114.00</b>		<b>2,940.11</b>		<b>2,356.84</b>		<b>41,410.95</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Jan. 20, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 19 AND DEC. 23, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Roy Blunt .....	12/19	12/20	Costa Rica .....		2,873.00		941.31		4,893.45		8,707.76
Mike Caraway .....	12/20	12/20	El Salvador .....				185.00		471.94		656.94
Hon. Mark Foley .....	12/20	12/22	Guatemala .....		5,356.00		6,376.00		4,242.00		15,974.00
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa .....	12/22	12/23	Dominican Republic .....		3,120.00		1,125.00		3,329.00		7,574.00
Hon. Greg Meeks .....											
Hon. Dennis Moore .....											
Hon. Solomon Ortiz .....											
Brian Diffell .....											
Michelle Hawks .....											
Scott Palmer .....											
Amy Burnside Steinmann .....											
Susan Burson Taylor .....											
Wilson Livingood .....											
<b>Committee total .....</b>					<b>11,349.00</b>		<b>8,627.31</b>		<b>12,936.39</b>		<b>32,912.70</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROY BLUNT, Chairman, Jan. 10, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO INDIA, THAILAND, VIETNAM, AND SINGAPORE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 10 AND JAN. 20, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Hon. Kay Granger	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Hon. Greg Walden	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Chris Walker	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Rachel Perry	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Martha Morrison	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Steve Rusnak	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(3)				1,338.65
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Hon. Kay Granger	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Hon. Greg Walden	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Chris Walker	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Rachel Perry	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Martha Morrison	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Steve Rusnak	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Mark Wellman	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(3)				694.72
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Hon. Kay Granger	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Hon. Greg Walden	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Chris Walker	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Rachel Perry	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Martha Morrison	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Steve Rusnak	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Mark Wellman	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(3)				464.00
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Hon. Kay Granger	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Hon. Greg Walden	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Chris Walker	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Rachel Perry	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Martha Morrison	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Steve Rusnak	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Mark Wellman	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(3)				1,375.00
Committee total					52,565.66		3,563.50				52,565.66

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LEBANON AND FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 23 AND JAN. 28, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Robert Lawrence	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		808.00		(3) 6,913.69				7,721.69
Thomas Ross	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		808.00		(3) 6,913.69				7,721.69
Robert Lawrence	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Thomas Ross	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Committee total					2,522.00		13,827.38				16,349.38

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Transportation expense is for entire trip.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Janice Helwig		7/11	USA				4,225.07				4,225.07
	7/12	9/30	Austria		19,415.03		268.00				19,683.03
Committee total					19,415.03		4,493.07				23,908.10

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 25, 2005.



REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Misc. Embassy Costs											
Commercial Transportation							270.58		2,565.36		2,565.36
							( <sup>3</sup> )				
Hon. Denny Rehberg	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58				270.58
							( <sup>3</sup> )				
Hon. James Moran	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58				270.58
							( <sup>3</sup> )				
Hon. Martin Sabo	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58				270.58
							( <sup>3</sup> )				
Beverly Pheto	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		622.00						622.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		827.35						827.35
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							2,684.08				2,684.08
							( <sup>3</sup> )				
Chester Lee Turner III	10/2	10/11	Russia		3,568.00						3,568.00
Commercial Transportation							5,813.16				5,813.16
Hon. Jim Kolbe	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							10,127.76				10,127.76
Hon. Mark S. Kirk	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/4	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							9,054.79				9,054.79
Elizabeth A. Phillips	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							8,595.26				8,595.26
Nisha Desai	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							8,595.26				8,595.26
Hon. Jack Kingston	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq		( <sup>3</sup> )						
	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
Part Commercial Airfare							3,018.97				3,018.97
							( <sup>3</sup> )				
Hon. Denny Rehberg	11/28	11/29	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq		( <sup>3</sup> )						
	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	Netherlands		261.80						261.80
Committee total					24,227.82		20,519.06		20,522.88		65,269.76

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, OFFICE OF SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Susan G. Joseph	10/29	10/31	Japan		278.25		9,020.58		37.00		9,335.83
	10/31	11/1	Japan		321.25						321.25
	11/1	11/2	Korea		231.00						231.00
	11/2	11/3	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/3	11/4	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/4	11/5	Korea		231.00						231.00
John N. Phillips	10/26	10/29	Guam		731.25		7,821.90		26.00		8,579.15
	10/30	10/31	Japan		278.25						278.25
	10/31	11/1	Japan		321.25						321.25
	11/1	11/2	Korea		231.00						231.00
	11/2	11/3	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/3	11/4	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/4	11/4	Korea		308.00						308.00
	11/27	11/28	England		353.75		11,008.95		320.24		11,682.94
	11/28	11/29	England		487.50						487.50
	11/30	12/2	Kuwait		946.00						946.00
	12/2	12/6	Qatar		1,188.00						1,188.00
	12/6	12/8	Singapore		420.00						420.00
Daniel C. Sparks	10/26	10/29	Guam		731.25		7,821.90				8,553.15
	10/30	10/31	Japan		278.25						278.25
	10/31	11/1	Japan		321.25						321.25
	11/1	11/2	Korea		231.00						231.00
	11/2	11/3	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/3	11/4	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/4	11/4	Korea		308.00						308.00
L. Michael Welsh	10/26	10/28	Guam		450.00		7,044.02		13.58		7,507.60
Douglas D. Nosik	11/27	11/28	England		353.75		11,008.95		213.39		11,576.09
	11/28	11/29	England		487.50						487.50



REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Adam Smith	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Hon. Kendrick Meek	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Hon. Tim Ryan	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
William Ostendorff	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Robert DeGrasse	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Delegation Expenses Visit to Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Italy With Codel Hagel, November 27–December 4, 2005:	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
							273.78		759.71		1,033.49
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	11/28	11/29	Israel		206.00						206.00
	11/29	11/30	Jordan		187.00						187.00
	11/30	12/1	Saudi Arabia		197.00						197.00
	12/1	12/2	Kuwait		186.00						186.00
	12/2	12/2	Iraq								
	12/2	12/3	Jordan		186.00						186.00
	12/3	12/4	Italy		540.00						540.00
Commercial Transportation							7,075.53				7,075.53
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, the United Kingdom, Decem- ber 20–28, 2005:											
Hon. Jim Saxton	12/24	12/26	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
	12/26	12/28	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Commercial Transportation							4,503.24				4,503.24
Hon. Jim Marshall	12/24	12/26	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
	12/26	12/28	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Commercial Transportation							3,995.66				3,995.66
Roger Zakheim	12/22	12/24	United Kingdom								
	12/25	12/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
	12/26	12/28	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Commercial Transportation							6,230.84				6,230.84
Committee total					35,993.80		26,153.15		8,057.63		70,204.58

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Ron Kind	10/8	10/10	Jordan, Iraq		254.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				254.00
Committee total					254.00						254.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, Jan. 26, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Tom Osborne	12/19	12/21	Tel Aviv/Israel/Jordan		362.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				362.00
	12/21	12/22	Kuwait/Iraq		147.41		( <sup>3</sup> )				147.41
	12/22	12/22	Germany		304.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				304.00
Hon. Charles Boustany	12/19	12/21	Tel Aviv/Israel/Jordan		362.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				362.00
	12/21	12/22	Kuwait/Iraq		147.41		( <sup>3</sup> )				147.41
	12/22	12/22	Germany		304.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				304.00
Hon. Carolyn McCarthy	12/27	11/30	India		999.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				906.00
	Committee total					4,157.82					

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

JOHN BOEHNER, Chairman, Jan. 27, 2006.

(ADDENDUM) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Addendum to 3rd Quarter Report Regarding Codel Stearns <sup>1</sup> Per Diem to Kuwait on September 23–25, 2005:											
Hon. Sam Johnson <sup>3</sup>	9/23	9/25	Kuwait		1,450.00						1,450.00
Hon. David Wu <sup>3</sup>	9/23	9/25	Kuwait		1,450.00						1,450.00
Committee total					2,900.00						2,900.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Please note that a per diem of \$788,000 was reported for Mr. Johnson and Mr. Wu on the third quarter report. The actual per diem for their trip to Kuwait is \$1,450.00.

JOHN BOEHNER, Chairman, Jan. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Colleen O'Keefe	6/27	7/1	Brazil		1,188.00		7,176.66				8,364.66
Christopher Knauer	6/27	7/2	Brazil		1,386.00		6,565.15				7,951.15
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	8/26	8/28	Greece		855.00						855.00
	8/28	8/29	Ukraine		261.00						261.00
	8/29	8/31	Estonia		420.00						420.00
	8/31	9/1	Iceland		422.00						422.00
Hon. Cliff Stearns	9/23	9/25	Kuwait		788.00		20.84				808.84
	9/23	9/25	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	9/25	9/26	Qatar		327.00		10.42				337.42
	9/26	9/27	England		335.00		10.42				345.42
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	9/23	9/23	Jordan		788.00		20.84				808.84
	9/23	9/25	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	9/25	9/26	Qatar		327.00		10.42				337.42
	9/26	9/27	England		335.00		10.42				345.42
Christopher Knauer	8/22	8/25	Japan		816.00		7,282.39				8,098.39
	8/25	8/27	China		740.00						740.00
		8/31	Hong Kong		1,644.00						1,644.00
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	7/30	8/10	China		556.53		277.85				1,834.38
Hon. Nathan Deal	8/26	8/29	Morocco		890.00						890.00
	8/29	9/31	Cyprus		660.00						660.00
	8/31	9/2	Israel		724.00						724.00
	9/2	9/6	Egypt		874.00						874.00
Hon. Rick Boucher	8/18	8/23	Ireland		1,209.00		3,708.52				4,917.52
Hon. Michael Burgess	8/16	8/18	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	8/16	8/18	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	8/18	8/19	Germany					30.00			30.00
Kelli Andrews	8/20	8/23	Sweden		1,257.00						1,257.00
	8/23	8/25	Germany		260.00						260.00
	8/25	9/1	England		3,008.00						3,008.00
	8/20	9/1	Air flights				6,092.91				6,092.91
Hon. Albert Wynn	8/26	8/29	Morocco		890.00						890.00
	8/29	8/31	Cyprus		660.00						660.00
	8/31	9/2	Israel		724.00						724.00
	9/2	9/5	Egypt		874.00						874.00
Hon. Edward Markey	8/26	8/28	Greece		805.00						805.00
	8/28	8/29	Ukraine		261.00						261.00
	8/29	8/31	Estonia		420.00						420.00
	8/31	9/1	Iceland		422.00						422.00
Hon. John Shadegg	8/18	8/19	United Kingdom		181.00		9,196.88				9,377.88
	8/19	8/21	Egypt		578.00		3,812.80				4,390.80
	8/21	8/24	Jordan		762.00						762.00
Hon. David Nelson	8/21	8/23	Sweden		1,257.00		6,092.91				7,349.91
	8/23	8/25	Germany		520.00						520.00
	8/25	9/1	England		3,108.00						3,108.00
Jack Seum	9/22	9/24	Kuwait		1,450.00						1,450.00
	9/23	9/25	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	9/25	9/26	Qatar		148.00		10.42		179.00		337.42
	9/26	9/27	England		148.00		10.42		179.00		337.42
Committee total					21,257.17		15,673.91		21,200.29		85,764.80

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, Dec. 20, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Gene Green	12/18	12/20	Israel		576.00						576.00
	12/20	12/20	Jordan								
	12/20	12/21	Kuwait		136.00						136.00
	12/21	12/21	Iraq								
	12/22	12/23	Germany		58.45						58.45
Hon. Jay Inslee	11/19	11/21	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/21	11/21	Iraq								
	11/21	11/21	Germany		314.00						314.00
Hon. Fred Upton	11/26	11/29	Pakistan		536.00		8,595.26				9,131.26
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/5	Pakistan		440.00						440.00
Hon. Cliff Stearns	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Tim Murphy	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
	11/23	11/24	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
Sue Sheridan	11/26	11/28	Germany		467.00						467.00
	12/4	12/9	Canada		850.00		898.42				1,748.42
Lorie Schmidt	12/4	12/9	Canada		850.00		898.42				1,748.42
Peter Spencer	12/4	12/9	Canada		850.00		898.42				1,748.42
Hon. Jay Inslee	11/19		Kuwait		394.00						
			Iraq								
			Germany		314.00						
	11/22	Ireland									
Committee total				10,749.67		11,290.52					20,309.19

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Melissa L. Bean	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				394.00
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		327.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				327.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				320.00
Hon. Al Green <sup>4</sup>	11/27	11/30	India		( <sup>4</sup> )		( <sup>3</sup> )				
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		( <sup>4</sup> )		( <sup>3</sup> )				
	12/2	12/2	France		( <sup>4</sup> )		( <sup>3</sup> )				
Hon. Melvin L. Watt	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				333.00
Committee total				2,211.00							2,211.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

<sup>4</sup> Reimbursed the U.S. Treasury for all per diem and travel.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Frederick Hill	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium				907.22				907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Larry Brady	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Hon. Candice Miller	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Laurent Crenshaw	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Hon. Christopher Shays	10/8	10/9	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	10/8	10/9	Jordan		153.00						153.00
	10/8	10/9	Jordan		254.00						254.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	10/8	10/11	Kazakhstan		934.00		4,074.10				5,008.10
	10/11	10/12	Georgia		295.00						295.00
	10/12	10/13	Azerbaijan		378.00			690.50			1,068.50
Frederick Hill	10/13	10/17	Austria		1,272.00						1,272.00
	10/8	10/11	Kazakhstan		934.00		4,074.10				5,008.10
	10/11	10/12	Georgia		295.00						295.00
Larry Brady	10/12	10/13	Azerbaijan		378.00			690.50			1,068.50
	10/13	10/17	Austria		1,272.00						1,272.00
	10/8	10/11	Kazakhstan		934.00		4,074.10				5,008.10
Alexandra Teitz	10/13	10/17	Austria		1,272.00						1,272.00
	12/6	12/9	Canada		465.68		802.10				1,267.78
	12/4	12/8	Canada		470.42		368.80				839.22
Gregory Dotson	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		491.00						491.00
Jon Porter	1/1	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/1	1/2	Pakistan		313.00						313.00
	1/2	1/5	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
Michael Hess	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		491.00						491.00
Ronald Martinson	1/1	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/1	1/2	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan .....		491.00						491.00
	1/1	1/2	Afghanistan .....		90.00						90.00
	1/1	1/2	Pakistan .....		178.00						178.00
Committee total .....					27,023.98		13,393.20		2,071.50		42,488.68

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM DAVIS, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Robert W. Ney .....	12/19	12/20	Israel .....		362.00						362.00
	12/20	12/21	Kuwait .....		136.00						136.00
	12/21	12/21	Iraq .....								
	12/21	12/22	Germany .....		304.00						304.00
Committee total .....					802.00						802.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT W. NEY, Chairman, Jan. 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Candace Abbey .....	11/27	11/29	Switzerland .....		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium .....		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom .....		537.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				537.00
Hon. Gary Ackerman .....	11/27	11/29	Switzerland .....		412.00						412.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium .....		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom .....		537.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				537.00
David Adams .....	10/8	10/12	Israel .....		1,248.00						1,248.00
	10/12	10/15	Egypt .....		717.00						717.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare .....				9,018.40				9,018.40
David Abramowitz .....	10/11	10/14	Netherlands .....		634.68		5,984.12				6,618.80
Blaine Aaron .....	11/28	11/29	Aruba .....		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil .....		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic .....		333.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				333.00
Paige Anderson .....	11/27	11/29	Switzerland .....		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium .....		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom .....		537.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				537.00
Ted Brennan .....	11/6	11/8	Haiti .....		396.00		1,172.20				1,568.20
	11/28	11/29	Aruba .....		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil .....		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic .....		333.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				333.00
Hon. Dan Burton .....	11/27	11/30	India .....		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan .....		626.00				3 1,523.27		2,149.27
	12/2	12/4	France .....		906.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				906.00
Hon. Steve Chabot .....	11/29	12/1	Russia .....		756.00						756.00
	12/1	12/2	Kuwait .....		86.00						86.00
	12/2	12/5	Afghanistan .....		180.00						180.00
	11/29	12/5	Round Trip Airfare .....				8,686.59				8,686.59
Hon. Eliot Engel .....	11/27	11/29	Switzerland .....		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium .....		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom .....		537.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				537.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega .....	10/6	10/10	Jordan .....		254.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				254.00
	11/28	11/29	Aruba .....		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil .....		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic .....		333.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				333.00
Jim Farr .....	11/28	11/29	Aruba .....		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil .....		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic .....		333.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				333.00
Brian Fauls .....	11/27	11/30	India .....		699.00						699.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan .....		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France .....		906.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				906.00
Barbara Fleck .....	11/27	11/30	India .....		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan .....		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France .....		606.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				606.00
Barton Forsyth .....	10/10	10/11	Belgium .....		516.00						516.00
	10/11	10/13	Netherlands .....		320.00						320.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Dan Freeman	10/10	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,852.12				6,852.12
	10/10	10/11	Belgium		320.00						320.00
	10/11	10/13	Netherlands		516.00						516.00
Kristen Gilley	10/10	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,852.12				6,852.12
	10/10	10/12	Thailand		364.00						364.00
	10/12	10/14	Burma		166.00						166.00
Daniel Getz	10/10	10/16	Round Trip Airfare				7,292.42				7,292.42
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
Dennis Halpin	11/27	12/4	France		906.00		(9)				906.00
	11/30	12/4	United Kingdom		716.00		3,616.20				4,332.20
	10/10	10/12	Thailand		318.00						318.00
Hans Hogrefe	10/12	10/14	Burma		106.00						106.00
	10/14	10/16	Thailand		279.00						279.00
	10/10	10/16	Round Trip Airfare				7,292.42				7,292.42
Hon. Henry Hyde	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(9)				333.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		410.00						410.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(9)				537.00
Jonathan Katz	10/10	10/12	Belgium		750.04		5,875.65				6,625.69
	11/30	12/1	Spain		380.00		4,093.34				4,473.34
	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00						936.00
David Killion	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				7,820.00				7,820.00
Bob King	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		253.00						253.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(9)				333.00
Kay King	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(9)				333.00
Sheila Klein	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	BRAZIL		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC		333.00		(9)				333.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(9)				333.00
Greg McCarthy	12/10	12/13	United Kingdom		1,320.00		7,252.63				8,572.63
	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00						936.00
	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
James McCormick	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				10,390.27				10,390.27
	10/10	10/12	Thailand		364.00						364.00
Hon. Thaddeus McCotter	10/12	10/14	Burma		166.00						166.00
	10/14	10/16	Thailand		304.00						304.00
	10/10	10/16	Round Trip Airfare				7,292.42				7,292.42
Alan Makovsky	10/15	10/18	United Kingdom		372.00		7,297.32				7,669.32
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		3,566.10				4,103.10
	11/9	11/15	Israel		1,600.00		7,900.80				9,500.80
John Mackey	12/10	12/13	United Kingdom		1,320.00		7,232.63				8,552.63
	10/11	10/16	Colombia		1,070.00		1,798.18				2,868.18
	10/9	10/12	Belgium		1,061.33		6,743.65				7,804.98
Richard Mereu	11/28	11/29	Austria		268.00						268.00
	11/29	12/1	Slovenia		201.00						201.00
	12/1	12/2	Austria		268.00						268.00
Thomas Mooney	11/29	12/1	Round Trip Airfare				6,271.06				6,271.06
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
Eleanor Nagy	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(9)				333.00
	11/11	11/14	Peru		795.00		2,817.44				3,612.44
	12/1	12/4	Vietnam		623.00		6,904.20				7,527.20
Paul Oostburg Sanz	11/6	11/8	Haiti		396.00		1,172.20				1,568.20
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		117.49						117.49
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		594.00						594.00
Hon. Donald Payne	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		273.00		(9)				273.00
	10/9	10/13	Liberia		352.00		(9)				352.00
	10/9	10/11	Belgium		660.00						660.00
Patrick Prisco	10/11	10/13	Netherlands		516.00						516.00
	10/9	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,872.12				6,872.12
	11/29	11/30	Austria		268.00		3,617.03				3,885.03
Gregg Rickman	11/30	12/1	Belgium		711.22						711.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00						936.00
John Walker Roberts	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				7,820.06				7,820.06
Laura Rush	10/17	10/20	Austria		252.00		6,225.95				6,477.95
	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
Jonathan Scharfen	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(9)				537.00
	10/10	10/11	Belgium		320.00						320.00
	10/11	10/13	Netherlands		516.00						516.00
Susan Schiesser	10/10	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,852.12				6,852.12
	11/29	12/1	Russia		756.00						756.00
	12/1	12/2	Kuwait		86.00						86.00
Adam Schiff	12/2	12/5	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	11/29	12/5	Round Trip Airfare				8,686.59				8,686.59
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
Doug Seay	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(9)				333.00
	12/19	12/21	Israel		362.00						362.00
Gregory Simpkins	12/21	12/22	Kuwait		147.41						147.41
	12/22	12/22	Germany		304.00		(9)				304.00
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(9)				333.00
	10/5	10/13	Liberia		704.00		7,078.33				7,782.33
Linda Solomon	11/10	11/14	Peru		795.00		2,695.44				3,490.44
	12/2	12/4	Vietnam		684.00		6,904.00				7,588.00
	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(9)				537.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Cliff Stammerman	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00						936.00
	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
Jason Steinbaum	10/11	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				7,820.06				7,820.06
	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
Sam Stratman	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
Mark Walker	12/2	12/4	France		906.00						906.00
	10/11	10/16	Colombia		1,070.00		1,798.18				2,868.18
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
Hon. Diane Watson	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00						906.00
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
Lynne Weil	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00						333.00
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		59.54						59.54
Hillel Weinberg	11/29	12/2	Brazil		492.61						492.61
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		171.51						171.51
	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
Hon. Joe Wilson	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00						906.00
	10/10	10/11	Belgium		375.02		5,875.65				6,250.67
Judith Wolverton	11/13	11/15	Israel		772.00		6,693.68				7,465.68
	11/30	12/1	Spain		380.00		4,093.34				4,473.34
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
Matthew Zweig	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00						333.00
	10/8	10/12	Israel		1,248.00						1,248.00
Committee total	10/12	10/15	Egypt		717.00						717.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				9,018.40				9,018.40
					94,929.83		243,245.43		3,1523.27		339,698.53

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Indicates Delegation Costs.  
<sup>4</sup> Military air transportation.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 28 AND DEC. 5, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Daniel P. Coughlin	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00						333.00
Committee total				1,170.00							1,170.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, Jan. 6, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Sheila Jackson	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00						285.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00						285.00
Hon. John Conyers	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00						285.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00						285.00
David Abruzzino	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00						285.00
Keenan Keller	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00						285.00
Committee total				1,710.00							1,710.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

F. JAMES SENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 24, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Todd Willens	11/4	11/8	Palau		1,200.00		7,766.46				8,966.46
Chris Foster	11/4	11/7	Palau		900.00		8,061.16				8,961.16
	11/7	11/9	Micronesia		450.00						450.00
Stevan Pearce	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00						906.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Kurt Christensen	12/5	12/9	Canada		1,681.92		1,428.45				3,110.37
Committee total					6,762.92		17,256.07				24,018.99

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

RICHARD P. POMBO, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Lincoln Diaz-Balart	11/29	12/3	Ukraine		933.00		6,596.58				7,529.58
Ana Carbonell	11/29	12/3	Ukraine		933.00		6,596.58				7,529.58
Hon. Tom Cole	11/19	11/21	Kuwait		394.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				394.00
	11/19	11/20	Iraq				( <sup>3</sup> )				
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				314.00
Committee total					2,574.00		13,193.16				15,767.16

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

DAVID DREIER, Chairman, Feb. 6, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Amy Chiang	9/4	9/12	China		<sup>3</sup> 1,896.07				2,302.47		4,198.54
Committee total					1,896.07				2,302.47		4,198.54

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Additional per diem.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, Chairman, Dec. 6, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Lynn Woolsey	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				394.00
	10/1	10/2	Iraq				( <sup>3</sup> )				
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		347.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				347.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				320.00
Hon. J. Kevin Carroll	12/4	12/9	Canada		404.80		4,348.33				753.13
Hon. Brad Miller	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				394.00
	10/1	10/2	Iraq				( <sup>3</sup> )				
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		347.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				347.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				320.00
Hon. Shelia Jackson-Lee	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				626.00
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				999.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				906.00
Hon. David Wu	11/26	12/3	China		2,033.88		4,863.34				10,671.22
Olwen Huxley	11/26	12/3	China		2,033.88		8,637.34				10,671.22
Julie Tippens	11/26	11/28	China		746.25		8,637.34				9,383.59
Committee total					9,871.81		26,260.35				36,132.16

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.  
<sup>4</sup> Commercial airfare.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Matthew Szymanski	11/17	11/22	Korea/China				6,643.64		2,182.00		8,825.64
Sean Deverey	11/17	11/22	Korea/China				6,643.64		2,182.00		8,825.64
Matthew Szymanski	12/9	12/19	India		2,902.00						
	12/20	12/21	Nepal		476.00						
	12/22	12/22	Bhutan		146.00		7,597.71				11,121.71
Christopher Szymanski	12/9	12/19	India		2,902.00						
	12/20	12/21	Nepal		476.00						
	12/22	12/22	Bhutan		146.00		7,742.09				11,266.09
Rich Beutel	12/9	12/16	India		2,783.00						
	12/17	12/20	China		1,164.00		7,908.15				11,855.15
Sean Deverey	12/9	12/16	India		2,783.00						
	12/17	12/20	China		1,164.00		7,908.15				11,855.15

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Kenneth Shaw .....	12/11	12/16	India .....		2,255.00		7,637.43				9,892.43
Committee total .....											73,732.81

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> CODEL returned \$3,798.21 USD

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

FOR 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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Nov. 15, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

FOR 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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 10, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Michael Capuano .....	10/8	10/9	Jordan .....		254.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				254.00
Hon. Mike Sodrel .....	11/18	11/21	Kuwait .....		394.00						394.00
	11/21	11/22	Germany .....		314.00						314.00
Hon. Mark Kennedy .....	11/18	11/21	Kuwait .....		394.00						394.00
	11/21	11/22	Germany .....		314.00						314.00
Rep. Luis Fortuño .....	11/28	11/28	Aruba .....		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil .....		689.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Rep .....		333.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				333.00
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart .....	12/1	12/2	Kuwait .....		86.00						86.00
	12/2	12/5	Afghanistan .....		180.00		8,237.49				8,417.49
Hon. John Boozman .....	12/19	12/21	Israel/Jordan .....		362.00						362.00
	12/21	12/22	Kuwait .....		136.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				136.00
	12/22	12/23	Germany .....		304.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				304.00
Committee total .....					3,908.00		8,237.49				12,145.49

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

FOR 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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STEVE BUYER, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	10/8	10/9	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	10/9	10/10	Iraq								
Hon. Michael McNulty	10/8	10/9	Jordan		204.00						204.00
	10/9	10/10	Iraq		154.00						154.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	10/9	10/10	Haiti		235.00						235.00
David Kavanaugh	12/15	12/19	Hong Kong, China		2,731.08		7,949.68				10,680.76
Julie Herwig	12/15	12/19	Hong Kong, China		2,731.08		7,538.68				10,269.76
Melissa Hart	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/30	01/2	Pakistan		982.00						982.00
	01/2	01/3	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	01/3	01/4	Ireland								
Kenny Hulshof	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/29	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/29	12/29	Iraq								
	12/30	12/30	Kuwait								
	12/30	12/31	Pakistan		804.00						804.00
	12/31	01/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	01/2	01/3	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
	01/3	01/4	Ireland								
Committee total					10,637.16		15,488.36				26,125.52

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, Chairman, Feb. 14, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
FOR 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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT W. NEY, Chairman, Jan. 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
FOR 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.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, Chairman, Jan. 12, 2006.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6473. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to India pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6474. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

6475. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 06-06 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement between the United States and Singapore for Analysis and Testing of Braided Composite Structures

and Joints, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6476. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 07-06 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement between the United States and Singapore for Motheye Antireflective Structure for ZGP Crystal, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6477. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 01-06 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement to the Research and Development Projects Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6478. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6479. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6480. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration & Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6481. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6482. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6483. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6484. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6485. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection

Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6486. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6487. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6488. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals Incidental to Rocket Launches from Kodiak Island, AK [Docket No. 011011247-6006-03; I.D. 082701E] (RIN: 0648-AP62) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6489. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Subsistence Fishing [Docket No. 040607171-5078-02; I.D. 051804C] (RIN: 0648-AR88) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6490. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclaw and Ocean Quahog Fishery; 2006 and 2007 Fishing Quotas for Ocean Quahogs [Docket No. 051017270-5339-02; I.D. 093005B] (RIN: 0648-AT85) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6491. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Extension of Emergency Fishery Closure Due to the Presence of the Toxin That Causes Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning [Docket No. 050613158-5262-03; I.D. 090105A] (RIN: 0648-AT48) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6492. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 122805B] received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6493. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel Lottery in Areas 542 and 543 [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 011306A] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6494. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 011206I] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6495. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic

and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 011906B] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6496. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Haddock Incidental Catch Allowance for the Atlantic Herring Fishery [Docket No. 050517132-5132-01; I.D. 051105D] (RIN: 0648-AT36) received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6497. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 6 [Docket No. 050314071-5230-02; I.D. 030105E] (RIN: 0648-AS16) received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6498. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Allocating Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crab Fishery Resources; Correction [Docket No. 040831251-5309-05; I.D. 082504A] (RIN: 0648-AS47) received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6499. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish and Summer Flounder Fisheries [Docket No. 050708184-5235-02; I.D. 070105B] (RIN: 0648-AT50) received January 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6500. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Gulf Grouper Recreational Management Measures [Docket No. 050708183-5183-01; I.D. 070505D] (RIN: 0648-AT45) received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6501. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish; Framework Adjustment 1; Establishing a Multiple-year Specifications Process [Docket No. 051104291-5350-02; I.D. 100405F] (RIN: 0648-AT29) received February 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6502. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2006 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Specifications; Preliminary 2006 Quota Adjustments; 2006 Summer Flounder Quota

for Delaware [Docket No. 051104293-5344-02; I.D. 102705B] (RIN: 0648-AT27) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6503. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; North Pacific Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Cost Recovery Program [I.D. 120805C] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6504. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 012006A] received February 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6505. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 011806K] received February 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6506. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 030805C] received February 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6507. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Increases [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 012406A] received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6508. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 012506A] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6509. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall and Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 020106A] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6510. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [I.D. 020606B] received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6511. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock from the Aleutian Islands Subarea to the Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 020606A] received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6512. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Modification of the Yellowtail Flounder Landing Limit for Western and Eastern U.S./Canada Areas [Docket No. 040804229-4300-02; I.D. 010606A] received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6513. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Quarter I Fishery for Loligo Squid [Docket No. 051209329-5329-01; I.D. 020306B] received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6514. A letter from the Acting Director, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared as a result of the influx of evacuees from areas struck by Hurricane Katrina beginning on August 29, 2005 in the State of Florida, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6515. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting a copy of the Central and Southern Florida Project Indian River Lagoon-South Feasibility Study; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 645. Resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States; adversely (Rept. 109-384). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOEKSTRA: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. House Resolution 641. Resolution requesting the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to electronic surveillance without search warrants

on individuals in the United States; adversely (Rept. 109-385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 710. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-386). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. POE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 4881. A bill to promote the national defense by establishing requirements for the ownership, management, and operation of critical infrastructure in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, International Relations, and Homeland Security, 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. POMBO (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PEARCE, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 4882. A bill to ensure the proper remembrance of Vietnam veterans and the Vietnam War by providing a deadline for the designation of a visitor center for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4883. A bill to provide justice for crime victims' families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

H.R. 4884. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include in gross income the value of assets set aside under an employer nonqualified deferred compensation plan when the employer defined benefit plan has a funding target attainment percentage of less than 80 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 4885. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to prohibit acquisitions, mergers, or takeovers of persons engaged in interstate commerce in the United States by entities controlled by or acting on behalf of foreign governments that do not recognize countries that are member states of the United Nations, participate in boycotts against countries that are friendly to the United States, or provide support for international terrorism; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and International Relations, 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 4886. A bill to designate Colombia under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to make nationals of

Colombia eligible for temporary protected status under such section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 4887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts awarded to qui tam plaintiffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. JINDAL):

H.R. 4888. A bill to amend the provision regarding the emergency watershed protection program in the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006, to restore the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to waive or reduce the non-Federal cost share requirements of the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GINGREY:

H.R. 4889. A bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mrs. BONO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MACK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. RENZI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 4890. A bill to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 4891. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to conduct an Independent Safety Assessment of the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 4892. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to continue to make available to the public on a weekly basis information on the measure of the M3 monetary aggregate, and its components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 4893. A bill to amend section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict off-reservation gaming; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 4894. A bill to provide for certain access to national crime information databases

by schools and educational agencies for employment purposes, with respect to individuals who work with children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 4895. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit the provision of United States military assistance and the sale, transfer, or licensing of United States military equipment or technology to Ethiopia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 4896. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard for each durable infant or toddler product, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 4897. A bill to reauthorize the Renewable Energy Systems and Energy Efficiency Improvements Program of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2011 and to increase the annual level of Commodity Credit Corporation funding for the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.J. Res. 81. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Phillip Frost as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.J. Res. 82. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 352. Concurrent resolution recognizing the contributions of the New York Public Library's Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture in educating the people of the United States about the African-American migration experience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H. Res. 711. A resolution recognizing and honoring the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H. Res. 712. A resolution commending the United States men's and women's curling teams on their accomplishments at the 2006 Winter Olympic Games in Torino, Italy; to the Committee on Government Reform.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

262. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 30 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to amend the No Child Left Behind Act to provide that paraprofessionals who are employed in Title I schools prior to the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act shall be deemed to have met the definition of "highly qualified" for purposes of such legis-

lation due to such employment and the experience gained as a result of such employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

263. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 32 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

264. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to honor the preferences of local governing authorities in determining the location of temporary housing sites; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

265. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 20 urging the Louisiana congressional delegation to ensure enactment of legislation to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide the same level assistance to the residents of certain parishes who were affected by Hurricane Rita as the residents of Louisiana affected by Hurricane Katrina, including funding assistance with demolition and removal of damaged housing; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

266. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to immediately close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet and return the area to essential coastal wetlands and marshes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

267. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 26 urging the United States Army Corps of Engineers to provide a listing of all Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita related projects, including specific details including the type of work, the name of the contractor, and the total price of the contract; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

268. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 17 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to allow a five hundred dollar federal tax deduction for people who housed evacuees rent free for at least sixty continuous days as a result of Hurricane Rita; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. MEEK of Florida.  
 H.R. 95: Mr. HOLT and Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 147: Mrs. NORTHUP.  
 H.R. 198: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 200: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 282: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 283: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
 H.R. 354: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 363: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BACA, and Mr. EMANUEL.  
 H.R. 503: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 515: Mr. MURPHY.  
 H.R. 517: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 550: Ms. NORTON, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 552: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 586: Mr. BOOZMAN.  
 H.R. 611: Ms. WATERS and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 615: Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 669, Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 752: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. Dingell, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 769: Mr. DELAHUNT.  
 H.R. 791: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 807: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 808: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 838: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
 H.R. 888: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 898: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 998: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1053: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. KIND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. HART, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1120: Mr. ROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 1188: Mr. STRICKLAND.  
 H.R. 1227: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1262: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1345: Ms. DEGETTE.  
 H.R. 1366: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 1393: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 1447: Mr. ROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 1494: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 1498: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1558: Mr. PLATTS.  
 H.R. 1578: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 1588: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 1621: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 1649: Mr. FATTAH.  
 H.R. 1671: Mr. SODREL.

H.R. 1806: Mr. ANDREWS.  
 H.R. 1951: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 2045: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2073: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2230: Mrs. MCCARTHY.  
 H.R. 2317: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 2348: Mr. RENZI.  
 H.R. 2369: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2390: Mr. MARKEY.  
 H.R. 2421: Mrs. CAPITO and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2534, Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2592: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2642: Mr. BARROW.  
 H.R. 2669: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2684: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2716: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2793: Mr. OBEY and Mr. FATTAH.  
 H.R. 2804: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 2939: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 3004: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 3167: Mr. WELDON of Florida.  
 H.R. 3255: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

- H.R. 3318: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
H.R. 3352: Mr. HOSTETTLER.  
H.R. 3361: Ms. HERSETH and Ms. WATSON.  
H.R. 3476: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BACA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 3478: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. SALAZAR, and Ms. HARRIS.  
H.R. 3861: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 3954: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 3986: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 4005: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SABO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 4015: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 4019: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GOODLATTE.  
H.R. 4188: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SANDERS.  
H.R. 4197: Mr. BECERRA.  
H.R. 4201: Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 4211: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 4217: Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 4236: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
H.R. 4244: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
H.R. 4291: Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 4315: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.  
H.R. 4319: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
H.R. 4338: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 4341: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. SHUSTER.  
H.R. 4357: Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
H.R. 4364: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RAHALL.  
H.R. 4403: Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 4423: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SABO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. BOYD.  
H.R. 4434: Mr. SHAYS.  
H.R. 4460: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 4474: Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 4493: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 4542: Mr. HOLT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 4547: Mr. BOREN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. HART.  
H.R. 4551: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.  
H.R. 4562: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. McNULTY, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 4623: Mr. TERRY and Mr. FATTAH.  
H.R. 4625: Mr. BOUSTANY.  
H.R. 4646: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 4662: Mr. WYNN and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 4668: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. SAXTON.  
H.R. 4681: Mr. LUCAS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. EMERSON, Miss MCMORRIS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. DENT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. GORDON.  
H.R. 4685: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 4687: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.  
H.R. 4696: Mr. GERLACH.  
H.R. 4704: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
H.R. 4709: Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 4727: Ms. BERKLEY.  
H.R. 4736: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
H.R. 4740: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
H.R. 4747: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 4751: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H.R. 4755: Mr. STARK, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. DELAURO.  
H.R. 4761: Mr. WAMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 4764: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 4774: Mr. FORD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SABO.  
H.R. 4780: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CASE, and Ms. HARRIS.  
H.R. 4790: Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 4799: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.  
H.R. 4800: Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 4807: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RENZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
H.R. 4808: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 4813: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.  
H.R. 4820: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 4830: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FORD, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. CONAWAY.  
H.R. 4843: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BILLRAKIS.  
H.R. 4859: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 4864: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.J. Res. 78: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H. Con. Res. 3: Ms. BORDALLO.  
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. ANDREWS.  
H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. ANDREWS.  
H. Con. Res. 235: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
H. Con. Res. 320: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SAM JOHN-SON of Texas, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
H. Con. Res. 336: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
H. Con. Res. 338: Mr. WEXLER.  
H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. HALL.  
H. Res. 295: Mr. OWENS and Mr. PALLONE.  
H. Res. 316: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H. Res. 566: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
H. Res. 578: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H. Res. 608: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HART, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WELLER, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SHUSTER.  
H. Res. 616: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MICHAUD.  
H. Res. 658: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. SERRANO.  
H. Res. 673: Ms. HART, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARDIN.  
H. Res. 680: Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H. Res. 681: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
H. Res. 698: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. DINGELL.  
H. Res. 699: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.  
H. Res. 700: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
H. Res. 701: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 415: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006

No. 28

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer.

Let us pray.

Our Father in heaven, today we praise You because Your loving kindness endures forever. You have blessed this land with freedom and abundance. Thank You for spacious skies and amber waves of grain.

Teach us to be thankful even when we face problems and pain as Your spirit opens our eyes to Your unfailing goodness.

Bless the Members of this body. May their labors today flow out of a pure heart, a good conscience, and a sincere faith. Give them trust and confidence in Your guidance and a reverence and humility in Your presence.

Keep us all from trying to please both others and You. We pray in Your holy 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, leadership time is reserved.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we will begin a 1-hour period for debate

prior to the cloture vote with respect to the LIHEAP bill. I ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour be for debate only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I expect that vote to occur sometime shortly before 11 a.m. this morning. If cloture is invoked—and I hope it will be—then we will be working toward an agreement that will allow us to finish the bill as quickly as possible today.

We will be returning to the lobbying reform bill today. We will begin considering amendments. Therefore, in addition to the LIHEAP bill, we will have votes in relation to the amendments to the lobbying reform bill.

I also expect the Senate to recess from 12:30 until 2:15 for the weekly party luncheons.

I say again to all colleagues who want to finish the lobbying bill this week that we certainly want to allow adequate time for Members to offer amendments. I urge Members to come forward early. We would like to lock in a filing deadline as soon as possible. As a matter of fact, I hope that we could lock in a filing deadline for today and therefore give our managers their best opportunity to schedule consideration of the amendments as soon as possible.

Again, we expect to be working into the evening each night in an effort to finish the bill as soon as possible.

### FLAG PROTECTION AMENDMENT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, every morning we open the Senate by reciting, as we just did a few moments ago, the Pledge of Allegiance. Hand over heart, we pay solemn tribute to the American flag, that sacred symbol of America's history, values, and principles.

We are reminded that we are but servants, momentary players in the great unfolding of the American story. The flag—transcendent, noble, still—

commands our humility and binds us in the common project of serving the body politic. It is with this understanding that, before Congress adjourns for the Fourth of July recess, I intend to bring the flag protection amendment to the floor.

The proposed amendment is simple. It is a one-sentence statement that reads: "The Congress shall have the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States."

Along with 80 percent of the American public and all 50 of our State legislatures, I believe the Constitution should allow laws that protect our flag.

Unfortunately, in 1989, the Supreme Court overturned 200 years of precedent and struck down all laws that prohibit flag desecration. I believe their decision was misguided. In my view, desecrating the flag is not speech but an act of physical assault. We know this when we see rioting mobs in foreign countries setting our flag on fire. We can see clearly that they are engaged in a specific act of physical aggression against our country and everything for which we stand. Whether inside or outside our borders, burning the American flag is intended to intimidate, not to engage in constructive speech.

I believe the amendment process is the appropriate remedy to the Court's 1989 decision. As Harvard law professor Richard Parker explains:

The amendment process is essential to the Constitution's deepest foundation—the principle of popular sovereignty affirmed in its first words, "We the people." Making use of this process reaffirms and thus preserves that foundation.

Since I first came to the Senate in 1995, I have supported a constitutional amendment to protect our flag.

The flag is not only the physical symbol of our Nation, our pride, and our in history, but also of our values:

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1807

freedom, justice, independence, equality, and, ultimately, we the people. Protecting the flag won't stop Americans from exercising their first amendment right to free speech.

Countless brave men and women have died defending the American flag. It is but a small, humble act to vote to defend it.

In the words of our esteemed colleague, Senator HATCH:

Whatever our differences of party, race, religion, or socio-economic status, the flag reminds us that we are very much one people, united in a shared destiny, bonded in a common faith in our Nation and the profound belief in personal liberty that our Nation projects.

I look forward to bringing the flag protection amendment to the floor for debate, and I am hopeful that we will be able to once and for all give the American people the opportunity to defend this noble symbol of our shared legacy.

#### MAKING AVAILABLE FUNDS FOR THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, 2006

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2320 which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2320) to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Kyl/Ensign amendment No. 2899, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for allotments to States for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006.

Inhofe amendment No. 2898, to reduce energy prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Under the previous order, there will be 1 hour of debate equally divided between the Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, and the Senator from Nevada, Mr. ENSIGN, or their designees.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the majority leader for his considerable effort, patience, and perseverance in bringing this legislation to the floor on the basis of the commitment which the leader made in December prior to our adjournment that we would have this legislation to increase low-income fuel assistance for those States that clearly need it, given the rising prices of home heating oil and natural gas, given the fact that we are in the midst of the winter, and given the fact that this has a major impact on families across the country.

I hope we will get beyond today, beyond the cloture vote and be able to secure the additional funding that is so essential to so many of the States and to so many individuals and families who depend upon it. It is absolutely critical that we provide these funds for

this fiscal year in order to prepare for the summer and also to address the contingency necessity of providing additional funding this winter.

I am joined in my efforts and I wish to thank my colleague, Senator COLEMAN, my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator SUNUNU, Senator SPECTER, and Senator SANTORUM, as well as Senator SMITH and Senator KERRY. I express my deep appreciation for their support.

I first want to address some of the criticisms that were engendered last week because I think there has been a lot of misunderstanding and misinterpretation about exactly where we stand today and what the facts are.

First of all, my underlying bill shifts the funding from fiscal year 2007 to 2006. There is an additional \$1 billion for the purposes of "contingency" funding, otherwise known as emergency funding for emergency purposes. So it is budget neutral. We are just advancing it 1 year because of the unusual circumstances and because of events between rising oil prices and a difficult winter which have eroded the value of the low-income fuel assistance. This would help to make it more consistent with the authorization level because of the dire need in so many States across the country, including my own.

It does nothing to modify how those funds are disbursed to the States. The Senate decided 1 month ago when it passed the Deficit Reduction Act that 25 percent of the \$1 billion would be appropriated through a formula funding and 75 percent would go to emergency contingency funding.

The Congress decided—including the Senate, and it became law just a month ago—that the President would continue to have the emergency funding capability in order to disburse that part of the funding, 75 percent to those States that needed it at that moment in time because there was an emergency. Emergencies are just that—emergencies.

What the critics are saying about my approach is they now want to change it for the first time ever and take away the capability of having emergency funding under the low-income fuel assistance. It doesn't make sense. Because the States are facing an emergency, they ought to be able to have their funding. That would be taken away by the Kyl amendment, and it would be distributed to States irrespective of whether they need it, irrespective of the fact that no emergency occurred in their State.

I understand that under the low-income fuel assistance program, you have part emergency and part formula. That is what it is all about.

All my underlying bill says is advance the funding from 2007 to 2006 for \$1 billion. So we are not increasing the net level of funding for low-income fuel assistance. We have already agreed to it in the budget. It is not increasing spending. It is budget neutral. I don't

change the way it is distributed. I am doing just exactly what was dictated by the U.S. Senate, and it became law in the Deficit Reduction Act a month ago.

Now we are saying let us change the entire formula, let us change the entire approach through the Kyl amendment by distributing all of the funds through a formula and we will have no emergency funding.

Let me remind my colleagues that just last fall, we had four States that benefited from the emergency funding as a result of the hurricane. Alabama received \$2 million; Florida, \$1.35 million; Louisiana, \$12 million; Mississippi \$11.75 million—exactly because it was an emergency. The President had the authority, had the discretion to disburse those funds from the contingency funds under the low-income fuel assistance program. Under the Kyl amendment, the President wouldn't have that capability. It would be given to States that didn't experience the hurricane, that didn't have an emergency. We would not be able to have any emergency funding if we passed the Kyl amendment.

I hope the Senate will continue the way in which we have approached it in the past. I hope we pass the underlying bill at the very least to advance that funding.

Emergency contingency funds exist because we cannot predict the weather, whether it is in the South or the Northeast or the West. We can't predict. That is why we created an emergency fund under low-income fuel assistance. Now, for the first time ever, we take away that capability.

I think it is important for my colleagues to understand what is at stake. All of the funding under low-income fuel assistance would be distributed according to a formula. There would be no separate funding for emergency purposes as we provided in the gulf last fall. So four States were able to benefit from the emergency distribution as a result of the President's action.

We need that discretionary capability because we are not weather forecasters. We do not know what will happen in America wherever it is going to happen. This is not a regional program. This benefits all 50 States. In fact, in January 2005, in looking at the distribution, all 50 States historically have benefited at some point from the emergency funding.

Unfortunately, on Thursday night there was a chart distributed in the Senate that was misrepresentative of the facts. Even the Congressional Research Service said it was misleading. The fact is, it did not portray the facts. It showed a distribution of the funds in January 2005 according to the emergency funding at that moment in time. But if you looked at it in February or March or April or this year, it might be radically different because the emergencies might have occurred elsewhere. That distribution was for that moment in time because of the emergencies

that resulted. That is not a constant pattern of distribution. It was a misleading chart. I don't blame my colleagues for voting for the interests of their respective States, absolutely. But I want my colleagues to realize and understand that chart was misleading. It does not represent what the emergency funding is all about. We cannot predict an emergency. So there were emergencies back in January 2005 that represented those distributions, but that is not the way it happens all the time because we do not know when the emergencies are going to occur.

I regret that chart was distributed on the basis that it represents how these funds are circulated and dispensed according to the States. They are dispensed according to need and necessity. That is what the emergency funding is all about.

It is important to realize the value of the low-income fuel assistance program overall. In fact, it is one that many of the States have come to depend on, rightfully. I was in the House of Representatives when we first created this program during an energy crisis back in 1979 on the essential basis of helping to mitigate people's fuel bills, particularly for the low income and those who are disadvantaged who cannot possibly pay for the total cost of their oil bills, or in the summer for air-conditioning bills. We know it has profound implications on people's budgets, their inability to meet the rising costs, and especially so this year with 30 to 50 percent increases in their energy bills. That is in addition to the increases that occurred last year that were 20 to 30 percent.

My constituents in the State of Maine cannot meet those rising prices. We are just attempting to hold them harmless with this funding, to hold them harmless to last year to maintain the status quo. What is the status quo? It is about meeting maybe a quarter of their fuel bill during the winter. Maybe. That depends on the rising price, and as we know, it has been an unpredictable pattern of rising prices. It is a very different thing when we have a price for a barrel of oil at \$29 compared to where we are today, with a fluctuation anywhere from \$61 or \$66 for a barrel of oil. That has a major impact on a family's budget. The value of low-income fuel assistance today from where it was back in the mid-1980s has declined to 19 percent of the real value of this program based on what we have provided under low-income fuel assistance.

Back in the 1980s it represented, in real terms, 50 percent to families across this country. Now it has declined to more than 19 percent.

There was a survey recently conducted that illustrated this situation and why this program is so critical to so many families in my State and across America. It illustrated this point. It is tragic. It said that 73 percent of households would cut back and even go without other necessities such

as food and prescription drugs and mortgage and rent payments to pay for heat. We have seen that illustrated in the State of Maine. We have had some very dire and tragic situations where people have had to be hospitalized because of hypothermia.

People say it is a mild winter. I invite Members to come to Maine and tell me about it. It has been a very cold winter.

But this is also about the price. In the State of Maine, the price has risen 30 to 50 percent in addition to the price increases last year. Yet the funding for low-income fuel assistance has maintained the status quo. So there has been an erosion of support for families who depend upon this program just barely to meet, perhaps, a quarter of their overall fuel bills depending on the price.

That is why I have asked, along with my colleague from Minnesota, Senator COLEMAN, my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, and so many others who have cosponsored this legislation, to advance the funding by 1 year. It has already been provided for. It is budget neutral.

I heard one possibility of using TANF funds to pay for this. Let me remind my colleagues, under the law, TANF funds are to go for families with children. It does not allow for the use of TANF funds for any other purpose. If States do so for ineligible individuals or families, the State is penalized up to 5 percent. Using TANF funds cannot be allowed for low-income seniors, for example, who otherwise are not eligible under the TANF law.

I remind my colleagues that it is important to look at the facts and how the law works and what the implications are. I hope we can get beyond the regionalization of this low-income fuel assistance program bill and look at what is in the best interest of America, irrespective of where the necessity lies. Whether it is in the North, East, South or West, is it a need? Is it vital? Is it important? That is what this legislation is all about.

That is why, in the wisdom of the Congress and the President, we established the contingency fund for emergency purposes so the President would have the discretionary authority to distribute those funds on the basis of need at that moment in time. The other funding is distributed according to a formula. I don't change any of that. I do not change existing law. I do not change what this Senate and the House passed that became law a month ago. I do not change that.

The amendment offered by Senator KYL changes all of that and places 100 percent of the funding under the low-income fuel assistance program on a formula basis so there is no emergency funding.

I hope my colleagues would vote for cloture so we can proceed. Whether we have amendments remains to be seen. But I am prepared to work with my colleagues, those who have differences

of opinion regarding this legislation, to work it out, work it out for their State and what is in the best interest of their State, our States, and for all of America. This should not be a North, South, East, West issue. This should be an issue on the basis of what is right, what is fair, what is required, and what is needed. That is what this is all about. An emergency is an emergency. That is what the emergency funding is. That is what this contingency funding is.

I impress upon my colleagues how important it is. It would be a dramatic departure to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to redistribute all of the funds through a formula and have no capacity whatever for the President to distribute it on an emergency basis.

I remind my colleagues this is not just about Maine or the North, it is about the South and the East and the West. This shouldn't be about a compass. This should be about America.

I hope Members will look at the facts. The facts are we distributed funding under the emergency contingency fund last fall to help those States in the gulf as a result of the hurricanes for four States, including Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. We gave them \$15 or \$14 million distributed by the President, rightfully, in response to an emergency.

Taking the emergency funding and distributing it on the basis of a formula means that States are going to receive funding when there is no emergency. How did that make sense? That was not the intent, ever. The intent was to maintain the separate funding for this capability. That is what it was all about.

Eleven States have totally obligated their winter heating fund for this winter, including my own State: Arkansas, California, Georgia, Iowa, Maine, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, and many of the other States. In fact, 34 Governors have written requesting this additional assistance. They are facing a crisis because applications are up and the funding is down. Increases of at least 20 percent are expected in 15 States alone.

The funds expended for the low-income fuel assistance is equivalent to the amount Congress allocated in 1983. That was 23 years ago. What about the price of a barrel of oil? It is important to my State of Maine where 84 percent of the people qualify for low-income fuel assistance, and the State in general is around 80 percent; 80 percent for those dependent on home heating oil. A barrel of oil in 1983 was \$29.

By the way, the price should be going down as we go away from winter and toward the summer. But there is a dramatic change this year. The price is actually going up. And the future price for oil is much higher in January of

2007. That should raise a serious concern among all Members about the potential for price increases with respect to home heating oil and natural gas.

A barrel of oil in 1983 was \$29; today it is at least \$61 a barrel. That is a difference of \$32. We are basically losing the value of low-income fuel assistance because the funding has remained the same. It has declined to about 19 percent of the real value of what it represented when we first created the program almost 27 years ago when I was serving in the House of Representatives.

I have offered the underlying bill to advance the funding based on the recent formula. I do not change the funding. It is 75–25, 75 for emergency and 25 percent on formula. I am prepared to offer a 50–50 that would actually allow many States to gain or stay the same if we want to talk about the formula but do not do away with the emergency funding. That would be the first time ever under this program, and we will not have the capability and the President will not have the authority or the prerogative to respond to those States that are in an emergency crisis, as was the case last fall with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. That is the major departure, historically, from how we have obligated funds, both to formula and for emergency.

Mr. President, 54 percent of my colleagues have voted for an increase in funding for low-income fuel assistance last year, requiring 60 votes. That was requiring 60 votes. We worked very hard. We got 66 votes last week on proceeding to this vital issue.

So I hope my colleagues will support this cloture motion so we can move beyond and get to the heart of the matter, so we can discuss the differences and the implications of the underlying bill versus the amendments offered. I am prepared to work with my colleagues in any way to work it out. It is not, in my view, a matter of North versus South, East versus West or whatever. It is not sectional interests we are talking about.

What we are talking about is doing what is right for whoever needs this program and depends upon it in a moment in time. That is what the emergency funding provides. It gives us that flexibility and that capability that will be done away with by the Kyl amendment. I truly regret there was this chart that was distributed last week because it gave an erroneous picture of the accurate distribution of funding because with emergency funding you cannot have a fixed picture because it depends on the emergency. And unless someone around here is a soothsayer, there is no way to know how that funding will be distributed.

Yes, it was distributed at that moment in time that way. That is precisely because there were emergencies. But you do not know what the emergency is going to be a year from now, a month from now, 6 months from now. We are coming upon the hurricane sea-

son again. God forbid if anything else happens. The fact is, we need to have that flexibility, as we did last fall. We need to have that capability similarly for our States that need it, in Maine and the other cold-weather States currently.

If we need more funding, I am all for it. But I know there is resistance by many to increasing the funding, regrettably. But this has fallen far short of the real value of this program, as I illustrated. We have not provided a real increase in the low-income fuel assistance program since it was created back in 1979 during my first term in the House of Representatives.

Those are the facts. So I urge my colleagues to vote to proceed to the final consideration of this bill.

I reserve the remainder of my time.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Illinois.  
Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the efforts of the Senator from Maine. She has been our leader and our champion on this issue of funding LIHEAP. It has been a bipartisan effort, too. Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, on this side of the aisle, and many others, have spoken in favor of what she is attempting to do.

To describe it very briefly, for those who are following this debate, it would put \$1 billion more in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program across America. We said we thought we would need \$5 billion this year. Then we only appropriated \$2 billion. And in some parts of the country the winter has been fairly mild, including the Midwest. In other parts it is still harsh and cold. But wherever you live, you have found the cost of heating your home has gone up dramatically, between 30 and 50 percent.

Now, imagine if you are on a fixed income, that you are a retired single woman, for example, a widow, and you turn to this program, as you have in years past, and this year you need it more than ever. Or imagine you are a woman I met, a mother in the city of Rockford, with three small children. She is divorced. She is working. She is trying to keep this little frame house she is living in warm enough so her kids can be well enough to go to school.

She needs a helping hand from this program. She is a minimum wage worker. She works as a waitress. She does not make a lot of money, but, God bless her, she is trying. And this program says we will give her a helping hand. The sad reality is, as the Senator from Maine told us, there is not enough money in this program. So many of these people find themselves without the helping hand that we have promised all across the United States.

All the Senator from Maine and others are saying is, let's put enough

money in this program to help the truly vulnerable people in America. These people are our neighbors. These are fellow Americans, the parents and grandparents of people who made this the great country it is today.

You look at the situation and say, this has so many echoes and memories of what happened in New Orleans. In New Orleans, when some of the nicest people in this world, who happen to be caught up in a flood, had nowhere to turn—and the Government was not there—the sad reality is that many of them suffered. We look back now, 6 months later, in horror to think that great city is still struggling to get back on its feet. Despite the best promises of President Bush and this administration, it is not happening.

I wonder if that would have been the case anywhere else in America. Would that have happened anywhere else in America, that a city would have been devastated, and 6 months later it is still not receiving the attention it needs because of a lack of leadership from this Administration?

What the Senator from Maine is saying, what we are saying, is that for individual families faced with the realities of life today, some of these programs make all the difference in the world. And the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program is one.

I met with a woman in Rock Island, IL, a retired lady, a beautiful lady, who works down at the senior center now just doing volunteer work. She counsels the seniors on how to apply for LIHEAP assistance so they can pay their gas bills, which, of course, is what we use to heat the majority of our homes in the Midwest.

So many of us believe that when we face these natural disasters and challenges in America, that it is a challenge to each one of us to come together as the American family. I can understand how the Senator from Maine feels. People say: Oh, this is just a big New England problem. Now, don't worry me because I happen to live somewhere else.

It is an American problem, my friends. It was an American problem in New Orleans. It is an American problem in New England. It is an American problem when American families struggle for the basic necessities to survive. Those who would divide us on sectional lines, on lines of economic benefit, on lines of racial differences—those people are just wrong because this country is strongest when it stands together. And we stand together when some members of the American family are in need, and they are in need today.

We need to stand behind the Senator from Maine on a bipartisan basis. We need to say to this administration: Do not leave more Americans behind—as happened in New Orleans. We cannot have it repeated in New England or in northern Illinois or anyplace across the United States. We need to come together.

As I look at this bill, I think this is reasonable. It is reasonable for us to

stand up for our fellow Americans who need a helping hand with low-income home energy assistance.

Let me add something as well. Wouldn't it be great if America had an energy policy? Wouldn't it be terrific if we really had a plan that would move us away from our dependence on foreign oil? When the Senator quotes oil prices, do you know what control we have over oil prices? None. When the OPEC cartel and the sheiks decide production levels, and oil prices go up, America reaches into its wallet for its credit cards and cash, and the money goes right on the line, and not just to them but to the oil companies.

It is similar with natural gas. Wouldn't it be great if we had vision and leadership in America today that moved us toward less dependence on energy from overseas? We wouldn't be caught when we stopped to fill up our cars, or provide energy to our homes and businesses, with dependence on oil cartels or fossil fuels that leave us dangling on the ends of strings, as the producers control the dance like puppeteers?

That is the fact today because for too long we have let the national energy debate—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. For too long, we have focused this energy debate on where can we drill for more oil. Can we go to a wildlife refuge in Alaska? The honest answer is, all the oil in that wildlife refuge would not provide the energy this country needs for more than 6 months over a 20-year period. It is not an answer. It is not a solution. We control less than 3 percent of the oil reserves in this world. Yet we consume 25 percent of the oil resources. There is no way we can drill ourselves to a point of self-sufficiency.

We need leadership. We need innovative, sustainable, renewable sources of energy. We need better fuel-economy in our cars and trucks. America should be moving forward as some other countries are with a new vision on energy. Instead, we are faced with these crippling bills to heat our homes, and at the gas station to fuel our vehicles.

Today, we need to vote to support the motion for cloture, bring the LIHEAP bill up, provide a helping hand to the most vulnerable Americans, and then sit down and get down to business about an energy policy that really works for our future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has 6 minutes 52 seconds, and the Senator from Nevada has 30 minutes.

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I just want to make a couple points, and then I will reserve the remainder of my time.

The Senator from Illinois mentioned Senator REED, and I, too, would be remiss if I did not mention Senator REED from Rhode Island, who has worked mightily on this issue and seeking increases in low-income fuel assistance and, in fact, has worked on that throughout the last year and this year as well. So I thank him for all of his efforts in that regard.

Finally, regarding low-income fuel assistance contingency funds, under the law—I would like to read it to my colleagues because I think it is important to understand the purpose that was underlying the design and how this program would allocate the funding in emergency situations. The low-income fuel assistance contingency funds are released at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services. I quote from the law, the law we all supported:

... to meet the additional home energy assistance needs of one or more States arising from a natural disaster or other emergency.

That is the purpose of the contingency fund that is currently in law. That was supported by this Senate, by the House, and became law. It is what the White House wants. The President wants it. He wants to continue that authority and flexibility to be able to respond to emergencies when they arise. We have no way of predicting when they might arise. Therefore, it is important to have those funds set aside for exactly and precisely that purpose.

The funding distribution is not altered under the underlying legislation that is pending before the Senate. It would be significantly altered by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona because we would no longer, for the first time in the history of the low-income fuel assistance program, have emergency funding capability, none whatsoever. So where we have provided millions of dollars to Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana and Florida as a result of the hurricanes last fall, we would not have that capability in the future. We do not have any capabilities.

I want to reiterate the fact that the graph that was distributed last week fundamentally misrepresented the allocation of funds. That was for one snapshot in time because emergencies existed at that moment in time. So if your State got that kind of money at that moment in time, it does not mean you get it the next time unless you had an emergency. That is what it is all about. You want your State to have the benefit of emergency funding under this program when an emergency arises, in the event it is necessary. If it is not, then you do not need that funding at that moment in time.

We have the formula capabilities under the low-income fuel assistance program to provide and distribute the

money to various States. That is another part of the program. But to do away with the emergency capabilities under this program, for the first time ever, is a dramatic departure from where we have been in the past, a dramatic departure even in the alteration of the funding formula, as represented by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. It would be a dramatic departure in all respects, and it would have implications all across America.

Let me remind my colleagues. I quote:

[It is] to meet the additional home energy assistance needs of one or more States arising from a natural disaster or other emergency.

As I said earlier, 34 of our Nation's Governors have recognized the crisis and have written to the Senate and House leadership respectively and said: Despite significant State contributions to emergency relief funds or supplementing existing State-Federal programs, with the record cost of energy nationwide, the Federal fiscal year 2006 funding for LIHEAP reflects a net decrease from the previous year's total. Exactly, because of the rising prices. That is what it is all about. It has been the status quo, as I said, for funding under LIHEAP, essentially since it was created, but most especially since 1983. That is a long time ago.

I think we ought to do what is right. It will benefit all of our States depending on the need and whether an emergency arises. Then we have the formula to distribute the other funding according to the States and to a formula upon which we have all agreed. And it is fair and equitable. What is underlying all of this is to do what is right for all of America, for all of our States, and not to pit one State against another, one region against another. That is not what this is all about. This program is for all 50 States based on formula and based on emergencies.

I hope we will not significantly alter this in a way that removes emergency funding capability that the President now has and what we certainly need and depend on in the event that occurs in any one of our States.

So with that, I reserve the remainder of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will please call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, let me say a few words about this before Senator ENSIGN comes to the floor. The first vote we will have shortly will be the vote to proceed with the consideration of this legislation, a so-called cloture vote. After that, the subject the Senator from Maine has primarily been addressing will be the pending business.

It is an amendment which would establish how this additional billion dollars would be made available to the States to meet their emergency needs for either home heating or home cooling, as conditions warrant.

There has already been about \$2 billion spent, almost all of which is for the heating needs of those in the colder part of our country. Those of us who offered the amendment to provide a way in which the third billion dollars would be distributed have had in mind some very difficult circumstances in our home States over the last year or so. In fact, part of the problem is the fact that the money that is available in the fiscal year is used pretty much at the front end of the time to treat the cold climate problems. By the time we get to the summer, when the heavy heat requirements would authorize funding to be spent in States such as Arizona and Nevada, there has been little money available.

Last summer, in response to the heat emergency there, when air conditioning bills were skyrocketing and a lot of people could not afford to pay them, bills which are much higher per household than home heating bills frequently are, there was no money available. We tried to get a contingency amount of money to apply to the problem. We literally had some people die. Yet by the time the money became available, it was too late.

One of the things we are trying to do with this amendment is to preserve some of the money pursuant to a formula so that it is not all sitting in a contingent fund to be spent in cold States in the beginning of the year with nothing left at the end of the year.

Let me cite some statistics from the city of Phoenix, for example: Arizona's LIHEAP program can only assist 4 percent of those who are eligible; 73 percent of the homes have an elderly or disabled or child under 5—this is in the city of Phoenix; these figures don't necessarily apply to everywhere in the State—18 percent have an energy burden of over 25 percent of their income. This is what I think folks don't realize. Air conditioning is a necessity when you have 115, 116, 118-degree days. It is not optional. Especially if you are elderly or very young, you have to have air conditioning. When you are paying 25 percent or more of your income for that air conditioning, it is a burden that too many people can't bear. That is why we are trying to get more of the funds allocated through a formula to the States that need that kind of help at the end of the year and not have it all sitting in a contingency where it is not available, as was the case last year.

We need to fix this problem. There is already appropriated for fiscal year 2006 \$2.183 billion—\$2 billion pursuant to the existing formula, almost all of which goes to the cold States in the Northeast and elsewhere, and \$183 million for contingency. So to the extent that there are contingency require-

ments, as the Senator from Maine has spoken to, there is funding currently available for that. What we are trying to do is ensure that the next billion dollars not only provides for that contingency funding and some additional contingency funding but that about three-fourths of it be distributed pursuant to a formula which is much fairer to those States that have not gotten the money in the past to assist their low-income folks to provide primarily for air conditioning. That is what the debate is all about.

The pending amendment is my amendment that would provide for a formula distribution of the next billion dollars. There is still contingency money available but not as much as there would be under the proposal of the Senator from Maine.

There is probably somewhere between zero and 100 an opportunity to try to work things out. It is my hope that in the time between now and the time we begin debating my amendment, we will be able to do so. I am certainly open to discussion about it. We need to make sure that wherever people are located, they are well taken care of. In the past, however, the way the money is distributed, virtually all goes to people in the colder States, with nothing left over for those folks who have to rely upon air conditioning. It is time we recognize that fact and modify the formula for the additional amount of money that is going to be spent if, in fact, money will be allocated, so it more accurately reflects the needs of the people in the hotter climates as well as those who have been the recipients of most of the money that has been allocated so far.

I reserve the balance of the time for others, in particular the Senator from Nevada, when he arrives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COLEMAN. How much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has 1 minute 18 seconds, and there is approximately 24 minutes reserved to the Senator from Nevada and counting.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we use an extra 3 minutes of the other side's time for my discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COLEMAN. I rise to respond to my friend and colleague from Arizona. We are in agreement on the idea that the money should go where it is needed. What I would disagree with is that there is nothing left for those from other States, warm weather States. That is not what we are dealing with here.

Two things about LIHEAP: One, it is not just another Federal acronym; it is a lifeline. I held hearings on this in St. Paul, where I heard from a woman named Lori Cooper, a working professional wife, mother of a 21-month-old

baby. It is about scraping by on salary alone, and even with assistance paying the heating expense, it was a real hardship. We had a senior named Lucille Olson who told a story of the struggle to balance the cost of high health insurance and prescription drugs with ever-rising heating bills that represent about 30 percent of her monthly income.

We are not talking about a Federal acronym. It is a helping hand.

You may hear some of my colleagues contending that a warmer-than-usual winter has somehow lessened the need. It may be a mild winter by Minnesota's standards, but certainly not by Virginia's. It was about minus 19 in St. Paul a couple weekends ago. If it is only 25 degrees, mild by Minnesota's standards, you still have to put about an extra 40 something degrees in there to heat your home so seniors and working people can live there with some measure of comfort.

We have 60 percent of all LIHEAP households in Minnesota heating their homes with natural gas. The price of natural gas has risen severely. It is a severe winter by national standards. LIHEAP is designed to soften that. We have heard it firsthand.

I want to make clear the bill which I cosponsored would designate an additional \$250 million for formula funding. But due to the nature of the formula governing allotments to States, this additional formula funding for Minnesota would provide a negligible increase. The 25/75 split is exactly the same split the Senate approved a few months ago in the Deficit Reduction Act. What we do is we change the date assistance is available from 2007 to 2006. Again, 25 percent of the funding goes to predominantly warm weather States.

This is about emergencies. It is about meeting the needs of emergencies. I have to say that we have been there. Senators from the northern States have been there when there has been flooding and tornadoes and hurricanes and other crises around the country. We haven't divided up regions. We didn't do that with Katrina and Rita when they swept across the gulf. We didn't do it in areas of Florida hit hard by hurricanes. We didn't do it in western States affected by wildfires. We are one great Nation. We come to the aid of those in need. This is about those in need. It is a severe winter where they can't afford the cost of natural gas, a lifeline, a helping hand, not an acronym for a program.

The Senate has a tradition of putting aside its regional and partisan divisions. When Americans face desperate situations, the Senate comes together in the name of the same Nation with the spirit of cooperation. I have heard the President speak eloquently about the spirit of America, of what it is all about. That is what we are asking for today. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita have already made natural gas prices worse. In northern States such as mine,

this is about hardship. I have seen the faces of those who need this assistance, those who work hard to get back on their feet, to build a better life. A dramatic increase in heating costs like those experienced in Minnesota this year is a cruel burden. They deserve a lifeline, a helping hand. Please support me in providing increased LIHEAP assistance designed to meet the needs of those who need it most.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I commend Senator COLEMAN for his leadership and all the efforts he has made in regard to the pending legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENSIGN. 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. ENSIGN. How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 22 minutes 14 seconds, and the Senator from Maine has 57 seconds.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, my preference would have been that this bill not go forward simply because I believe this legislation is not paid for. It would be different if the proponents of this legislation had truly paid for it, in other words, offset this spending. Instead of offsetting this spending, they take in the money from next year, bring it into this year and then will try next year to restore the money. If they would have said: This is the priority, let's reset our priorities and let's cut some other type of spending to pay for this, the legislation would have been a lot more acceptable.

That is the reason we raised the budget point of order last week against this legislation. We lost on that budget point of order. So now it looks as though the legislation has a chance of moving forward, and we have to determine how the money is spent. Is it fair to spend it across the country, or should it benefit some States at the expense of other States?

The LIHEAP program is set up with a very complex formula. It is assistance for those people who are low income, who need help with their heating oil or with air conditioning expenses—for those who live in hot States such as myself, or in Arizona, or some of the other southern States around the gulf coast.

The reason people are seeking this increase is because natural gas has exploded in price. Obviously, heating oil has done the same. So there is a need out there for assistance and we don't deny that. We think there is legitimacy to meeting that need. But it is a question of how do we now disburse this money fairly to the States.

Let me get back to the LIHEAP formula—how we determine how the

money goes to the various States. It was set up a long time ago when this program was first put in effect that it would benefit more of the colder States. When it was set up, the first amounts of money would go in and mostly benefit those cold weather States; and then if there was more money put into the program, it would be distributed more fairly to help States that are warmer. The proponent has put forward that three-quarters of the money would go to continue to help those States that are in the colder regions of the country, and 25 percent of the money would then be distributed kind of equally across the country. That is not the way the program was intended to be set up.

Additional moneys are supposed to be distributed fairly across the board. Mr. President, 28 out of the 50 States would lose under Senator SNOWE's bill; 22 States would benefit. Those same 22 States benefit under the moneys that have already been spent this year—more than the other States benefit.

We are not going to win the cloture vote. We fully admit that. We lost on a budget point of order, so we know we are going to lose on a cloture vote. After the cloture vote, there will be at least one amendment to change the formula so that other States are more fairly treated in this program.

I believe this billion dollars should be more fairly distributed across the country. So that is what we are going to attempt to do. We hope all of the Senators will look to see whether their States benefit more under the amendment Senator KYL and I are going to put forward or benefit under Senator SNOWE. If they look from a selfish perspective to their own States, they will vote with our amendment.

I think it is important when you are in the Senate to try to do what is best in the national perspective, but you also look to your State and your State's interest. When there is a pot of money out there, it is our responsibility to look to try to get our States' fair share of that money. That is what I am going to do for Nevada, and I know the Senator from Arizona is going to do that for the State of Arizona.

While this cloture vote will go forward, that doesn't mean we won't have germane amendments—which our amendment is—and that we won't have germane amendments to vote on to more fairly distribute the money.

How much time does the Senator need?

Mr. KYL. A couple of minutes.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, last year, we had a debate on increasing LIHEAP funding, but we had to pay for it last year. We paid for it by allowing drilling in ANWR. The ANWR provision got stripped out in the Senate. So the amount of money to pay for LIHEAP was no longer present. I would like to see drilling in ANWR. I think it is important to diversify our energy supplies in America. The money would

have been there and people would not have had objections. I agreed to that last year. This is purely deficit spending even though the proponents of the bill say it is not because of the phony budget games that are played around here. But because it is deficit spending, we are going to try to make sure that the money is spent fairly across the United States. That is what this whole debate is going to come down to in the next day or two.

Mr. President, with that, I reserve the remainder of our time, and 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. KYL. 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. KYL. Mr. President, since I last spoke, I want to get a couple of the specific numbers on moneys actually spent under the formula that currently exists for providing low-income energy assistance for both the cold weather States and the warm weather States.

I have some statistics that relate to three of the States in comparison with the State of Maine, for example. Nevada has about 40,000 more people, or eligible households than Maine. Under the current formula, it receives about \$22.7 million less than Maine. In the case of Arizona, with a population of about four times that of Maine, Arizona receives three times less money. In other words, Maine receives more than three times the money of Arizona, with Arizona having more than four times the population. Georgia had to spend \$10 million, up from \$3 million last year, for its energy needs and for needy families.

We are all interested in seeing that the low-income families have assistance. We want a formula that is fair. In the past, the formula has not been fair. Growing States such as Nevada and Arizona, which have far more population than some of the other States, receive far less money. As I said, in comparison of air conditioning bills versus heating bills, the air conditioning bills can be far greater—sometimes more than 25 percent of the income. That is what we are talking about here. We are trying to achieve fairness with the formula, not have the money all in a contingency fund which is spent early in the year on the cold weather, with nothing left for the hot weather folks.

If the Senator from Oklahoma is ready, I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I have been on the floor numerous times to talk about priorities. We are on an unsustainable course in our country. The GAO says that. Anybody who looks at our books, our budgets, and our deficits would realize that. We have before us a \$1 billion expenditure that I am

sure we are going to do. I have done everything I can to keep us from doing it. Without paying for it, we will transfer that money to our children.

I think it is important for the American public to know how awry we are in this body. I want to put forward and into the RECORD what the cosponsors of this bill did. They did, collectively, \$777 million worth of earmarks last year. Those States of the cosponsors are going to get \$145 million in LIHEAP money. The fact is, we spent over \$770 million on earmarks.

I wish to spend a few minutes reading some of them so we can see whether the American people think it is a priority. Do we help people who need heat with their homes or do we build the Katahdin Ironworks in Maine? Or do we build a new industrial park in Maine? Do we buy new land—the Rachel Carson land acquisition for \$600,000? Do we pay for a new building for the city of Brewer, an administrative building? I cannot find in the Constitution where that is a responsibility of the Federal Government. We are going to build a new Bangor waterfront park. We spent \$246,000 on earmarked lowbush blueberry research. Here is a George and Barbara Bush cultural center at the University of New England, \$300,000. Do we do that and charge it to our children and grandchildren, or do we help people with their heat? To me, it is an obvious choice. But we refuse to make those hard choices here. We would rather spend the money and charge it to our children and grandchildren.

Here is a Franco-American Heritage Center renovation project in Lewiston. And Bowdoin College in Brunswick, ME, gets \$100,000 for site planning and renovation. Here is a purchase of land, Brainerd Lakes, MN. Here is Midtown Greenway, Minneapolis, \$1.5 million. Here is Augsburg College, in Minnesota, \$1 million. I didn't know private colleges were part of the responsibility of funding from the Federal Government. Next we have Grand Portage in Minnesota, to establish a heritage center, \$4 million. We are going to establish a heritage center for \$4 million and we cannot help people with their heating bills. We are going to try to do both because it is politically expedient, but it is not politically expedient for our grandchildren.

We gave \$200,000 to the Hmong American Mutual Assistance Association. We gave \$500,000 to the Minneapolis American Indian Center in Minneapolis. We sent \$1 million to the Pine Technical College in Minnesota. We rehabilitated the Ames Lake Neighborhood, Phalen Place Apartments, in St. Paul with \$150,000 of taxpayer money. Here is the Willard Pond in New Hampshire, \$550,000. Then we have Roseview, a purchase of land for \$2 million. Here is the Hubbard Brook Foundation and the Daniel Webster College. Here is the city of Portsmouth, to build an environmentally responsible library. We are going to build a library instead of

paying for people's heating bills, and we are going to charge it to our children and grandchildren.

We spent \$150,000 for site preparation for improvements to White Park in Concord. We are going to restore Temple Town Hall in the town of Temple, \$225,000. That is not a Federal responsibility; it is a State responsibility.

Yet the American people are right to ask the question: How is it that we can have \$775 million in earmarks from five States, and those five States under this formula would get \$145 million in LIHEAP?

I suggest that we shouldn't take it from our children and grandchildren. I suggest that we ought to pay for it, and the way to pay for it is either reduce the number of earmarks that are not legitimate under the Constitution, but are very politically expedient, or find the money elsewhere.

I am not just picking on these items. This goes across this body throughout. The culture of earmarks is killing our country in terms of how much money we spend and who is paying for it. And who is actually paying for it is not us. We are shifting it to the next two generations.

I will show this document in the RECORD—it lists the earmarks by the five cosponsors of this bill—and let the American public decide whether they think we ought to take \$1 billion from our grandkids or cut out some of these projects that are not necessary right now. We are in a time of tremendous fiscal severity, and it is time we start acting as grownups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the document that lists earmarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE OUR PRIORITIES—EARMARKS OR LOW-INCOME ASSISTANCE?

(Estimated number and cost of earmarks in FY2006\*; additional LIHEAP funding based on estimate of an additional \$250 million allocated through the standard formula and \$750 million allocated through the contingency fund; contingency fund allocation rates for each state are based on the average distribution rate from the five previous releases from the contingency fund)

State	Number of earmarks	Cost of earmarks	Additional LIHEAP funding
Maine .....	38	\$29,362,000	\$16,277,940
Minnesota .....	85	127,383,000	29,089,755
New Hampshire .....	50	46,338,000	8,845,527
Ohio .....	171	238,005,026	39,060,740
Pennsylvania .....	286	336,210,500	52,561,169
Total .....	630	777,298,526	145,835,131

\*Note: The number and cost estimate of earmarks for each state likely underestimate the total number and cost of earmarks. Only earmarks where a state is clearly and readily identifiable are used in the estimates.

Sources: Congressional Research Service, LIHEAP Clearinghouse, staff calculations.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I want to help those people who cannot help themselves, but I have also discovered that there is very limited authorization for us in the Constitution for us to be paying the heating bills of people in this country. There is no such thing as compassion when you are using somebody else's money to offer compassion.

The real answer to heating bills is solving our energy crisis and local communities taking care of their local citizens with their assets.

I will not vote for cloture, although I know cloture is going to be invoked, but I think this is a great time that everybody in this country ought to be questioning the process here and the utilization of earmarks which could have paid for the heating bill, but instead we did things to help us back home, help us get reelected.

I remind the Members of this body, Mr. President, when they take the oath of this body, they don't take an oath to protect their State or bring home the bacon. They take an oath to do what is in the best long-term interest of this country, not what is in their best short-term political interest.

I believe, as the American people look at this—I know this recent polling said 69 percent of the people in this country think we ought to eliminate earmarks, even if it hurts them. The only way we will get out of the financial mess we are in is start attacking the process of earmarks that greases the sled for spending that is out of control.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield back her 57 seconds?

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, Senator COLLINS from Maine.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine have an additional minute and only 2 minutes be reserved on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation. I realize I need to talk very rapidly.

I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma listed earmarks that the Senator from Maine and I have jointly sponsored. I want to tell my colleagues that I am very proud of those projects, and I will stand here and defend every single one of them. But the fact is, that is irrelevant to the debate before us right now.

I think it is so unfortunate to see this breakdown as certain States in certain parts of the country oppose what is a program that is absolutely essential to those of us who live in colder States.

I supported all of the aid for Hurricane Katrina's victims in the gulf region. I routinely support programs that benefit other regions of the country. I think it is unfortunate and unfair and very disappointing for colleagues to oppose a program simply because it doesn't benefit their region as much as others.

This is a program that is a matter of literally life and death to those of us

representing low-income and elderly constituents.

I realize my time has expired. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to invoke cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I will conclude by making two points. First of all, the question on cloture is not whether to allow the program to go forward but whether it will be paid for or, in effect, the money taken from next year, in which case then next year's money will have to be taken from the year after that, and so forth. So it is a question of how we pay for it.

The average temperature in July of last year in Arizona was just under 100 degrees. It was about 98 degrees. It is a matter of life and death. Eighteen people died in Arizona, and there was no money available in Arizona for this program. By the time we found we could get a contingency of \$183 million, it was too late.

So while we would like to see the program continue, we would like to see it paid for and also we would like to see the formula modified so those people who suffer from the heat have as much of an opportunity to participate as those who have trouble from the cold weather. As a result, assuming that cloture is invoked, what we will be urging is that the next billion dollars be spent pursuant to a formula that more fairly divides the money among the various States, all of which have problems, but they are just different kinds of problems. And we will be able to debate that at that time.

Mr. President, I yield back all of the remaining time so we can go ahead with the vote.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 2320: a bill to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.

William Frist, Lamar Alexander, Ted Stevens, Pat Roberts, R.F. Bennett, George Allen, Pete Domenici, Rick Santorum, Gordon Smith, John Thune, Richard G. Lugar, Arlen Specter, John E. Sununu, Mitch McConnell, Lincoln D. Chafee, Lisa Murkowski, Mike DeWine, David Vitter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 2320, a bill to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays

are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 75, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Akaka	Dorgan	Mikulski
Alexander	Durbin	Murkowski
Allen	Feingold	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Grassley	Obama
Biden	Gregg	Pryor
Bingaman	Hagel	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Burns	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burr	Inouye	Salazar
Byrd	Jeffords	Santorum
Cantwell	Johnson	Sarbanes
Carper	Kennedy	Schumer
Chafee	Kerry	Smith
Clinton	Kohl	Snowe
Cochran	Landrieu	Specter
Coleman	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Stevens
Conrad	Levin	Sununu
Dayton	Lieberman	Talent
DeWine	Lincoln	Thune
Dodd	Lugar	Voinovich
Dole	McConnell	Warner
Domenici	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—25

Allard	DeMint	Martinez
Bond	Ensign	McCain
Brownback	Enzi	Roberts
Bunning	Graham	Sessions
Chambless	Hutchison	Shelby
Coburn	Inhofe	Thomas
Cornyn	Isakson	Vitter
Craig	Kyl	
Crapo	Lott	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). On this vote, the yeas are 75, the nays are 25. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. FRIST. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2913 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2899

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 2899 and now call up amendment No. 2913 as the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST], for Ms. SNOWE, proposes an amendment numbered 2913 to amendment No. 2899.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the distribution of funds to States under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program)

Beginning on page 1, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 2, line 5, and insert the following:

(A) by striking "for a 1-time only obligation and expenditure";

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking "\$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2007" and inserting "\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006"; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking "\$750,000,000 for fiscal year 2007" and inserting "\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006";

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF DANA REEVE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I awakened this morning to some very, very sad news: the death of Dana Reeve last night at the age of 44. With her death, I lost a dear friend and our American family lost a very, very special member of our family.

The world will remember Dana in many ways—as a fine actress, as a tireless advocate for spinal cord and embryonic stem cell research, and as the wife who stood by her husband through incredible adversity. I will remember her as a person of extraordinary grace and decency, always thinking of others, passionately committed to making a difference in the world.

Over the years, I was privileged to get to know and to work with both Dana and Christopher Reeve. Whoever coined the phrase that "life is unfair" must have had the Reeve family in mind. But these two people faced adversity with unflinching courage.

They taught us the most valuable of lessons. Christopher taught us how to transcend suffering and to live life to its fullest and to make every moment count. Dana taught us about the true meaning of love and commitment and loyalty.

Together, Dana and Christopher Reeve expanded access to new treatments and therapies for countless thousands of paralyzed Americans. Through their Christopher Reeve Foundation, they were tireless advocates for medical research.

Dana Reeve was also a superb politician, and I mean that in the best sense of the word. She knew exactly which committees to target, which levers to pull, which elected officials to cultivate and pressure and plead with. She also knew how to go over the heads of certain political leaders who got in her way, by taking her case directly to the American people. That is how Dana—and Chris, too—did so much to put embryonic stem cell research front and center on the national agenda. That is how she rallied support for spinal cord research.

But Dana spoke up passionately for all people living with disabilities. She spoke up for Parkinson's and ALS research. She advocated for more generous funding for the National Institutes of Health. Of course, she wanted a cure for her husband, but she fought for a cure for others as well, including all those children whom she and Chris met with spinal cord injuries. And, my friends, so must we. We must fight

also. Dana continued full speed ahead because of her drive and determination, because of the incredible work of all the dedicated people at the Christopher Reeve Foundation. And now Dana's work must continue full speed ahead because of our commitment and determination.

We must continue because we have an unfinished agenda. As long as misguided leaders deny our best scientists access to embryonic stem cells, we have an unfinished agenda. As long as people with disabilities are forced to live in nursing homes because Medicaid will not cover home care, we have an unfinished agenda. As long as there is hope for a cure to spinal cord injuries, Parkinson's, ALS, and other diseases, we have an unfinished agenda.

If we have just half of the commitment and tenacity and courage that Dana Reeve and her husband had, then we will complete this agenda.

Helen Keller, who knew plenty about adversity and disability, said something that applies very much to Dana Reeve in her last months. "Life," said Helen Keller, "is either a daring adventure, or nothing. To keep our faces toward change and behave like free spirits in the presence of fate is strength undefeatable."

That is the Dana Reeve I will always remember and cherish. Even when her husband was gravely injured and then taken from her, even a few months after that when she was cruelly stricken with lung cancer—a person who had never smoked in her entire life—she never gave up her fight for a better world and a better future for other people, especially those struggling with disabilities.

Dana Reeve was an extraordinary person, a passionate advocate, a wonderful mother, a loyal, committed, loving wife. As I said, she has taught us a lot about what commitment really means. We are grateful to God for the many gifts she shared with the world. We are grateful for all she has done to enrich our lives and to instruct us in how to live. Today, we grieve her passing.

May she rest in peace, and may her work continue.

Just on behalf of the Harkin family, Ruth and I and our children send our condolences to Will and to all the other members of the Reeve family. May they know we are going to continue the work. Through the Christopher Reeve Paralysis Foundation, we will find a cure for paralysis and spinal cord injuries. We cannot afford to give up. Dana Reeve never gave up. We cannot afford to either.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we heard the sad news of the death of Dana Reeve. My wife Marcelle and I got to know, first, Christopher Reeve, who often traveled to Vermont. We met with him there, did things with him there, and with members of his family; and then, subsequently through Chris, with Dana Reeve. We know they had only been married for 3 short years

when Christopher Reeve had a terrible accident which left him paralyzed from the neck down.

Like so many of the friends of both of them, we saw how Dana kept by his side. They raised their young son, she encouraging Chris at every step along the way.

It was my privilege to see and be with the two of them many times throughout that, as she helped him with his foundation, to help those with spinal cord injuries. And I heard him say so many times he could not have possibly done this without her steadfast help.

She said at one point that she learned that life does not take the turns you might think it would but that she would continue to stay with Chris and help him.

I remember when the sad time came for the end of his life, and the funeral and the eulogies and discussions that I had with her after that, and her commitment to go forward to help with the foundation and to raise their son.

Then, with the stunning news just a few months ago that she had lung cancer, in typical fashion, she said she felt she could beat that and would do—she had the best doctors—all the steps possible. Then in the last few days she got more and more ill. And, of course, today we received the news she had died.

I think of her talking about her years at Middlebury College in Vermont, going to Vermont with Chris—the two of them giving us so much.

A devoted wife and mother, a talented singer and actress, a determined and dedicated activist, Dana Reeve was the embodiment of grace and courage in the face of so many staggering challenges.

A graduate of Vermont's Middlebury College, Dana pursued both acting and singing, appearing on television programs, on Broadway, and on other stages across the country. When she married Christopher Reeve, a dear friend of so many of us across this land, she could not know what direction her life would take.

I first met Chris in the 1980s and had the good fortune of spending time with him in my home State of Vermont. Over the years, Marcelle and I came to count Chris among our friends. I am privileged to say that Dana became a dear friend of ours as well.

When tragedy struck Chris and Dana's lives in 1995, just 3 short years after their marriage, Dana's love and courage became the focal point of so many stories. Left a quadriplegic in a tragic equestrian accident, Chris repeatedly credited Dana's constant care, companionship, and love with bringing him out of shadowy sadness he felt in the first months after the accident. Together they opened the Christopher and Dana Reeve Paralysis Resource Center, designed to teach paralyzed people to live more independently. They also chaired the Christopher Reeve Paralysis Foundation, which provides funds for research on paralysis.

When Chris died in 2004, Dana—her courage never wavering—assumed the foundation's chairmanship, and she came to the Halls of Congress to make the case for easing the restrictions on stem cell research. Her unrelenting efforts to improve the quality of life for sufferers of paralysis have led to the distribution of more than \$8 million in grant funding to support programs designed to improve the daily lives of paralyzed people. Despite being diagnosed with lung cancer in 2005, Dana continued her advocacy efforts. In 2005, the American Cancer Society named her Mother of the Year.

Both Chris and Dana instilled in so many a hope and inspiration that can only come from conquering adversity. Their generous, vibrant, and compassionate souls have touched an entire nation. Their young son Will will no doubt look to that strength as he continues through life. Two years ago, I mourned the loss of my friend, Chris Reeve. Today, I join so many in mourning the loss of Dana, his inspiration, and ours as well.

It is sad when two good people like this are taken so early. I know I speak for so many tens of thousands of their friends not just around this country but around the world.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a remarkable woman who has shown Americans what courage is all about. That woman is Dana Reeve.

I knew Dana as a smiling, beautiful woman standing behind Christopher Reeve's wheelchair, accompanying him to DC to testify in support of advancing stem cell research. Since Chris's death, Dana was the face of this fight on behalf of patients across the country with spinal cord injury, Parkinson's, juvenile diabetes and countless other illnesses.

I thought that after everything Dana had gone through with Chris that she would have time to smell the flowers and be in the sun. But apparently that was not meant to be.

My heart goes out to Dana and Chris's son William, Dana's stepchildren Matthew and Alexandra, and the entire Reeve and Morosini families during what is and has been a very difficult time.

Dana was the picture of steadfast loyalty and compassionate care. She and Chris taught us all that life is short and that we should all have the courage and hope to "go forward."

Dana carried that spirit with her in her drive to push Congress to expand embryonic stem cell research and to expand access to new treatments and therapies for thousands of Americans with spinal cord injuries.

Dana was an activist, actress, singer, motivational speaker and published author. Dana was a founding board member of the Christopher Reeve Foundation and succeeded her late husband as chairperson in 2004. She created and led the Foundation's Quality of Life initiatives.

She received numerous awards for her work, most notably the Shining Example Award from Proctor & Gamble in 1998, an American Image Award from the AAFA in 2003, and the American Cancer Society named her Mother of the Year in 2005.

Dana, the person, was a tireless advocate for people with spinal cord injuries. For me personally, she and Chris will forever be the shining lights in the great national debate for advancing medical research.

It is with sadness that I stand before this body, more than 9 months after the historic vote in the House to expand Federally funded embryonic stem cell research, and still there has been no vote in the Senate.

With each day that passes the research that could one day lead to cures and treatments for millions of Americans with deadly and debilitating diseases is being held up.

It is incomprehensible to me that we have a bill, which has already passed the House, that may help millions of Americans but instead is just sitting, languishing in the Senate despite some overtures or promises that it would be taken up by this body.

It is time for the Senate to do exactly what the House did. It is time for the Senate to take up and pass the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, the Castle-DeGette bill, with no amendments and no alternatives. I believe we have the votes to pass this bill today and send it to the President.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge Dana's last struggle, her battle against cancer. This terrible disease is a very personal one for me. I have lost many loved ones to it. The elimination of death and suffering due to cancer has been one of my highest priorities since coming to the Senate.

Dana died of lung cancer and, as many of you have read in the papers, Dana was a non-smoker. I believe she had stage one metastatic lung cancer. In fact, over 60 percent of new lung cancers are diagnosed in people who never smoked or who managed to quit smoking even decades ago.

While cigarette smoking is by far the most important risk factor for lung cancer, many other factors play a role.

Lung cancer remains the deadliest form of cancer. In 2006, it will account for more than 162,000 cancer deaths, or about 29 percent of all cancer deaths. Since 1987, more women have died each year of lung cancer than from breast cancer.

Screening for lung cancer is years behind screening for other cancers, which means that when it is diagnosed, the disease is often already in its late stages, which is what I suspect happened to Dana Reeve.

The 5-year survival rate for all stages of lung cancer is only 15 percent. Compare this to the overall 5-year survival rate of 65 percent for all cancers diagnosed between 1995 and 2001.

Clearly we can and must do better. Increased NIH research for lung cancer is essential and we must press for better screening tools for lung cancer. I plan to address both of these issues in

comprehensive cancer legislation I plan to introduce shortly.

In closing, it is my sincere hope that the love Dana and Chris shared for each other will reunite them wherever their journeys take them from here. Dana left us far too soon—in her mid-40s—but she left us with her fighting spirit and the will to push forward so that one day we may find treatments and cures for those living with spinal cord injuries and other disabling conditions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withdraw his suggestion of an absence of a quorum?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of North Carolina, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. to accommodate the weekly party lunches and that the time will be counted postcloture.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:24 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ISAKSON).

#### MAKING AVAILABLE FUNDS FOR THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, 2006—Continued

Mr. MARTINEZ. 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. DAYTON. 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. DAYTON. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes with the time charged against my hour under cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### KIRBY PUCKETT

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to note with sorrow the passing of one of Minnesota's greatest sports heroes, Kirby Puckett, who suffered a stroke on Sunday and died yesterday at the age of 45. Kirby Puckett was born and raised in Chicago, but he became a Minnesotan when he was drafted at the age of 22 by the Minnesota Twins.

After two seasons in the minor leagues, he played his first major league game for the Twins on May 8, 1984, where he became the ninth player in baseball history to get four hits in his first game. Three years later, he appeared in the first of eight consecutive All Star games during which time he also won the American League's Most Valuable Player honors and Most Valuable Player in the American League championship series.

When his great career was cut short by blurred vision caused by glaucoma

in 1996, he sported a lifetime major league batting average of .318 with 2,304 hits, 207 home runs, and 1,085 runs batted in in 1,783 games. But even those extraordinary statistics comprise only part of Kirby Puckett's greatness. He played baseball with an enthusiasm, a devotion, and an excitement that was thrilling to watch. Whether at bat or in center field, where he was a Golden Glove outfielder, he brought Twins fans out of their seats with spectacular game-winning plays.

No Minnesota Twins fan old enough to remember our team's two world championships will ever forget Kirby Puckett. In 1987, with the Twins trailing the St. Louis Cardinals three games to two, Kirby tied World Series records by reaching base five times and scoring four runs to lead the Twins to victory in game No. 6. The next night the Twins won game 7 to win their first world championship and a Minnesota team's first professional world championship in almost 30 years.

Four years later in another World Series game 6 with the Twins, this time playing the Atlanta Braves three games to two, Kirby Puckett was unbelievably even more spectacular than before. His over-the-wall catch saved the game-winning Braves home run and sent the game into extra innings which he then won with a home run in the bottom of the 11th inning. The next night the Twins won another game 7 and another World Series.

During those years, Kirby Puckett was a wonderful representative of the Minnesota Twins and Major League Baseball. He hosted celebrity events for local charities, made countless appearances for others, signed endless autographs, all with his infectious Kirby Puckett smile. Andy MacPhail, now president of the Chicago Cubs, and general manager of the Twins during those World Series years, said yesterday:

Kirby Puckett was probably the greatest teammate I've ever been around. You always felt better when you were around Kirby. He just had that way about him.

The years following his retirement from baseball stardom were more difficult ones with his sterling reputation tarnished by marital discord and other public incidents. When his contract as executive vice president for the Twins expired at the end of 2002, Kirby Puckett retired from baseball and later moved to Scottsdale, AZ where he passed away. He is survived by his two children Catherine and Kirby, Jr. and his fiancée Jodi Olson, to whom I extend my deepest condolences.

The Kirby Puckett I will remember, as will a generation of Minnesota Twins fans young and old, will always be wearing a Minnesota Twins uniform, No. 34, leaping for flyballs, racing around the bases, making his greatest plays in the most important games, and doing so with a zest for the game and for life that was unmistakable and unforgettable.

Thank you, Kirby, for those treasured moments, now forever our memories. Thank you, Kirby. May you rest in peace.

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. KERRY. 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. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO DANA REEVE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today, we learned of the unbelievably tragic passing of a remarkably courageous, strong, and dedicated woman, Dana Reeve. Most Americans knew Dana as the wife of Christopher Reeve, and most Americans new Christopher as Superman and, as this unbelievable figure, capable of overcoming so many obstacles.

I think the whole Nation was shocked and touched when they learned that Dana, not too long after the loss of Chris, herself was battling lung cancer. She was always ebullient and strong in that effort. At times, she was filled with doubt about her kids and the future, as anyone would be, but always unbelievably courageous. She was a passionate advocate after Chris passed away, and even before. She was, herself, an accomplished actress and singer, appearing off Broadway and on Broadway. She was, above all, a loving mother and a stunningly supportive and nurturing wife.

Through her very selfless effort to be part of Chris's life in gigantic ways, bigger than most people could describe, after his accident, she became an inspiration to millions of Americans. This is no way for anybody who was touched by that family to adequately express our shock and our sorrow to her immediate family—to Will, age 13, and her stepchildren, Matthew and Alexandra, and to her friends, who were with her until the end.

Dana was always a crusader, but with Chris's accident, she became an even more tireless, passionate crusader for the particular promise of medical research into stem cell treatments. After Chris's paralysis, she and Chris together created the Christopher Reeve Foundation, which has raised and distributed over \$55 million in research grants, much of it aimed at speeding the development of stem cell treatments.

I can remember visiting Chris at his home in New York. He had this elaborate exercise setup, which he went through, I think, almost every day, or whenever possible, always keeping his muscles as alive and growing as possible under the circumstances, with the

belief that he was going to walk again. Dana believed in him and she believed in that possibility. Together with Chris she was deeply involved in the fight for increases in medical research funding, and she was an active advocate for the rights of the disabled.

Many of my colleagues in the Senate had the opportunity to get to know her or talk with both she and Chris in the course of that advocacy. After Chris's death in 2004, Dana courageously kept up the battle to advance medical research. She became the chairwoman of the foundation, picking up where Chris had left off. She was responsible for developing the foundation's Christopher and Dana Reeve Paralysis Resource Center and for a program that has now distributed more than \$8 million for projects that improved the daily lives of people with paralysis.

In October of 2004, I was particularly honored and moved to be joined by Dana on the campaign trail in Ohio. I cannot tell you how incredible it was that within 2 weeks of Chris passing away—less than 2 weeks—Dana took the time, found the strength and courage and the sense of purpose somewhere, which she described to me as coming directly from Chris himself, to come out on the trail and fight for what he had been fighting.

I will never forget the grace and the strength that she showed that day, and even a glow that she exuded in her love for Chris and her passion about the issue.

Let me share, if I may, a few of the words that she spoke that day which I found so moving, but I also find important for all of us to focus on today. She said:

Chris struggled for 9½ years, but it was essential to him that every day bring some kind of forward progress, either personally or globally. Despite the enormous challenges he faced each morning, he awoke with focused determination and a remarkable zest for life. Chris was able to keep going because he had the support of his loved ones, a dedicated nursing staff, the belief of his fans, and members of the disabled community, and because he had hope—hope that one day science would restore some of his function. Chris actively participated in clinical trials. He was on a strict exercise regimen and was recently in a clinical trial right here in Ohio to breathe on his own. Chris could breathe off his ventilator for hours at a time, thanks to science, and scientists taking bold steps.

Chris understood that all journeys begin with a single step, and to take that first step one needs hope. His vision of walking again, his belief that he would reach this goal for himself and others in his lifetime was essential to the way that he conducted his life.

Dana went on to describe that while Chris led the crusade for research, she in turn put her energy into improving the quality of life for people who were living with diseases, inspired by individuals who could still benefit from research. She talked about how right there in Ohio, where we stood that day, the Christopher Reeve Paralysis Foundation had funded a number of items that kept people healthy and active despite the challenge of living with a dis-

ability. She did all of this because both she and Chris imagined living in a world where politics would never get in the way of hope.

Dana shared that vision and she worked tirelessly to help achieve it. Today, the whole country will again remember this couple. They will remember them together and their dedication to furthering stem cell research. Here in the Senate, we have an opportunity to honor their memories and that work by fighting to advance stem cell research. We can do it. Mindful of all the ethical considerations that we understand, there is a way to do it and to respect life. We have the opportunity to take the steps that Dana and Chris would have been so thrilled to see, worked so hard to achieve, to finally see a stem cell bill passed through the Senate.

In the end, none of their efforts, nor their lives were about policy. It was about hope and it was about values. It is about honoring their lives now that we should set about that task. They shared an unquenchable belief in the genius of America when we put our minds to it. They drew strength from the talent and dedication of the scientists they met and, in turn, they inspired them to go out and do even more. Chris stunned doctors by regaining some sensation in over 70 percent of his body and moving most of his joints, which people said he would never do. He did that because of science.

Dana and Chris never lost faith that America and American science was the greatest hope for humanity. That is a faith that all of us should share for Chris and Dana and the millions of people who believe in the possibilities of this remarkable time and our remarkable country. A lot of people ask, How can we do that? The answer is simple. How can we commit ourselves to anything less?

So to Will, Matthew, Alexandra, and Dana and Chris's friends and families, colleagues and supporters, I say the best thing we can do to complete their journey is by doing our best in ours. If we do that, we will give even greater meaning to two remarkable lives.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FOREIGN TRADE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, in news reports last evening and this morning there was a suggestion that some sort of deal was being reached in the Congress, between the Congress and the administration, on the issue of the Dubai

Ports World Company managing six of America's large seaports. Let me point out there is no deal that I am aware of, but if there is a deal, it is being made by people who have not consulted many of us in the Congress.

In any event, I think this proposal still lacks basic common sense. I want to speak about it for a couple of minutes.

In the Wall Street Journal, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Mr. Chertoff, says: "U.S. ports takeover"—again, by the Dubai Ports World, the United Arab Emirates-owned company—the head of our Homeland Security Chertoff says: "U.S. ports takeover would tighten grip on security."

So he actually makes the case, the head of our Homeland Security agency, that allowing the management or the takeover of our six major port facilities, seaport facilities, would strengthen America's security. That is an unbelievable statement. I will describe why he says it. He said:

Assuming the deal would go through, we intend to have a deep look into their practices, certainly in the U.S. ports.

That is a direct quote. That is almost unbelievable. So they apparently haven't had a deep look into their practices before the deal goes through. This is a circumstance where most of the American citizens understand what is being proposed and very strongly react to it in opposition.

This country is the subject of many terrorist threats. We understand that terrorists from around the world want to strike inside this country. We have all this security in this country—some judged to be quite good, some very deficient. Go to an airport and see what happens when you want to board an airplane. You are going to have to go to a line and you are likely to have to take off your shoes and you are probably going to have to take off your belt and wristwatch and then they are wandering some little 6-year-old boy, spread eagle against a wall someplace because he set off the buzzer. So all of that happens before you get on an airplane. Why? Because airport security is very important.

So is seaport security. We don't have seaports in my home State, but we are recipients of those containers that come on ships into our seaports. Somewhere between 5.7 million and 5.9 million containers a year come into our seaports at 5 or 6 miles an hour to go into the dock where those containers are lifted off by that crane and trucked off all across the country. All of us are recipients of what is coming into our seaports.

Seaport security, frankly, is miserable; 5.7 to 5.9 million containers come into this country and 4 to 5 percent is inspected, all the rest is not inspected, and we believe somehow we are protecting our country?

You will recall shortly after 9/11, there was a fellow from the Middle East, from Egypt I believe, who decided to put himself in a container, get it

nailed up and put on a container ship, shipping himself to Canada. He had all the amenities you would need to travel in a container: he had a cot, a GPS locator, a radio, apparently, and a heater. He was in a container on a ship. He was a fellow they thought to be a terrorist shipping himself into Canada in a container for the purpose of coming into the United States.

So seaport security is critically important. We have had vote after vote in the Senate to improve seaport security but the majority doesn't want to spend the money to do that.

Now, with respect to the issue of seaport security, we are told that a United Arab Emirates wholly owned company called Dubai Ports World has been approved by something called CFIUS, one of those God-awful acronyms, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. They have approved the takeover and management, which would include security, by the way, of ports, six major seaports in this country, including New York and New Jersey and Baltimore and New Orleans, and so on.

CFIUS, which is 16 or 18 of the agencies of the current administration getting together, said they think this will be just fine, so they approved it. They approved it without even the 45-day extension you would normally have if someone expressed some concerns about it.

Now Mr. Chertoff, the head of Homeland Security, says our security will actually be better if the United Arab Emirates company takes over our ports. Chertoff says, "U.S. ports takeover would tighten grip on security."

I don't know. Maybe he's not drinking the same water most Americans are drinking. I don't know how you come to this conclusion. Allowing a United Arab Emirates company to manage our ports is going to manage and improve our security? I don't think so. That doesn't make any sense.

Let me describe the United Arab Emirates. I will do it in terms that do not suggest this is a bad country. That is not my point, although I must say that two of the hijackers who attacked this country on 9/11/2001 came from the United Arab Emirates, a substantial portion of the financing for those terrorist attacks came through the financial institutions of the United Arab Emirates, Dr. Kahn from Pakistan, who was moving nuclear materials and nuclear knowledge and knowhow around the world, did that through the UAE ports. There are serious questions to be asked.

But let me make another point; that is, the relationship of the United Arab Emirates to Osama bin Laden. The 9/11 report described a circumstance in which we had discovered, in 1999, where Osama bin Laden was at that time and our country was attempting to target Osama bin Laden. This is in early 1999. The CIA learned that Osama bin Laden could be found at a camp in the Afghan desert, and the U.S. military began to

plan a strike against that camp. But the strike was called off because Osama bin Laden was apparently being visited by members of the royal family of the United Arab Emirates.

In fact, let me read to you from the 9/11 Commission report. You will find this in the booklet published by the 9/11 Commission:

No strike was launched.

This is the strike against Osama bin Laden whom our Intelligence Committee said they had discovered. They knew where he was.

No strike was launched. . . . According to the CIA and defense officials, policymakers were concerned about the danger that a strike would kill an Emirati prince or other senior officials who may be with bin Laden.

That is on page 138 of the 9/11 report, the former CIA Director George Tenet explaining why an attack against Osama bin Laden at a Afghan camp was called off said:

You might have wiped out half of the royal family in the United Arab Emirates in the process, which I'm sure entered into everyone's calculation in all of this.

The administration says the UAE has been helpful to our country in the fight against terrorism. If they have, and there is some evidence they have since 9/11, then this company appreciates that. But that appreciation, in my judgment, should not and will not extend to inviting the United Arab Emirates-owned company to manage America's seaports. It just defies common sense.

The administration says: What about offending the United Arab Emirates by saying no? We would offend this country by saying no? What about offending common sense by saying yes? Most of the American people understand. They understand if you are going to have security in this country, security includes the United States deciding to provide security at its seaports. The United States can't manage its seaports? I don't understand that.

I was interested in a piece yesterday in the Washington Post by Sebastian Mallaby. I don't know Sebastian Mallaby, but he is a pretty good reflection of those who are pushing this issue, saying that those who oppose having the United Arab Emirates company manage our seaports are demagogues. He said:

The demagogues are poised to strike again.

He said:

If demagogues can turn a tiny ally such as Dubai into a villain, you can bet they will do that with China.

He's talking about China trade.

The Dems will next play the China card.

One of the things he points out, he says we have a trade deficit with China. He doesn't seem to care much about that. But he says if we are going to get serious about dealing with the trade deficit, we need to get serious about balancing the Federal budget. This person must have missed Economics 101. We did balance the trade deficit under the final years of the Clinton administration and the deficit continued

to rise. We keep hearing these folks say the reason we have a trade deficit is because we have a fiscal policy budget deficit, which is not true. We actually created a surplus here before President Bush took over, and the trade deficit continued to rise. Now we have the highest trade deficit in history and a substantial portion of that trade deficit is with the Chinese.

It is interesting to me, all of these columnists, of course, tend to be apologists for public policies that don't work. But to suggest that somehow those who stand and oppose the management of American ports by a United Arab Emirates company are demagogues is elitist and it is wrong.

The so-called group called CFIUS, which, by the way, almost turns down nothing. They have reviewed lots and lots of proposals, and they have approved them all, virtually. I think they disapproved eight of them out of many proposals. But the Coast Guard had written a classified memo to CFIUS—on February 27 that was disclosed publicly by Senator COLLINS, I believe, at the hearing. The report said the following:

There are many intelligence gaps concerning the potential for the UAE company's assets to support terrorist operations and that precludes an overall threat assessment on the potential DPW and P&O Ports merger.

In fact, the Coast Guard restored a large number of potential vulnerabilities. That is directly from the Coast Guard's memorandum.

One of the so-called intelligence gaps that the Coast Guard referred to was that no one had checked the backgrounds of the people in charge of the UAE company that would manage our ports. So when the Coast Guard's secret report was made public, the administration said the Coast Guard ought to say something pleasant. So the Coast Guard came out and issued a statement the next day saying:

Upon subsequent and further review, the Coast Guard and the entire CFIUS panel believe the transaction, when taking into account strong security assurances by DP World, does not compromise American security.

Interesting—the Coast Guard statement doesn't say anybody had checked out the backgrounds of the officials at the UAE company. That is what their secret memo had said represented the vulnerability. But the highest ranking official in the Department of Homeland Security, who was part of this group and who reviewed this port deal, said this:

The CFIUS review did not include background checks on the senior managers of the company.

It is quite clear the Coast Guard, in a classified memorandum, expressed concerns about the terrorist threat, about vulnerabilities as a result of the takeover of American ports by a UAE-owned company and then the Coast Guard, when the classified memo became public, was ordered—the Coast

Guard, of course, works for the President, the Coast Guard said something softer, but the Department of Homeland Security's ranking official, Stewart Baker, quite clearly said:

The CFIUS review did not include background checks on the senior managers.

This is a fascinating description of trying to put a patch on a hole that is too big. None of this adds up very much.

I do want to make another point. This is about offshoring and outsourcing, and so on. The question is, Why would we be contracting with a foreign government, essentially—through a foreign company they wholly own—to manage our ports? This is the new global economy, we are told. If you don't get it, you are an isolationist, xenophobic stooge who can't figure it out. This is all part of the global economy.

President Bush went to India last week. If you are asking the question: How is it that the management of American seaports should be done by the United Arab Emirates company and you don't understand it, you won't understand what the President said last week in India either. What the President said in India, in several speeches, was you need to understand this global economy of ours. He said things have changed. This is about outsourcing of jobs.

I have some quotes from the President. The President says, about globalization: I guess generally outsourcing—you know outsourcing is not bad. People do lose jobs as a result of globalization, and it's painful to those who lose jobs, but the fundamental question is how does a government or society react to that? One of two ways. One is to say losing jobs is painful, therefore lets throw up the protectionist walls and the other is to say losing jobs is painful so let's make sure people are educated so they can find or fill the jobs of the 21st century.

I have news for the President. Those 21st century jobs for educated Americans—he was visiting them in India. He was looking at them. He's looking at the engineers who are now working at jobs American engineers used to have. Why did those engineering jobs go to India? Because you can hire an engineer in India for one-fifth the cost of an American engineer. So the solution is not to say let's have an American lose his or her job and then get better educated. How better educated than going to school to get a degree in engineering and then losing it to somebody in the country of India who is able to work for one-fifth the price?

So he said:

You don't retrench and pull back. You welcome competition. Understand globalization provides great opportunities.

It is fascinating to me, the people who always talk about this are people who will never be outsourced. The President of the United States is never going to be outsourced. Do you think they are going to move his job to

India? I don't think so—or China or Bangladesh or Sri Lanka or Indonesia? I don't think so.

Our first great purpose is to spread prosperity and opportunity to people in our own land and to the millions of people who have not known it.

How does that fit, spreading prosperity and opportunity by moving American jobs to China and to India?

How does it spread prosperity and opportunity by deciding that a United Arab Emirates country will come and manage American seaports? How does that spread opportunity?

The President says the United States will not give into protectionists and lose these opportunities. So the President, very much like the columnist, Mr. Sebastian Mallaby from the Washington Post, all use the same language. It is code language. They all understand it. It is elitist language: protectionist, building walls, isolationist xenophobes.

We have a trade deficit of some \$720 billion. Every single day, 7 days a week, all year long, we actually import \$2 billion more in goods than we export to the rest of the world. Every single day, 7 days a week, we sell \$2 billion worth of our country to foreigners.

I am not suggesting we shouldn't trade. I believe expanded trade is beneficial. But I am suggesting that we have a backbone, nerve, and a little will to stand up for our country's economic interests.

Can we not tell China, for example, that they can't have a trade relationship with us that has a \$202 billion surplus every year? Last year it was a \$202 billion deficit with China. Do we not have the nerve to say to China trade is mutually beneficial, a two-way street, that is the way we insist on it, and if they are going to sell to us then they are going to buy from us? Don't we have that nerve and will. If not, why not?

The same is true with others, especially Japan. With Japan it has been a couple of decades where we have had very substantial deficits year after year after year. And our country doesn't have the nerve or will to do anything about it.

We still have folks walking around thumbing their suspenders and puffing on their cigars talking about globalization and how wonderful it is. No one ever lost a job to outsourcing—it is just American workers who lose those jobs.

It is not just the jobs that are gone. It is the jobs left here that become priced by the China price—downward pressure on wages, downward pressure on benefits, stripping away retirement benefits and health care benefits. That is what is happening all across this country.

The issue I started talking about—the issue of managing an American port by a United Arab Emirates firm—wouldn't even have been discussed here 20 years ago. It would have been laughed at. Are you kidding me? Are

you really serious? We will have America's ports managed by the United Arab Emirates given the climate we face today?

Twenty years ago, you wouldn't be talking about a \$700-plus billion trade deficit. Things have changed a lot.

We have a President who cheerleads now for that trade strategy despite the evidence—all of the evidence year after year—that this is a bankrupt trade strategy. It is bankrupting this country. It is selling part of America piece by piece of every single day. All of these things relate.

I only wanted to speak briefly—it turned out not to be so briefly—about those who announced to the press or those who talked to the press resulting in news stories last evening that there is a deal in the works; perhaps the United Arab Emirates company could buy an American subsidiary and actually run the ports through a U.S. subsidiary. There is no deal in the works that I am aware of.

I have introduced legislation that would overturn this decision. In one way or another we are going to vote on these things. I believe there are other colleagues who believe the same.

We are going to go vote on these things no matter what kind of deal somebody else comes up with. I think there needs to be a good healthy dose of common sense expressed on some of these issues, and that is certainly lacking on trade, on national security, and on port security.

I hope, perhaps, we can get those before the Senate soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LOBBY REFORM

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise today to again address the very important issue of lobby reform and to applaud the efforts of many, particularly the bipartisan working group on which I was proud to serve—coming together and working hard to produce good lobby reform packages that will very soon be on the floor of the Senate.

As I have said since the beginning of this discussion spanning several weeks, in so many ways there is no more important threshold issue to the functioning of our democracy and the health of this institution of Congress than these important reform issues. Clearly, they go to the heart and soul of our integrity and our own credibility.

How can we address any other major national issue, whether it is health care, prescription drugs, foreign policy, or defense unless we have that core, central principle of integrity and credibility with the people?

Unfortunately, we have lost that credibility to some significant extent

over the past years because of some horrible situations and scandals that have developed.

It is very appropriate and very necessary that we act as an institution to address these abuses and potential abuses which we need to stop from happening in the future.

As I said, I was very proud to serve on an informal working group—Republicans and Democrats coming together with this common purpose to address these central questions, to bring real meaningful, strong reform to our institutions, to develop consensus, not to play political partisan games but to develop real consensus and pass important legislation that could have major support on both sides of the aisle.

I very much enjoyed that work with leaders on this issue—Senators COLLINS, LOTT, MCCAIN, SANTORUM, KYL, and ISAKSON—of course, all those Republicans—joined by Senators LIEBERMAN, OBAMA, DODD, and FEINGOLD, Democrats, as well as myself, a Republican, coming together to address this very crucial issue.

We are about to put this legislation on the floor of the Senate, hopefully, very soon, later today. I encourage all of my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to again come together for an important debate, to make a proposal about how to improve this legislation but to support the underlying bills which include major systemic reform. That is what I am going to do. That is why I joined this working group from the very beginning. That is why I participated in the discussions and debate which led to the bills coming to the floor.

In addition to that, I am going to do what I mentioned a little while ago, participate in the debate on the floor and make some proposals to strengthen the bill, to make it even better before we report it out from the Senate.

In doing that, I am going to make three specific proposals in areas which I think we need to address that are not in the underlying bill. I again want to outline those three proposals very briefly.

The first has to do with an unfortunate scenario which has happened in the past of spouses and children of Members of Congress, House Members, Senators, getting a paycheck off that Member's reelection campaign. This has happened in the past. It is not some theoretical issue. In fact, family members have made substantial sums in the past in some instances off the campaign of the family member who is also a Member of Congress.

I talk to folks back home in Louisiana all the time. When these circumstances made the newspaper a few months ago, I can tell you what the universal reaction was. The universal reaction was this is abuse. There was no discussion about what these family members were doing, weren't doing, what hours they were lobbying, weren't lobbying. The universal reaction was this was a way for the Member of Con-

gress to basically increase his family income through the political process and is an abuse.

I think the solution is really simple. I will have an amendment that proposes that solution. It is simply this: Ban it; to say a Member of Congress, the House, or the Senate can't have a spouse, can't have a dependent child on the campaign payroll. That is the simplest way to address it. That is the most direct way to address it. That will put the whole issue to rest for once and forever.

Certainly, the huge majority of Members should embrace this idea because it would never cross our minds, quite frankly, a huge majority of Members, to do this. Let us put this potential abuse and real abuse in the past to rest forever.

I encourage all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this floor amendment.

The second floor amendment addresses another very important area of campaign finance that has also been in the news; that is, with regard to Indian tribes.

Again, this is not some theoretical discussion. This is not dreaming up a problem. This has been at the heart of the recent scandals and controversies which bring us to where we are today.

In my opinion, a central problem is the fact that in current law Indian tribes, with regard to campaign contributions to Federal candidates, are treated in a whole different way than similar entities such as corporations, such as labor unions.

With regard to corporations and labor unions, there are very clear and very strict laws that apply in terms of how those entities can raise PAC money, campaign funds that they can turn into political contributions and the overall limit that applies to a single corporation—a single labor union with regard to political contributions that election season. Those rules don't apply to Indian tribes.

When it comes to Indian tribes, those rules I just referenced are out the window and basically no rules apply. There is no governance of how tribes collect and raise funds to give to political candidates. In fact, with so many having very lucrative casinos now, what they do is real simple. They write a check out of the casino operation and fund the entire political operation from which they give campaign contributions. Corporations can't do that—absolutely not. Labor unions can't even do that. I think the rules should be the same for Indian tribes.

Likewise, the limits on campaign contributions should be the same as well. There should be an aggregate, an overall limit for what a specific tribe can give to Federal candidates just as there is for corporations through their PACS, just as there is for labor unions through their PACs.

Again, I will offer a floor amendment that is pretty darned simple and pretty easy to understand. It will basically

say those same rules that apply with regard to the sources of funds and disclosure and aggregate limits that apply to corporations and labor unions, those exact same rules will apply in exactly the same way to Indian tribes.

Third and finally, I will propose on the floor another amendment which relates to Members' families and the ability in some circumstances of a Member to increase his family income through involvement in lobby shops by a spouse.

I think it is very important in this instance to distinguish between what I consider two pretty different cases. The one case is where a spouse was a registered lobbyist, a professional with expertise and professional background well before the Member was ever elected to office, or well before the marriage between the Member and the spouse ever occurred. In my mind, that is a very different situation than when a spouse gets into the lobbying business after the Member is elected or after the marriage occurs with a Member already being elected.

In the first case, that spouse was a professional with background and expertise in this area well before the marriage happened or the Member was elected. In the second case, the cart came way before the horse. It is that second case I am concerned about, and it is that second case on which I believe we should pass a blanket ban that such a person shouldn't get into the lobbying business even after the Member was elected.

Again, I think people back home view that sort of case pretty darned simply. It is a way for direct family members to get involved in lobby shops, and through that route directly supplementing that Member's family income.

That absolutely tears at the integrity, at the credibility of our institutions, and I believe we must act to restore that credibility and integrity.

Again, this is not some theoretical discussion. I wish it were. This is not some problem made up out of the blue. This is a practice that has happened before, that has been in the headlines, that has been in the news. So let us address it directly, boldly, and be done with it.

In closing, I thank all of the leaders who came together in the important working group on lobby reform that I mentioned, particularly Senators COLLINS, LOTT, MCCAIN, SANTORUM, KYL, and ISAKSON, and Senators LIEBERMAN, OBAMA, DODD, and FEINGOLD. I worked closely with them. I believe the product we will bring to the Senate very soon, under the leadership of the two committee chairs, Senators COLLINS and LOTT, is a strong, meaningful, worthwhile product.

I hope we all come to this important debate with additional ideas. I hope we add to the bill and improve it, including through the three floor amendments I just outlined, and then report an even stronger and even better bill

out of the Senate to address this crucial issue.

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. OBAMA. 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. OBAMA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ETHICS AND LOBBYING REFORM

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the ethics and lobbying reform bill we will be considering this week.

Over 100 years ago, at the dawn of the last century, the Industrial Revolution was beginning to take hold in America, creating unimaginable wealth and sprawling metropolises all across the country.

As factories multiplied and profits grew, the winnings of the new economy became more and more concentrated in the hands of a few robber barons, railroad tycoons, and oil magnets. In the cities, power was maintained by a corrupt system of political machines and ward bosses. In the State of New York, there was a young Governor who was determined to give government back to the people.

In his first year, he had already begun antagonizing the State's political machine by attacking its system of favors and corporate giveaways. He signed a workers' compensation bill, and even fired the superintendent of insurance for taking money from the very industry he was supposed to be regulating.

None of this sat too well with New York's powerful party bosses, who finally plotted to get rid of the reform-minded Governor by making sure he was nominated for the Vice Presidency that year.

What no one could have expected is that soon after the election, when President William McKinley was assassinated, the greatest fears of the corrupt machine bosses and power brokers became true when that former Governor became President of the United States and went on to bust trusts, break up monopolies, and return the government to its people.

His name, of course, was Theodore Roosevelt. He was a Republican. Throughout his public life, he demonstrated a willingness to put party and politics aside in order to battle corruption and give people an open, honest government that would fight for their interests and for their values.

I think today we face a similar crisis of corruption and a similar crisis of confidence. I believe we need similar leadership from those in power as well.

The American people are tired of a Washington that is open only to those

with the most cash and the right connections. They are tired of a political process where the vote you cast is not as important as the favors you can do. They are tired of trusting us with their tax dollars when they see them spent on frivolous pet projects and corporate giveaways.

It is not that the games that are played in this town are new or surprising to the public. People are not naive to the existence of corruption. They know that over the years it has worn both a Republican and a Democratic face.

Moreover, the underlying issue of how extensively money influences politics is the "original sin" of everyone who has ever run for office, including me. In order to get elected, we need to raise vast sums of money by meeting and dealing with people who are disproportionately wealthy. This is a problem that predates Jack Abramoff.

So I agree with those on both sides of the aisle who believe we should not let half measures and partisan posturing on campaign finance reform derail our current efforts on ethics and lobbying, but I also think this is an issue and a conversation we are going to have to have in the months to come—the conversation about campaign financing. That is not, however, the topic that is before us this week.

While people know that both parties are vulnerable to these problems, I do not think it is fair to say that the scandals we have seen most recently under the current White House and Congress—both legal and illegal—are entirely predictable or the standard fare. They are worse than most of us could have imagined.

Think about it. In the past several months, we have seen the head of the White House procurement office arrested. We have seen some of our most powerful leaders of both the House and the Senate under Federal investigation. We have seen the indictment of Jack Abramoff and his cronies. And, of course, last week, we saw a Member of Congress sentenced to 8 years in prison for bribery.

Now, there are some in the media who dismiss these scandals by saying: Everybody does it. The truth is that not everybody does it. We should not lump people together—those of us who have to raise funds to run campaigns but do so in a legal and ethical way with those who invite lobbyists into their offices to write bad legislation. Those are not equivalent. And we are not being partisan by pointing that out.

The fact is, since our Federal Government has been controlled by one party, this kind of scandal has become, unfortunately, a regular order of business in this town. For years now, some on the other side of the aisle have openly bragged about stocking K Street lobbying firms with former staffers to increase their power in Washington—a practice that should stop today and never happen again.

But what is truly offensive to the American people about all of this goes far beyond people such as Jack Abramoff. It is bigger than how much time he will spend in jail or how many Members of Congress he ends up turning in. It is bigger even than the K Street project and golf junkets to Scotland and lavish gifts for lawmakers.

What is truly offensive about these scandals is they do not just lead to morally offensive conduct on the part of politicians; they lead to morally offensive legislation that hurts hard-working Americans.

When big oil companies are invited into the White House for secret energy meetings, it is no wonder they end up with billions in tax breaks while most working people struggle to fill up their gas tanks and heat their homes.

When a committee chairman negotiates a Medicare bill one day, and after the bill is passed is negotiating for a job with the drug industry, it is hardly a surprise that industry gets taxpayer-funded giveaways in the same bill that forbids seniors from bargaining for better drug prices.

When the people running Washington are accountable only to the special interests that fund their campaigns, it is not shocking that the American people find their tax dollars being spent with reckless abandon.

I have to point out that since the current administration took office, we have seen the number of registered lobbyists in Washington double. In 2004, over \$2.1 billion was spent lobbying Congress. That amounts to over \$4.8 million per Member of Congress.

How much do you think the American people were able to spend on their Senators or Representatives last year? How much money could the folks back home, who cannot even fill up their gas tanks, spend on lobbying? How much could the seniors forced to choose between their medications and their groceries spend on lobbyists? Not \$4.8 million—not even close.

This is the bigger story here. The American people believe that the well-connected CEOs and hired guns on K Street who have helped write our laws have gotten what they paid for. They got all the tax breaks and loopholes and access they could ever want. But outside this city, the people who cannot afford the high-priced lobbyists and do not want to break the law are wondering: When is it our turn? When will somebody in Washington stand up for me?

We need to answer that call. Because while only some are to blame for the corruption that has plagued this city, we are all responsible for fixing it.

As you know, I am from Chicago, a city that has not always had the most stellar reputation when it comes to politics. But during my first year in the Illinois State Senate, I helped lead the fight to pass Illinois' first ethics reform bill in 25 years. If we can do it in Illinois, we can do something like that here.

But we have to pass a serious bill that has to go a long way toward correcting some of the most egregious offenses of the last few years and preventing future offenses as well. This is not a time for window dressing or putting a Band-Aid on a problem to score some political points. I think this is a time for real reform.

I commend the work the two committees that have dealt with this issue have already put in under the leadership of Senator LOTT and Senator DODD, Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator COLLINS. I want to note that the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act, which was originally sponsored by those of us on this side of the aisle, has 41 cosponsors and, I think, established a good marker for reform. I commend my leader, HARRY REID, and his staff for their hard work in putting it together.

But real reform means making sure that Members of Congress and senior administration officials are dealing with this in as thoughtful and aggressive a fashion as is possible. Let me give you some examples of some provisions that are already in, but also some provisions I would like to see included.

Real reform means making sure that Members of Congress and senior administration officials wait until they leave office before pursuing jobs with industries they are responsible for regulating.

I understand that former Congressman Billy Tauzin has said he was not negotiating for a job with the drug industry at the same time he was negotiating the Medicare bill, but the fact is this: While he was a Member of Congress, he was negotiating for lobbying jobs with not one but two different industries that he was responsible for regulating—the drug industry and the motion picture association.

That is wrong. This should not happen anymore. Real reform means ensuring that a ban on lobbying after Members of Congress leave this office is real and includes behind-the-scenes coordination and supervision of activities now used to skirt the ban. Real reform means giving the public access to now secret conference committee meetings and posting all bills on the Internet at least a day before they are voted on so the public can scrutinize what is in them. Real reform means passing a bill that eliminates all gifts and meals from lobbyists, not just the expensive ones. And real reform has to mean real enforcement because no matter how many new rules we pass, it will mean very little unless we have a system to enforce them.

I commend Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS for their efforts to create such an enforcement mechanism through an independent office of public integrity. While this proposal doesn't go quite as far as my proposal for an outside ethics fact-finding commission, it is still very good, and I am looking forward to working with them to try to get it included in the bill that has been marked

up. But to truly earn back the people's trust, to show them we are working for them and looking out for their interests, we have to do more than just pass a good bill this week; we are going to have to fundamentally change the way we do business around here.

That means instead of meetings with lobbyists, it is time to start meeting with the 45 million Americans who don't have any health care. Instead of finding cushy political jobs for unqualified buddies, it is time to start finding good-paying jobs for hard-working Americans trying to raise a family. Instead of hitting up the big firms on K Street, it is time to start visiting the workers on Main Street who wonder how they will send their kids to college or whether their pension is going to be around when they retire.

All these people have done, our constituents, to earn access and gain influence is to cast their ballot. But in this democracy, that is all anyone should have to do.

A century ago that young, reform-minded Governor of New York, who later became our 26th President, gave us words about our country that everyone in this town would do well to listen to today. Here is what Teddy Roosevelt said back then:

No republic can permanently endure when its politics are corrupt and base . . . we can afford to differ on the currency, the tariff, and foreign policy, but we cannot afford to differ on the question of honesty. There is a soul in the community, a soul in the Nation, just exactly as there is a soul in the individual; and exactly as the individual hopelessly mars himself if he lets his conscience be dulled by the constant repetition of unworthy acts, so the Nation will hopelessly blunt the popular conscience if it permits its public men continually to do acts which the Nation in its heart of hearts knows are acts which cast discredit upon our whole public life.

I have come to know the Members of this body and know that the people who serve here are hard-working, thoughtful, and honorable men and women. But the fact is, the entire Congress has been marred and is under a cloud. Our consciences have been dulled by the activity of the few. We have to make certain we are sending a strong signal to the American public that we are no longer going to tolerate that kind of activity, that our conscience has been sharpened, and we are willing to take the steps necessary to restore credibility to this August body.

I hope this week we in the Senate will take the first step towards strengthening this Nation's soul and bringing credit back to our public life.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. FRIST pertaining to the introduction of S. 2381 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished majority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. For the information of my colleagues, we should have a vote somewhere in 25 minutes or so. Depending on the outcome of that vote, there may be another vote, either a roll call or voice vote, after which we will go back to lobbying reform. I need to talk to the floor managers. I would expect we will not have more rollcall votes after we finish these next two votes shortly. But I do want to talk to the managers. So what I will do is ask unanimous consent which, in essence, will be 20 minutes of debate equally divided and then we should have a rollcall vote. And then I will be talking to the managers about what we will be doing after that tonight. I don't expect rollcall votes after we handle these next two.

I ask unanimous consent that there now be 20 minutes equally divided between Senator SNOWE or her designee and Senator ENSIGN or his designee on the pending second-degree amendment, followed by a vote in relation to the amendment with no intervening action or debate; provided further that immediately after that vote, the Senate proceed to a vote in relation to the underlying Kyl amendment, as amended, if amended, with no further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. 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. ENSIGN. 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. ENSIGN. Mr. President, we are now engaging in a debate over an amendment. The amendment has to do with the LIHEAP proposal that has been brought forth. This first amendment would say to Senators that instead of the original proposal that Senator SNOWE put forward, where 75 percent of the money went through the

contingency fund, 25 percent goes through the regular formula, that now she has brought forward an amendment that would be 50-50, 50 percent through the contingency fund, 50 percent through the regular formula. If we defeat this amendment, the underlying amendment would say 100 percent of the money goes through the regular formula.

Why is that important? It is important because the 50 percent versus the 100 percent going to the regular formula, this is how it breaks down across the country. The red-colored States—this isn't Republican or Democrat, this just happens to be red-colored States in this case—all would get more funding under the underlying amendment, the one where 100 percent of the money goes through the regular formula. The 50-50 or the underlying bill that Senator SNOWE has put forward, basically the white-colored States, 21 of them, would do better under her formula. So it really is a question of fairness. Because the underlying formula in the LIHEAP provisions, the way it is implemented, benefits those 21 States right now. So the first \$2 billion that is spent per year benefits 21 States. That is historically what has happened. And what we are saying is: If you are going to put an additional billion dollars to help low-income people around the country, it should benefit people from all over the country and be more fairly allocated. That is really what the 100 percent of the money going through the regular formula does. It makes it fairer.

Senator SNOWE will make part of her arguments, and we had this discussion at lunch today. She will say that this is an emergency fund. This contingency fund is an emergency fund to be directed toward emergencies. That is not the way it has worked in the past. In the past, it has been divvied out earlier in the year when the cold States need it. And so when the warm States need it for air-conditioning in the summertime—and by the way, they need that air-conditioning, and in many cases it is a life-or-death situation because people can die from heat prostration and that is the real issue—the money is gone because it has been spent out of the contingency fund. That is why the only fair way to do it is to put it through the regular formula, divvy it out through the States. And then low-income people who need either heating or cooling assistance can receive that fairly.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am offering an amendment that essentially preserves the emergency funding that has been consistently part of the low-income fuel assistance program. I am offering my amendment as a second degree to the Kyl amendment that removes the emergency funding that has been part of this program for the last 5 years. So it would be a marked depart-

ture from historical practice and, unfortunately, a 100-percent appropriation through a formula for low-income fuel assistance would not allow the President to respond to any situation that is clearly an emergency.

Last fall, the President had the discretion, because we had an emergency funding under the legislation, under low-income fuel assistance, that, in fact, was supported by the Senate and the House and the President, and it became law a month ago that basically embraced the approach that we have here today pending before the Senate.

The Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Nevada are suggesting that somehow we no longer need any emergency funding, that we will distribute all of those funds through a specific formula. But we cannot predict where or when that emergency will occur, denying the President the ability to respond to an emergency. Last fall the President had the discretion, because he had this emergency funding, to provide \$14 million to Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and to Florida as a result of the hurricane damage. The President had that capability. That will be removed by the underlying amendment. It simply does not make any sense to say that we should have a formula in the distribution of emergency funding when we don't know where the emergency is going to occur and when. We cannot predict that. That is why the President has it in a contingency fund so in the event that there are such emergencies, we can release that funding. That is what it has always been about.

This is a historical departure from previous precedent, policy, and practice; in fact, a practice and policy that was embraced and endorsed by the Senate and by the House of Representatives and the President a month ago that became law in the Deficit Reduction Act.

I am surprised we are here today to suggest that somehow we should now no longer have emergency funding, no longer have any contingency funding. In fact, the Senator from Nevada says that there is no remaining funding for warm States. I should mention to the Senator from Nevada that the President has set aside \$101 million in fiscal year 2006 emergency funds. This money has not been released. In fact, it is at the disposal of the administration to release in the event that there are potential emergencies this summer, so that there is money. And certainly we can address the concerns of the Senator from Nevada if he feels it is not sufficient.

I, for one, felt we should increase the funding for the low-income fuel assistance program because the real value of this program has eroded over the last two decades. It essentially has the same value as it did in 1983. In 1983, it provided 50 percent of the cost of energy for a family. Today it provides 19 percent. That is not accommodating all the demands, all the people who are on

the list in various States across this country. Thirty-four Governors wrote a letter to the leadership of both the House and Senate saying how they have run out of funds. Even in addition to the significant State contributions for this purpose, they have run out of money. And rightfully so, understanding the cost of energy today. Now some have suggested—and they have suggested it from their positions in Arizona, in Nevada, in Alabama—that it has been a mild winter. But come to Maine and tell us about it being a mild winter. Then add to that the 30- to 50-percent increase in the cost of home heating oil and natural gas, in addition to the increases this last year.

The amendment I am offering today preserves the emergency funding. It provides for the formula funding as supported by the Senator from Nevada which I supported. It has two tiers of funding. One allows for emergencies and the other allows for emergency distributions. I regret that last week there was a chart distributed that misrepresented the distribution of funds. That was for that snapshot in time when there were emergencies so those States benefited from the release of funding because they had emergencies. But if you looked at it the next month, you would have discovered that there would have been a different distribution because we don't know when or where, nor can we possibly predict where, the emergencies will occur.

So the White House supports this approach, supports the emergency funding. It supports the 50-50 distribution in my amendment that I am offering as a second degree to the Kyl amendment which essentially does away with the emergency funding and provides 100 percent through a formula. So any State that requires support from the emergency funds under this program would be denied if such an emergency should arise. I believe my second degree is a positive step in providing additional assistance for those in need of emergency assistance this year.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services supports this amendment to advance the funding, the 2007 funds to 2006, in order to provide for this billion dollar increase. We are just advancing the funding. This is budget neutral because there is no net increase in Federal spending. It is important to understand the facts. There is no net increase in Federal funding. We are advancing the billion dollars. We have compromised. We asked for \$2 billion, which is what I thought we agreed to before we adjourned for the Christmas recess on December 23, that we would have a 50-50 percent allocation, 50 percent to emergency, 50 percent to formula.

Here we are today, now having to say: You know, we can't afford the billion dollars because it increases spending, which it does not, and now we decide that we don't need emergency funding for this purpose, and we will allocate all the funding through a for-

mula so that the States that depend upon this money in the event there is an emergency will not be able to have it.

I hope the Senate will support my amendment to the Kyl amendment. My amendment is fair. It is equitable. It is reasonable. This legislation should not be divisive. This isn't regional legislation. It is for all of the country. It is to benefit any region of the country. It is designed to ensure that regardless of where you live in America, if for some reason you have an emergency that affects your ability to have access to natural gas, to propane, to home heating oil, to the need for air-conditioning, for electricity, that this emergency funding will help to mitigate the impact of those disasters. That is what this is all about.

I should add, it is very specific in the mandate in law in terms of how the contingency funds are used and where do these go. I should quote from the law and what it means. It says: To meet the additional home energy assistance needs of one or more States arising from a natural disaster or other emergency. That is why it simply makes no sense to distribute emergency funds through a formula because how do you know who is going to have an emergency? Why would you be distributing money to States that don't have an emergency for that distribution?

That wasn't the attempt of this program. I would hope that we could come to an agreement on this question. At the very least, I would hope that the Senate would endorse my approach, which is a second-degree amendment that preserves the emergency funding and provides for a 50-50 allocation between emergency and formulas. I think that is patently fair to all of the States, all of the regions in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, first of all, I wonder if the Senator from Maine would be willing to answer a question on my time. She says that this is off-set. We have already had this argument, and we lost it. But it would be curious to get an answer to a question I have. You say that it is not going to increase the deficit at all because a billion dollars is taken out of next year's funding. I wonder if the Senator from Maine would be willing to agree not to come back and try to refill that money next year?

In other words, there is \$1 billion taken out next year and she is saying it is deficit neutral. Would the Senator be willing to commit to not going after more money next year?

Ms. SNOWE. I am glad to answer the Senator's question. Obviously, I cannot forecast the future in terms of the extent of the needs that are required by any State. But I remain unchallenged when it comes to my fiscal credentials in the Senate. I have been more than

happy to work with the Senator in terms of meeting our fiscal responsibilities on this issue and on any other question that benefits every State in America. From that standpoint, I would be more than happy to work with the Senator.

Mr. ENSIGN. Reclaiming my time. I will answer the question because I can predict the future because I have seen it here enough. If you watch and learn from the past, you can predict the future. People will be going after this money and probably even more. These kinds of budget games are played all the time.

I wish to make a couple of points to respond to what the Senator from Maine has talked about. First, there is \$183 million in the contingency fund this year, and \$100 million has been spent so far. There is \$83 million left in the contingency fund. She said this is for emergencies—the contingency fund is for emergencies. Well, other than post-Katrina, every other allocation since 2004 from the contingency fund has gone to all 50 States. She says it is only for emergencies. So all 50 States must have had emergencies every year.

That is not what the contingency fund has been. It has gone to every State. Our point is that the contingency fund has not been allocated fairly. I mentioned the \$183 million, and there is \$83 million left for this year's contingency fund. Has anybody noticed that it is all being allocated in the wintertime, so when the warmer weather States need their contingency fund, there won't be any left? That is the point.

She had problems with our numbers the other day. So we redid the numbers. We looked at the last 5 allocations of the contingency fund. As it turns out, in the last 5 allocations, 29 States do worse under her formula than if you adopt the underlying Kyl amendment—29 States. We are going to be passing this chart out to every Senator. The 29 States are the red States on the chart I have here. If you see your State there in red, your Senator should be voting with myself and Senator KYL to more fairly allocate this money that is for LIHEAP.

The allocations that go out for LIHEAP are there for a very noble purpose. All we are asking is, if we are going to spend this money, let's do it fairly. For too long, the formulas have benefitted some States at the expense of others. The Senator from Maine is looking out for her State. I have no problem with her doing that. It is one of the things we are elected to do—to look out for the interests of our States—also the country, but particularly for our home State.

I think the people in my State and the people in the other 28 States that are unfairly treated in the way that she has her amendment drafted deserve fair treatment, and we as Senators should fight for the people in our States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 40 seconds.

Ms. SNOWE. That is enough to respond.

The Senator from Nevada is incorrect with respect to my amendment and the way in which States it would benefit. Twenty-nine States would gain under my amendment. Unfortunately, the information the Senator is providing is inaccurate, as was the chart distributed last week that fundamentally misrepresented not only how this funding was distributed, but the fact is it was done on the basis of an emergency. If all 50 States had the benefit of the emergency funding, it is because emergencies existed in those States. That is the point. It is at the discretion of the President to distribute and release that funding in order to enable the President to respond immediately to any natural disasters or emergencies. That is what it is all about.

Under a formula for funding, States would receive it irrespective of whether an emergency occurred in their States. So 29 States would gain under my amendment. It is unfortunate that we are where we are, talking about this in that fashion, because the Senator released a chart last week that suggested this is the historical pattern. If it is the historical pattern, it is because there were emergencies. It wasn't distributed just for the sake of distributing it that way. It was done because there were emergencies in those particular States.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes 24 seconds.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine had a problem with the way we did this. It was the Congressional Research Service that did this. She said it was just a spot in time. So we said, OK, let's look at the last 5 allocations historically. How have these funds been allocated? She said 29 States would benefit under her formula. That is correct, 29 States would benefit under her amendment compared to her underlying bill. But 29 States would benefit more with the Kyl amendment than with the Snowe amendment. That is according to data from the Congressional Research Service. That is what we have to go from. That is our expert source we turn to for unbiased information. The chart I have is accurate if the people at the Congressional Research Service have done their jobs right. I have no way of knowing, other than they provide pretty good information to all Senators in a nonpartisan way. To say they are inaccurate—I don't believe that is an accurate statement; I will leave it at that.

To sum this up and close this argument, it is about fairness. The underlying LIHEAP program was set up a long time ago, and it was set up to be

biased toward many of the northern States, especially in the Northeast. The LIHEAP formula is drafted so that when we start adding money in, then it is going to be distributed more fairly to all States for heating and cooling. This is an additional billion dollars. Those other 29 States that are not treated as fairly in the original program need to be treated more fairly.

Whether you are Republican or Democrat, you should look at our charts to find out how your State is treated under the Snowe amendment versus the Kyl amendment. Senators from the 29 States should, I believe, vote against the Snowe amendment, and then support the Kyl amendment.

I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. ENSIGN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2913.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Alexander	Feingold	Murkowski
Baucus	Feinstein	Murray
Bayh	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Grassley	Obama
Biden	Gregg	Pryor
Bingaman	Hagel	Reed
Bond	Harkin	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hatch	Salazar
Burns	Inouye	Santorum
Cantwell	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Chafee	Kennedy	Smith
Clinton	Kerry	Snowe
Cochran	Kohl	Specter
Coleman	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Lautenberg	Stevens
Conrad	Leahy	Sununu
Dayton	Levin	Talent
DeWine	Lieberman	Thune
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lugar	Wyden
Dorgan	Menendez	

NAYS—31

Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Brownback	Enzi	Reid
Bunning	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Hutchison	Sessions
Chambliss	Inhofe	Shelby
Coburn	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Vitter
Craig	Lott	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	
DeMint	McCain	

NOT VOTING—1

Byrd

The amendment (No. 2913) was agreed to.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2899

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand that we are now prepared to agree to the Kyl first-degree amendment without a rollcall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2899), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. KYL. May I have just 30 seconds to thank all of those who participated in this debate, including the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Nevada. I think this 50-50 compromise that has been adopted will allow the various States to try to find a way to take care of the folks in their States who need this assistance. I appreciate the efforts of all involved to get it done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2898

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I now make a point of order that the Inhofe amendment, No. 2898, is not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of greater funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP.

As I have traveled around Illinois this winter, I have heard from many low-income families and senior citizens about the burden of rising heating costs. These families are being forced to spend considerable portions of their incomes on gas bills, and many of them simply cannot afford it. Some families are having to keep their thermostats low just so they can buy groceries. It is essential that States have the funding they need through LIHEAP to help these families pay their heating bills during the cold months.

That is why, last year, I joined a number of my Senate colleagues in sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee requesting \$3 billion in funding so that low-income families, disabled individuals, and senior citizens who live on fixed incomes have access to affordable energy when they need it most. We also asked that advance funding be allocated in the budget for LIHEAP. This would allow States to plan more economically in preparing for the winter heating season by purchasing fuels during the spring and summer months. Unfortunately, our request was denied.

Months later, during consideration of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Congress reauthorized the LIHEAP program from fiscal year 2005 to 2007, providing for a yearly appropriation of \$5.1 billion. However, in the fiscal year 2006 Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, Congress provided \$2.2 billion for LIHEAP funding—the same allotment

given to the program in fiscal year 2005. During Senate consideration of several bills in the final weeks of 2005, I voted for a number of amendments providing more funding for LIHEAP, but those amendments were defeated.

Funding for LIHEAP has remained level for the past 20 years, but energy prices are at an all-time high. According to the Department of Energy, DOE, natural gas prices in the Midwest were expected to rise between 69 percent and 77 percent during the winter heating season. The National Energy Assistance Directors Association estimates that for families using natural gas, heating bills would average well over \$1,500 per consumer, an increase of over \$600 per consumer as compared to the winter of 2004–2005. As a result, we have seen an unprecedented rise in requests for LIHEAP assistance across the country. In Illinois, requests in 2005 were up 41.4 percent from the year before. That is nearly a quarter of a million Americans asking for help in my State alone.

I think we often forget how much our working families need this program, and just how heavy the burden of heating one's home can be these days. In a thank-you note to the staff at Illinois LIHEAP, a woman in Lake County, IL, wrote:

Having you help me and my mother this year with our utility bill was a godsend. It was over my head and I didn't know what I was going to do. . . . My mother is on oxygen 24-hours a day, and we couldn't be without electricity, so you see it was a matter of life and death also for me.

I commend Senator SNOWE for her tenacity in pushing this legislation, and I commend Senator JACK REED for his longstanding commitment to this issue.

I hope my colleagues will recognize the importance of this problem and support this measure, as well as greater LIHEAP funding in the future. With natural gas prices increasing so severely, more Americans than usual are expected to apply for LIHEAP assistance in paying their heating bills.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, today I rise to address the rising costs faced by Americans as they try to heat their homes this winter. Obtaining affordable heating assistance each winter, and cooling assistance during the summer months, is critical to hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians and millions of Americans. Unfortunately, projections from the Energy Information Administration this January show that on average, consumers will spend nearly 35 percent more for natural gas this winter than they did last winter.

The primary Federal heating assistance program is the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. I represent a Commonwealth that depends heavily on this program. My State also has a high percentage of elderly citizens; they are especially vulnerable to cold winter temperatures. Overall, the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare reports that it distributed LIHEAP funds to approximately 462,000

households during the 2004–2005 winter, with 128,000 of these recipients being elderly.

While I am pleased that my Commonwealth ranks second in the Nation in the total Federal LIHEAP assistance distributed, more has to be done to help Pennsylvanians in need. At current funding levels, only 15-percent of LIHEAP-eligible households are served in my home State.

As a member of the Special Committee on Aging, I am pleased that Chairman SMITH has recognized the importance of this program for many low-income senior citizens. This past June, my colleague from Oregon convened a hearing to examine the effect of energy prices on the elderly. However, much has changed across the national energy landscape since that hearing. The tragedies of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita put severe pressure on our energy industries, increasing costs of oil and natural gas. Now that the winter has arrived, the increasing cost of home heating fuel weighs heavily on the minds of the elderly and low-income individuals, and it is time for the Senate to further address this vital issue.

In the beginning of January, I chaired a field hearing for the Special Committee on Aging near my hometown of Pittsburgh, PA, to revisit this critical issue and hear from a variety of witnesses about ways in which the Government and private sector are helping the elderly and others stay warm. Representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Energy, Pennsylvania State Department of Public Welfare, and private sector organizations and utilities testified in support of LIHEAP.

The testimony of Pennsylvania State secretary of public welfare Estelle Richman was especially troubling. Secretary Richman testified that, by December 30, 2005, her agency had received over 320,000 LIHEAP applications. This is a 5 percent increase over 2005, which means that over 17,000 additional Pennsylvania households have requested heating assistance already this winter. Furthermore, the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare has already seen a 15-percent increase in crisis home heating assistance applications.

Pennsylvania is not alone in facing such difficulties. According to Assistant Secretary for the Administration for Children and Families, Wade Horn, his agency assists nearly 5 million households each year. However, those who are eligible for these benefits far outnumber those who receive this assistance.

As a Senate, we need to address this growing national problem. Each winter, our Government is faced with distributing emergency LIHEAP funds, while millions of Americans are stuck out in the cold. This past year, we tried, in a bipartisan fashion, to appropriate additional funding for LIHEAP. Unfortunately, we were not able to gar-

ner enough support for those provisions to pass.

This year we find ourselves in a worse situation than we did last year. When I travel throughout Pennsylvania, I continually hear from my constituents their concerns about rising energy costs and what we, the Congress, are doing to help. Now we have our chance to provide additional assistance that will benefit millions of Americans in the short term. However, while we need to pass this additional LIHEAP funding, we also need to look toward long-term solutions for our Nation's energy needs.

As we are all aware, there is no one solution to our Nation's energy problems. However, by increasing our domestic supplies and production capacity, we can take steps towards lowering the cost of energy for all Americans. We also need to promote alternative energy solutions that utilize state-of-the-art technological advancements like coal-to-liquid fuel advancements. Without this combination of current and new technologies, the costs faced by consumers at the pump and in their home heating bills will only continue to increase.

While this is clearly a long-term problem that we, as a body, need to address, I am proud to support my colleague from Maine, Senator SNOWE, in her effort to provide additional LIHEAP funding this winter. This measure will assist thousands of Pennsylvanians and millions across the country. For this, as well as the reasons I have cited, I urge my colleagues to support this measure that assists countless senior citizens and low-income Americans.

Mr. KENNEDY. Today's Senate action adding \$1 billion for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for this winter is a step in the right direction. It is the best we can do, and it deserved to pass. But no one should be under the illusion that we have now provided adequate assistance to millions of struggling families around the country, many of whom are elderly and disabled. The additional \$1 billion is less than half what is needed to fully fund LIHEAP and guarantee the assistance these families need and deserve. A small step is better than no step, but it is still far from meeting the obvious need.

Countless citizens in communities throughout America live year-round in constant fear of power shutoffs because they can't pay their energy bills, and they have no confidence that either Congress or the President is on their side.

According to a report by the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, since the winter of 2001–2002, the average yearly cost of heating oil has soared from \$627 to \$1474, natural gas from \$465 to \$1000, and propane from \$736 to \$1286. Yet the Republican Congress and the Bush administration continue to ignore the fact that millions of Americans can't afford these steep increases.

Democrats have pressed for months to fund LIHEAP at the authorized level of \$5.1 billion for the current fiscal year. We have urged Congress to act, but the Republican majority has blocked our efforts at every turn, and they continued to try to block our efforts to obtain an additional \$1 billion for the program today. Families are paying a steep price for this neglect. The average LIHEAP grant has decreased by almost 10 percent since 2002 and is now only \$288.

In Massachusetts, the State government has provided \$20 million in additional funds for LIHEAP this year.

Low-income families are more fortunate in our State than in most other States on this issue, but we have exhausted all Federal funds, and need is still great. Even the poorest households with the highest bills will get no more than \$840—less than half what is needed to get through the winter.

As Self Help, a community action program in Avon, MA, “Many of our clients have exhausted their benefits . . . The bottom line is that we need some kind of relief, as quickly as possible.”

ABCD, a community action agency in Boston, reports that as of January 17, the number of applicants applying for fuel assistance for the first time increased by 26 percent. Its clients are currently exhausting all of their fuel assistance benefits. Even a benefit of \$765 buys only one tank of oil at today’s price of \$2.40 per gallon, when at least two or three tankfuls are needed to get through the winter, and no other source of funding is available.

These aren’t just numbers. They represent real people facing real hardships.

For example, an elderly couple lives in a modest home on the outskirts of Haverhill and both receive Social Security benefits. Their home is heated with oil, and they use an old woodstove in the basement to supplement their steam boiler. Their \$525 LIHEAP grant covered one delivery of 256 gallons of oil in late November. Attempting to cut wood for the woodstove, the husband fell from a ladder and was injured. If LIHEAP had been funded fairly, his injury could have been prevented. With this bill, the chances are 50–50 that his injury could have been prevented. We could have done better, and we should have done better. It is wrong to let people like this suffer.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I join Senator SNOWE and others in supporting this legislation to provide additional funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP.

This legislation will shift the \$1 billion in fiscal year 2007 funding, which we recently enacted in the budget reconciliation bill, to the current fiscal year, so it can be used this winter. Providing these needed funds in this way is not the best approach to get this done, but with Vermonters facing record heating bills and no other choices

available to us at this crucial juncture, we cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. The fact is the burden of record heating prices this winter could financially wipe out many families and elderly Vermonters. No family in our Nation should be forced to choose between heating their home and putting food on the table for their children. No older American should have to decide between buying life-saving prescriptions or paying utility bills. Unfortunately, these stark choices are a reality for too many Vermonters and for too many other Americans across the Nation.

This legislation will bring the total funding available for LIHEAP in fiscal year 2006 up to nearly \$3 billion. Certainly more is needed. That is why I have voted four times to increase LIHEAP funding to \$5.1 billion. Bipartisan amendments offered to the Department of Defense appropriations bill, the Transportation, Treasury, and HUD Appropriations bill, the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill, and the tax reconciliation bill received a majority of the Senate’s support. Unfortunately, the majority party would not allow these amendments the opportunity for straight up-or-down votes, and we were blocked from securing these needed supplements for LIHEAP in our earlier efforts.

The Energy Information Agency forecasts that households heating with natural gas will experience an average increase of 35 percent over last winter. Households heating with oil will see an increase of 23 percent, and households using propane can expect an increase of 17 percent. Compounding these difficulties for families needing this help, wages are not keeping pace with inflation. The Real Earnings report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the average hourly earnings of production and nonsupervisory workers on private nonfarm payrolls were lower in December 2005 than they were a year ago, after accounting for inflation. Working families are continuing to lose ground, meaning more families also need LIHEAP assistance this year. Paychecks are being stretched thinner as families face higher prices for home heating, for health care, and for education. Vermont families and seniors need this relief from high energy costs, and they need it now.

As I have said, this is not my preferred approach to providing LIHEAP funding, but Vermonters cannot wait for a better option. This help is needed now. I call on the leadership in the House of Representatives and on President Bush to support this legislation and to ensure its immediate enactment. I also urge the administration to join the bipartisan majority in Congress to replenish LIHEAP funding for next winter.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I believe we are ready to proceed to passage. That will not require a rollcall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 2320), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2320

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

**SECTION 1. FUNDS FOR LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

Section 9001 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “for a 1-time only obligation and expenditure”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$750,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available under this section may be used for the planning and administering described in section 2605(b)(9) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(9)).”; and

(4) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking “September 30, 2007” and inserting “September 30, 2006”.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, first I want to thank my colleagues for their cooperation in bringing to a resolution what has been more difficult than I thought it would be, addressing the LIHEAP issue.

We have achieved passage, and we are now ready to resume the lobbying measure.

I know Senator REID is prepared to lay down his amendment tonight. Senators will be able to debate that amendment tonight, and we will set a vote on the Democratic leader’s amendment sometime tomorrow morning.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent 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.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES  
OVERSIGHT BOARD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, recent press reports reveal that despite its creation more than a year ago, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board has yet to hire any staff members or even hold a single meeting. This board was established by a law signed in December 2004 in response to recommendations from the 9/11 Commission. Now, several months into 2006, we learn from a Newsweek article that the board's members will finally be sworn in at the White House this month. I will ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article be printed in the RECORD. Starting up the work of this important board, particularly in this time of unprecedented intrusion into the privacy of Americans by the executive branch, is shamefully overdue.

On December 14, 2004, the President signed into law the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. Section 1061 of this act implemented a 9/11 Commission recommendation to establish an independent board within the Executive Office of the President to fill a clear void in Government for protecting Americans' liberties.

Creating the board was no easy feat. The Bush-Cheney administration initially resisted the 9/11 Commission's recommendation for a privacy board, unpersuasively asserting that it was already protecting privacy and civil liberties. The administration then tried to circumvent a congressionally authorized, independent board by issuing an Executive order establishing an anemic alternative. That entity was not independent, had no authority to access information, had little accountability, and was comprised solely of administration officials from the law enforcement and intelligence communities—the very communities in need of oversight. It was the proverbial case of the fox guarding the henhouse. But many of us in Congress were committed to creating an effective board in keeping with the 9/11 Commission's recommendations.

We succeeded, and the President signed the bill creating the board well over a year ago, but the White House's delays and resistance continued. Last May 11, I joined Senators DURBIN, COLLINS, and LIEBERMAN in writing to the President to inquire why there had not yet been any nominations and to urge him to nominate board members as soon as possible. We also expressed concern about the inadequate funding in the White House budget proposal, which would only have provided an underwhelming and insufficient \$750,000 for its operations. Fortunately, the Transportation, Treasury, and HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve, raised the amount to \$1.5 million to ensure a better start for the board.

President Bush waited until June of last year to appoint three members of

the board, and to nominate the chairman and vice chairman of the board, who were confirmed by the Senate last month. No board members have yet been sworn in. Meanwhile, as Newsweek reported, the White House's new budget, released last month, listed no money for the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board. Administration officials have said that this omission came only because they decided not to itemize funding for offices within the White House, but they could not explain why other White House offices were individually listed, yet this board was not.

Regrettably, the delays and insufficient funds suggest that the Bush-Cheney administration is simply going through the motions, rather than following through on a meaningful commitment to the Privacy Board. As the Chairman of the 9/11 Commission said, "The Administration was never interested in this."

This board is too important for us to simply go through the motions. Prior to the board, there was no office within the Government to oversee the collective impact of Government actions and powers on our liberties. This is a critical blind spot. We have increased and consolidated the authority of an already-powerful Government in an effort to address the realities of terrorism and modern warfare. As Lee Hamilton, Vice Chairman of the 9/11 Commission, noted in a Judiciary Committee hearing on August 19, 2004, these developments represent "an astounding intrusion in the lives of ordinary Americans that is routine today in government."

In the months since Mr. Hamilton made this statement, we have learned of reports of far more disturbing and unprecedented intrusions into the lives of Americans, including warrantless wiretapping in violation of the laws of the land, as well as surveillance of ordinary Americans that may include a group of Quakers in Vermont. It is more important than ever to have a meaningful entity ensuring that the Government pursue crucial antiterrorism efforts without giving up the privacy and civil liberties so important to all Americans.

The delays in setting up the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board and the failures to properly fund it show that the Bush-Cheney administration does not take this responsibility seriously. We must make sure that we do take it seriously, on behalf of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Newsweek article to which I referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, March 13, 2006 issue]

WATCHDOG: WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO THE  
CIVIL LIBERTIES BOARD?

(By Michael Isikoff)

For more than a year, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board has been the

most invisible office in the White House. Created by Congress in December 2004 as a result of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, the board has never hired a staff or even held a meeting. Next week, NEWSWEEK has learned, that is due to finally change when the board's five members are slated to be sworn in at the White House and convene their first session. Board members tell NEWSWEEK the panel intends to immediately tackle contentious issues like the president's domestic wiretapping program, the Patriot Act and Pentagon data mining. But critics are furious the process has taken this long—and question whether the White House intends to treat the panel as anything more than window dressing. The delay is "outrageous, considering how long it's been since the bill [creating the board] was passed," said Thomas Kean, who chaired the 9/11 Commission. "The administration was never interested in this."

Renewed concerns about the White House's commitment came just a few weeks ago when President Bush's new budget was released—with no listing for money for the civil liberties board. Alex Conant, a spokesman for the Office of Management and Budget, denied to NEWSWEEK the White House was trying to kill the panel by starving it of funds. "It will be fully funded," he said, explaining that the board wasn't in the budget this year because officials decided not to itemize funding levels for particular offices within the White House. When a reporter pointed out that funding for other White House offices such as the National Security Council were listed in the budget, Conant said: "I have no explanation."

The funding snafu is only the latest setback. Kean said the 9/11 Commission had pushed hard for the board to ensure that some agency within the government would specifically review potential abuses at a time vastly expanded powers were being given to U.S. intel and law-enforcement agencies. But the White House, and congressional leaders, resisted and sharply restricted its scope, denying the board basic tools like subpoena power. Bush didn't nominate members of the board until June 2005—six months after the panel was created—and they weren't confirmed until last month. The chair of the board is Carol Dinkins, a former senior Justice official under Ronald Reagan and former law partner of Attorney General Alberto Gonzales. Dinkins did not respond to requests for comment.

PASSAGE OF H.R. 32

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise today to compliment my friends in the House of Representatives for passing expeditiously H.R. 32—the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act—as amended by the Senate.

In addition to a few technical changes, I am pleased that the bill included the entirety of S. 1095, the Protecting American Goods and Services Act, introduced last year by myself and Senator LEAHY.

I am particularly pleased to work with the senior Senator from Vermont in our continued bipartisan effort to protect intellectual property rights as well as to work on other important issues. Last year, we worked together on a matter near and dear to my heart—good government legislation related to the Freedom of Information Act, and it indeed has been a pleasure to work with him again. His staff has

worked tirelessly with mine—especially Susan Davies, whose hard work and dedication to the goal of making good public policy is a testament to her, to Senator LEAHY, and to good legislative process.

The combined package passed today in the form of H.R. 32 represents important, bipartisan legislation designed to combat the trafficking of illegitimate goods throughout the world. The rampant distribution of illegitimate goods—be it counterfeited products, illegal copies of copyrighted works or any other form of piracy—undermines property rights, threatens American jobs, decreases consumer safety and, oftentimes, supports organized crime and terrorist activity.

Amazingly, it is estimated that between 5 percent and 7 percent of worldwide trade is conducted with counterfeit goods and services. According to FBI estimates, counterfeiting costs U.S. businesses as much as \$200 to \$250 billion annually—and that costs Americans their jobs—more than 750,000 jobs according to U.S. Customs.

In recent years, this plague on global trade has grown significantly. According to the World Customs Organization and Interpol, the global trade in illegitimate goods has increased from \$5.5 billion in 1992 to more than \$600 billion per year today. That is \$600 billion per year illegally extracted from the global economy.

But for me, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship, I find it most troubling that the counterfeit trade across our borders and throughout the world threatens our safety and our national security. Most frighteningly, evidence indicates that the counterfeit trade supports terrorist activities. Indeed, al-Qaida training manuals recommended the sale of fake goods to raise revenue.

Further, counterfeit goods undermine our confidence in the reliability of goods and service. For example, the Federal Aviation Administration estimates that 2 percent of the 26 million airline parts installed each year are counterfeit. And the Federal Drug Administration estimates that as much as 10 percent of pharmaceuticals are counterfeit.

And the reach of counterfeiting runs deep in my own home State of Texas. Data is difficult to collect, but a 1997 piece detailing Microsoft's efforts to combat counterfeiting and piracy—while dated—pointed out that this type of activity costs Texas over 10,000 jobs and almost \$1 billion. Today, we know those numbers are much higher.

We must act to stop this illegal activity. The legislation we passed today will help us do just that. It is not complicated—nor is it long, but its global impact will be significant. The legislation is designed to provide law enforcement with additional tools to curb the flow of these illegitimate goods and it is perhaps even more critical for businesses, large and small, throughout

America and for ensuring the safety of consumers around the globe.

Those who traffic in counterfeit goods put Americans in danger, support terrorism and undermine the health of our Nation's economy. S. 1095—or the "PAGS Act"—as included in the legislation passed today—fills certain important gaps in current counterfeiting law by clarifying the term "trafficking" to ensure that it is illegal to:

Possess counterfeit goods with the intention of selling them; give away counterfeit goods in exchange for some future benefit—in effect, the "bartering" of counterfeit goods in such a way that avoids criminality; import or export counterfeit goods or unauthorized copies of copyrighted works.

This bill will protect property rights, protect consumer safety, preserve American jobs, and bolster the American economy by cracking down on the trade of illegal counterfeit goods and services.

Each of these items was highlighted by the Department of Justice in its October, 2004 report on its Task Force on Intellectual Property. In it, the Department describes the significant limitation law enforcement oftentimes faces in pursuing counterfeiters and offers, among others, the principles embraced in the Protecting American Goods and Services Act, as possible solutions to these obstacles.

This legislation, and other reforms, will help turn the tide of the growing counterfeit trade. The legislation is critically important to law enforcement—but it is even more critical for businesses, large and small, throughout America—including in my home State of Texas—as well as for ensuring the safety of consumers around the globe. Those who traffic in counterfeit goods put Americans in danger, support terrorism and undermine the health of our nation's economy. It is time to put an end to this scourge on society.

I look forward to the President signing this legislation into law, and in so doing, protecting property rights, protecting consumer safety, preserving American jobs and bolstering the American economy.

#### OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an organization with which many of my colleagues have some personal familiarity, the Office of the Attending Physician. Many of my colleagues have come to rely upon the Attending Physician's Office here in the Congress as the source for support and medical advice. Most of us are personally aware of the fine work performed by Dr. Eisold and his staff in providing care for the Members of Congress, but there is much about the office which we don't think about regularly.

The Senate has been served by the Attending Physician since 1930, a little

more than a year after the office was established by the House of Representatives. The first Attending Physician, Dr. George Calver, served this body for approximately 37 years. He was known for offering health tips to Members of Congress such as "eat wisely, drink plentifully (of water). Play enthusiastically and relax completely. Stay out of the Washington social whirl—go out at night twice a week at most." And, perhaps most importantly, "Don't let yourself get off-balance, nervous and disturbed over things." Each of these remains good advice all these years later.

My colleagues and I know we can count on the expertise of the Attending Physician in many areas of medical advice. On average, the office successfully treats more than 50,000 patients annually. They regularly track the spread of infectious disease so that they can determine which inoculations and other medications will be required when Members travel to foreign locations. Members of the Senate rely on the physician's office for our annual flu shots and for assistance on minor medical problems. We also count on them, as do our staff and visitors to the Capitol, for handling medical emergencies.

The Office of the Attending Physician also provides unique capabilities that are very important to the success of this institution which are not well known. The office is poised for crisis response. In recent years, it has responded to the anthrax outbreak in the Hart Building and to the ricin scare. The physicians, nurses, and other medical staff have the capability and training to respond to many potential emergencies up to and include terrorist response.

The office is equipped with mobile medical vehicles designed to allow for deploying medical support throughout the region, if necessary, for offsite operations. These vehicles are well equipped to handle many medical emergencies that could arise. Each has a fully functioning laboratory and two examination rooms complete with most modern equipment. As the Congress considers its continuity of Government requirements, the Office of the Attending Physician is well positioned to support emergency legislative operations which could be required following an attack.

Mr. President, the Office of the Attending Physician provides a critical capability to the legislative branch. The services they provide serve as a convenience to busy Members of the Congress, but they are much more. They are a vital piece of emergency response in the Capitol. They are ready, when called upon, to play a key role in ensuring continuity of the legislative branch, they serve to handle any medical emergency which might arise at the Capitol.

We owe a great deal to Dr. Eisold and his team of fine specialists. May I suggest all of my colleagues thank them for their great service the next time we

see them in action. They deserve our gratitude and support.

#### VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am concerned that the President's Department of Veterans Affairs fiscal year 2007 budget request does not include adequate funding for VA health care. Specifically, this budget request would require certain veterans to pay a \$250 enrollment fee in order to access the health care system each year. In addition, the budget proposes to more than double prescription copayments from \$7 to \$15, further burdening the limited resources of those who have served our country.

The VA estimates that these measures will save the Department an estimated \$795 million in 2007. This savings estimate is based not only on collections but on increasing the number of veterans who will opt-out of the service due to the higher fees. The VA estimates they will force over 1 million veterans, almost half of the Priority 7 and Priority 8 veterans, to drop out of the VA health care system.

Do we really want our veterans to be faced with the difficult choice of either dropping out of the VA health care system or bearing these additional costs? Those who do not drop out of the VA health care system will be forced to pay hundreds more for their health care. Veterans who receive prescription drugs from the VA and who fill a typical number of prescriptions a year could face new fees amounting to nearly \$600. I realize that agencies such as the VA must look for ways to save dollars, but our Nation's veterans deserve adequate and affordable health care.

While I understand the need to reduce Federal spending, I urge my colleagues to reject these proposals to reduce spending for VA health care in the fiscal year 2007 budget. I believe it is absolutely critical that the VA health care system be fully funded. The Congress has rejected these proposals in the past, and I hope it will do so again this year. Our veterans should not be faced with these choices nor forced to bear this burden. We must keep our promise to care for the veterans who made so many sacrifices to ensure the freedom of so many.

#### NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, March 7, 2006, we celebrate the 16th annual National Sportsmanship Day. Begun in 1991 by the Institute for International Sport at the University of Rhode Island, this initiative promotes the highest ideals of sportsmanship and fair play among America's youth. In 13,000 schools, across all 50 States, and in countries around the world, students, teachers, administrators, coaches, and parents will engage in discussions on the issues of sportsmanship and fair play. The theme of this year's National Sportsmanship Day is "De-

feat Gamesmanship!" and participants will talk about appropriate tactics and strategies when participating in games and sports.

This year, in addition to promoting the values of sportsmanship and fair play, the Institute for International Sport will recognize schools across the country that have exceptional sportsmanship programs with the new All-American Sportsmanship School Award. A minimum of 64 awards will be given out to elementary, middle, and high schools as well as colleges that participate in National Sportsmanship Day and honor its principles year round.

I am proud that Rhode Island is home to the Institute for International Sport and National Sportsmanship Day. For 16 years, this initiative has had a positive influence on our Nation's youth in promoting the best in athletics, and I know it will continue to do so this year and in the future.

#### HONORING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, on March 1, 1961, President Kennedy signed an Executive order that established the Peace Corps whose mission would be to promote peace, mutual understanding, and friendship between Americans and the people of the world. Back then, the world was viewed as engaged in a cold war with the United States and its allies pitted against the Communist bloc. President Kennedy envisioned the Peace Corps as an agency that would create opportunities for Americans to reach out to the rest of the world, and make positive contributions to community development and nation-building overseas.

As we celebrate the Peace Corps's 45th anniversary, all Americans can be proud of what the agency has accomplished and continues to do. Through its hardworking and committed volunteers who now number nearly 8,000, the Peace Corps provides assistance today in 138 host countries in such fields as education, healthcare, environmental preservation, and business development.

Last year, the Peace Corps's Crisis Corps Volunteers helped with rebuilding efforts in tsunami-ravaged areas of Sri Lanka and Thailand. And, for the first time in its history, volunteers were deployed at home as approximately 270 volunteers assisted with recovery efforts along the U.S. gulf coast in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

I am also proud to report that the Peace Corps continues to attract Volunteers from Hawaii. At this moment, 12 volunteers from Hawaii are serving in 12 different host countries that include Bulgaria, China, Morocco, Nicaragua, Swaziland, and Tanzania.

It is a pleasure to join all Americans in congratulating the Peace Corps and its volunteers past and present for their outstanding work, and for their

invaluable and effective civic contributions to communities throughout the world.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would like the record to reflect that I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 31, the confirmation of Timothy C. Batten, Sr., of Georgia, to be U.S. District Judge on Monday, March 6, 2006. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted in favor of the nomination.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO ARNOLD FRIBERG

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to Arnold Friberg, a gifted American artist.

For more than eight decades as a painter, Mr. Friberg has set down a profound and varied body of work, including magazine covers and illustrations, World War II depictions, the Northwest Mounted Police, Book of Mormon illustrations, portraits, including Her Royal Highness Queen Elizabeth of England, and many rich and dramatic depictions of the Old West. This year marks the 30th anniversary of his revered Prayer at Valley Forge, which shows George Washington at prayer. Along with Emanuel Leutze's Washington Crossing the Delaware, Friberg's Prayer at Valley Forge is one of the great American patriotic paintings.

In 1953, Arnold Friberg was summoned to Hollywood by Cecil B. DeMille for a 1-month consultation on costume design for a film he was going to remake. DeMille became so impressed by the artist that soon afterward Mr. Friberg was called back to Hollywood and began a warm, personal collaboration with the storied director that lasted for 4 years.

Mr. Friberg became DeMille's chief artist-designer for the well-known movie "The Ten Commandments," which brought the artist an Academy Award nomination. Half a century later, "The Ten Commandments" still draws sizable audiences to television broadcasts and DVD sales. Becoming the visual designer for what DeMille and his set decorators and cameramen put on film, Mr. Friberg painted major scenes of the salient episodes in the Old Testament including The Finding of Moses, Moses and the Burning Bush, First Passover, Exodus Begins, Orgy of the Golden Calf, Moses Receiving the Law, and Crossing of the Red Sea. Visually, the film was built around these scenes, along with major costume designs created by the artist.

After completion of the film, Mr. Friberg's original paintings were widely exhibited wherever the film opened, and more than 1 million copies of a catalog depicting them were sold.

The golden anniversary of the release of the film is being celebrated this

month at an exhibition of these marvelous paintings, along with artifacts from the film, at the Utah Cultural Celebration Center in West Valley City, UT.

I am honored today to acknowledge the work of Arnold Friberg and add my name to the long list of Americans who are grateful for his outstanding contributions.●

#### CONGRATULATING THE RUTGERS UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Rutgers University women's basketball team for its thrilling victory against the University of Connecticut on February 27. Before a sold-out crowd of over 8,000 fans, the tenacious Scarlet Knights achieved one of college basketball's most coveted titles: Big East Conference champions. In the process, Rutgers also became only the third team in history to finish its regular season undefeated.

This victory did not come easily, but the Scarlet Knights came ready to play, thirsty to win, and eager to give the Connecticut Huskies a run for their money. Despite trailing UConn by 18 points in the first half, Rutgers refused to give up. Instead, they regrouped, refueled, and used strong defense and solid teamwork to make up the point deficit. Led by head coach C. Vivian Stringer and senior standout Cappie Pondexter, the Scarlet Knights played a flawless second half that capped an outstanding season. By the time the final buzzer rang, the Rutgers women had proven that they can compete with any team in the Nation. More importantly, after winning their second straight conference title, the Scarlet Knights confirmed that hard work, perseverance, and desire remain the keys to success.

With four New Jersey natives on their roster, including Big East Defensive Player of the Year Essence Carson, these young women have become a source of pride for my home State. Coach Stringer, in particular, deserves special recognition for the strong coaching and leadership skills she has demonstrated over her 10 years at Rutgers University. As one of the most recognized and most respected coaches in the game, she was inducted into the New Jersey Sports Hall of Fame in 2005. I think I speak for both the Scarlet Knights and the Rutgers community when I say how pleased I am to have Coach Stringer leading this remarkable team.

Mr. President, on behalf of the entire State of New Jersey, I am proud to congratulate the Scarlet Knights once again for their second consecutive Big East Conference title. As the Scarlet Knights begin this year's NCAA tournament, we hope they are able to maintain the momentum that carried them so well through the regular season. We wish them the best of luck.●

#### TRIBUTE TO REDFORD AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Redford Avenue Presbyterian Church on 100 years of worship and service to the community. This milestone was recently commemorated with 2 days of events, culminating in a dance and dinner celebration that took place on March 6, 2006. This momentous occasion provides the perfect opportunity to reflect on Redford's rich history and to remember the integral role Redford has played in the community over the years.

Redford Avenue Presbyterian Church was established in March 1906 by a small congregation that served what was then known as the Sand Hill in Detroit. The church's membership grew rapidly, and as a result, in 1929, a separate addition was built to accommodate the larger congregation. Unfortunately, in 1945 the sanctuary was completely destroyed by a fire. However, this tragedy provided an important opportunity for the congregation and community to work together to rebuild the church, and by 1954, a new sanctuary, educational wing and fellowship hall was constructed. By the late 1960s, the membership had grown to more than 3,600 people.

Today, Redford Avenue Presbyterian Church has a smaller congregation but has maintained its strong spirit, deep faith and unwavering commitment to serve and minister to the greater Detroit community. For the last 30 years the church has run a daycare center that helps to meet the needs of many working parents in the community. In addition, Redford's educational building is currently being leased to a charter school and is also used by a local division of Sea Cadets.

Redford Avenue Presbyterian Church also continues to make its building available to many groups and organizations in the neighborhood. Considered a cornerstone of the community, Redford consistently provides meeting space for groups such as Narcotics Anonymous and Metro Detroit Deaf Senior Citizens. And, for 1 night each January, the church opens its doors to house, feed, clothe, and minister to the homeless.

I know my Senate colleagues will join me in congratulating Redford Avenue Presbyterian Church and wish its members, volunteers, and ministerial staff many more years of fellowship and service.●

#### 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 a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### 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-5921. A communication from the Vice President, Government Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrack, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the completion of Amtrack's Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5922. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Administration's intent to award a contract to the Jackson Hole Airport Board for screening services at Jackson Hole Airport in Jackson, Wyoming; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5923. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Administration's intent to award a contract to Covenant Aviation Security, LLC for screening services at Sioux Falls Regional Airport in Sioux Falls, South Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5924. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska" (I.D. No. 030805C) received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5925. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Increase" (I.D. No. 012406A) received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5926. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Temporary Rule; Inseason Retention Limit Adjustment" (I.D. No. 011906B) received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5927. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel Lottery in Areas 542 and 543" (I.D. No. 011306A) received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5928. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Framework 1 to the Spiny Dogfish Fishery Management Plan" (RIN0648-AT29) received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5929. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule to Amend the Subsistence Fishery Rules for Pacific Halibut in Waters Off Alaska" (RIN0648-AR88) received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5930. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, the report of a nomination for the newly created position of Administrator, received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5931. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of nominations for the following positions: Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Policy; Administrator, Maritime Administration; Administrator, National Highway Safety Administration; and Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, received on March 2, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5932. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's annual report on the regulatory status of the National Transportation Safety Board's "Most Wanted" Recommendations to the Department of Transportation for calendar year ending 2005; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5933. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the threat from acts of terrorism to U.S. ports and vessels operating from those ports; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5934. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Design-Build Effectiveness Study"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5935. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, case number 04-10; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5936. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force, case number 04-01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5937. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, case number 04-06; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5938. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, case number 05-04; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-5939. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the American River Watershed, California (Folsom Dam and Permanent Bridge) Project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5940. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the Chief of Engineers on multiple projects and notification that the Administration review on these projects is still pending; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5941. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's December 2005 monthly report on the status of its licensing and regulatory duties; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5942. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the URL addresses of documents entitled: "Source Water Monitoring Guidance Manual for Public Water Systems for the Final Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule"; "Microbial Laboratory Guidance Manual for the Final Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule"; and "Membrane Filtration Guidance Manual", received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5943. 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 "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Alabama: State Implementation Plan Revision" (FRL No. 8042-9) received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5944. 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 "Montana: Incorporation By Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program" (FRL No. 8035-5) received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5945. 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 "South Dakota: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision and Incorporation By Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program" (FRL No. 8035-4) received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5946. 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 "Flumiclorac Pentyl; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No 7764-1) received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5947. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5948. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on

the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5949. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consolidated Plan Revisions and Updates" ((RIN2501-AD07)(FR-4923-F-02)) received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5950. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2006 NASA Strategic Plan"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5951. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Death Benefits" (5 CFR Part 1651) received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5952. A communication from the Deputy Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received on March 7, 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### 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. COLEMAN:

S. 2375. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2376. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 2377. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and other Acts to provide for border security and interior enforcement improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 2378. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure that tribal libraries that receive assistance under the Library Services and Technology Act are eligible for E-rate assistance to the same extent as other libraries receiving such assistance and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 2379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for

health and long-term care insurance costs of individuals not participating in employer-subsidized health plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2380. A bill to add the heads of certain Federal intelligence agencies to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, to require enhanced notification to Congress and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. ALLARD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. THUNE, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. THOMAS):

S. 2381. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide line item rescission authority; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. REID, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2382. A bill to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer health benefits plans to individuals who are not Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 2383. A bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make a technical correction; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 65

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to amend the age restrictions for pilots.

S. 333

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 333, a bill to hold the current regime in Iran accountable for its threatening behavior and to support a transition to democracy in Iran.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor 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. 548

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 548, a bill to amend the Food

Security Act of 1985 to encourage owners and operators of privately-held farm, ranch, and forest land to voluntarily make their land available for access by the public under programs administered by States and tribal governments.

S. 558

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 558, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special compensation and to eliminate the phase-in period under current law with respect to such concurrent receipt.

S. 641

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D.

S. 1112

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to make permanent the enhanced educational savings provisions for qualified tuition programs enacted as part of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, supra.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to provide for programs to increase the awareness and knowledge of women and health care providers with respect to gynecologic cancers.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1272, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, and title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits to certain individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II.

S. 1513

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1513, a bill to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing, and for other purposes.

S. 1791

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified timber gains.

S. 1955

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1955, a bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Security Act of 1974 and the Public Health Service Act to expand health care access and reduce costs through the creation of small business health plans and through modernization of the health insurance marketplace.

S. 1968

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1968, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes.

S. 1994

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1994, a bill to require that an increasing percentage of new automobiles be dual fueled automobiles, to revise the method for calculating corporate average fuel economy for such vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1998

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1998, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections relating to the reputation and meaning of the Medal of Honor and other military decorations and awards, and for other purposes.

S. 2052

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2052, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to certain agriculture-related businesses for the cost of protecting certain chemicals.

S. 2154

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, a bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Rosa Parks.

S. 2178

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2178, a bill to make the stealing and selling of telephone records a criminal offense.

S. 2201

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2201, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify the mediation and implementation requirements of section 40122 regarding

changes in the Federal Aviation Administration personnel management system, and for other purposes.

S. 2237

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2237, a bill to withhold United States assistance from the Palestinian Authority until certain conditions have been satisfied.

S. 2279

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2279, a bill to make amendments to the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act.

S. 2292

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2292, a bill to provide relief for the Federal judiciary from excessive rent charges.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2308, a bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to improve mine safety, and for other purposes.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille.

S. 2362

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2362, a bill to establish the National Commission on Surveillance Activities and the Rights of Americans.

S. 2370

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2370, a bill to promote the development of democratic institutions in areas under the administrative control of the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes.

S. 2371

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Montana

(Mr. BURNS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2371, a bill to permit the use of certain funds for recovery and mitigation activities in the upper basin of the Missouri River, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 76

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 76, a concurrent resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its flagrant violations of its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and calling for certain actions in response to such violations.

S. RES. 232

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 232, a resolution celebrating the 40th anniversary of the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and reaffirming the commitment of the Senate to ensuring the continued effectiveness of the Act in protecting the voting rights of all citizens of the United States.

S. RES. 359

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 359, a resolution concerning the Government of Romania's ban on intercountry adoptions and the welfare of orphaned or abandoned children in Romania.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BURR:

S. 2379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for health and long-term care insurance costs of individual not participating in employer-subsidized health plans; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would provide an above-the-line tax deduction for individuals who purchase their own health insurance and are not receiving it through their employer. An above-the-line tax deduction would allow a taxpayer to take the deduction even if they don't itemize their taxes. Current law allows those individuals who are self-employed and purchase health insurance to take an above-the-line tax deduction. My legislation would make the tax code fairer by allowing those people who are not self-employed to take the same deduction.

An estimated 17.4 million Americans in 2005 were covered by individually purchased health insurance policies. Some of these people are self-employed and can currently take this deduction. However, based upon these statistics, I estimate that up to 2 million families who have purchased health insurance do not have access to this deduction. My legislation seeks to correct that. Additionally, the legislation will make

it cheaper for uninsured people to purchase their own health insurance policies. Health care costs in general are expected to rise 7.2 percent per year for the next ten years, so it is important for Congress to pursue steps to attempt to rein in this inflation and also to try to make health care and health insurance more accessible and affordable. This legislation is a part of those efforts.

Another important aspect of the legislation is that it would also allow individuals to take an above-the-line deduction for the purchase of long-term-care insurance. Most employers do not offer any subsidized long-term-care insurance to their employees, so those who need this protection often have to purchase it in the individual market. It is very important for Americans to purchase this insurance, since many people assume that Medicare covers long-term-care costs when people turn age 65. However, this is not true. Often, seniors will find themselves on Medicaid, the low-income federal health care program, when they have long stays in nursing homes that they cannot pay for. Long-term-care insurance is a far better alternative to having seniors go onto Medicaid. It is important for Congress to incentivize people to purchase this insurance, and my legislation is a step in the right direction.

I want to urge my colleagues to look at this legislation. It is short and to the point, but helping people to have private health insurance and long-term-care insurance is an important part of improving our health care system.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2380. A bill to add the heads of certain Federal intelligence agencies to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, to require enhanced notification to Congress and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I have introduced a bill entitled the U.S. National Security Protection Act of 2006. This legislation would enact some critical reforms with respect to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, CFIUS. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming days on this bill.

One thing is clear. The importance of reforming CFIUS has been brought into sharp focus by the proposed acquisition of P&O Steamship Navigation Company's U.S. port operations by Dubai Ports, DP, World, a company based in Dubai in the United Arab Emirates, UAE. The reason so many people are concerned about that particular deal is obvious: while security threats are dynamic, assets such as our ports are, and always will be, a national security concern.

CFIUS's role is to vet these deals for possible national security dangers. But the problem here is that the CFIUS process is broken. Indeed, the DP World deal was approved in less than 30

days—even though U.S. law clearly required there to be a full 45-day investigation.

Many of us here in Congress have for a while now expressed concerns over whether the current CFIUS structure is adequately protecting our national security. The GAO also expressed these concerns in a report it released last September. So again, it's not like the cat has suddenly been let out of the bag that the CFIUS process needs reform.

Yet despite all the evidence to the contrary—most prominently, the DP World-P&O deal—the administration does not seem to believe that there is anything wrong with the CFIUS process.

The bill I introduced today—the National Security Protection Act of 2006—goes to the heart of three very simple principles. First, since CFIUS is set up to protect our national security, the intelligence community—whose fundamental purpose is to promote national security—needs to have a formal and expanded role in CFIUS. Second, accountability and transparency need to be made a permanent part of the CFIUS process. And third, when critical U.S. infrastructure might be acquired by a foreign government-controlled entity, CFIUS must perform a full 45 day investigation—no exceptions.

My bill would address these issues by doing the following: First, it would add the Director of National Intelligence, DNI, and Director of the CIA, DCI, to the CFIUS panel.

Second, it would create a CFIUS Subcommittee on Intelligence whose members would represent the heads of all of the intelligence agencies of the U.S. government. That subcommittee, chaired by the Director of National Intelligence, would review and provide comments on matters to come before CFIUS—including comments on 30 day reviews which do not result in 45 day investigations and comments on the results of 45 day investigations. This subcommittee would also conduct 15 day initial reviews of all cases filed with CFIUS.

Some might ask why the DNI would need to serve on both the full CFIUS panel and on the subcommittee. The reasoning behind this is simple—the DNI has two important roles in the process. On the full committee, the DNI should fill a role of providing policy advice from the perspective of the intelligence community. On the subcommittee level, the DNI should oversee the collection, analysis, and reporting on specific, case-related intelligence that is vital to the CFIUS process.

Third, the National Security Protection Act would create two Vice Chair positions on the full CFIUS panel, to be filled by the Secretaries of Defense and Homeland Security. That will help to ensure that economic, intelligence, and security matters are given appropriate weight in the decision making process.

Economic interests, while important, must never come ahead of the protection of our national security.

Fourth, this legislation would mandate that only the CFIUS chair, with the concurrence of the two Vice Chairs, or the President acting on his own authority, can sign off on a 30-day review which concludes that a potential deal poses no security threat. In addition, it would require that this determination be made in writing with the appropriate signatures, and mandate that the CFIUS Chair and Vice Chairs who make such a determination be at the level of Secretary so that this responsibility is not delegated to subordinates. Furthermore, if either of the Vice Chairs dissent with respect to the decision to not conduct a 45-day investigation, my bill would mandate that the matter be sent to the President for a final determination.

Fifth, my bill would require the President or CFIUS to notify Congress not later than 15 days after paperwork is submitted by companies for CFIUS review, and not later than 15 days after the commencement of all 30-day reviews and 45-day investigations.

Sixth, this bill would also require the President to provide quarterly reports to Congress detailing all 30- and 50-day actions. These reports would include the intelligence subcommittee's comments on each case, and they would be submitted in unclassified form with a classified annex.

Seventh, for any transaction where a foreign-owned company is seeking to acquire U.S. critical infrastructure, this bill would mandate that the company provide the appropriate notification to CFIUS of the proposed transaction as well as the required information for CFIUS to examine the case. Currently that process is voluntary and it shouldn't be.

Eighth and finally, the National Security Protection Act would amend existing U.S. law, which governs under what conditions the President must conduct a full 45-day investigation. Currently, U.S. law requires a full investigation if "an entity controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government" attempts to acquire a U.S. entity engaged in interstate commerce that could affect U.S. national security. My bill would clarify this provision by requiring a 45-day investigation whenever the U.S. entity to be acquired controls, owns, or operates critical infrastructure in the U.S.

I don't want anyone to misinterpret what I am saying here. Foreign investment in the U.S. economy provides an important influx of capital. In today's globalized world, we would do tremendous damage to our economy by cutting off foreign investment. And I do not think anyone here is talking about that.

Just to provide some reference, according to the Commerce Department, in 2004, foreigners invested \$113 billion in U.S. businesses and real estate. But that amount is only about half as

much as U.S. firms invested abroad. So while we rightly have concerns about outsourcing and enforcement of fair trade practices, the U.S. obviously gets significant benefits from participating in the global economy.

But supporting free and fair trade, and working to protect the national interest, are not mutually exclusive. Because we are not just working to protect the American worker, we are also trying to protect his or her family, and the generations to come.

Simply put, national security should never be subordinated to commercial interests.

Some would suggest that this is an issue of race-baiting, ill will, or bias toward the Arab world. Let me be clear on that point. Nothing we say with respect to DP World or the situation in the UAE—or any other potential deal—should be construed as such.

To that end, I wholly reject the views of those who suggest that our concern with the DP World acquisition, and with other foreign government acquisitions of U.S. critical infrastructure, is somehow rooted in a xenophobic ideology.

Rather, when it comes to international business, there are two main issues that I think we as Americans are concerned with. One is the protection of the U.S. economy, our industrial base, and American workers. The other is the safeguarding of our national security. With respect to the DP World-P&O deal, we're mainly talking about that second issue.

According to United Press International, UPI, operations at up to 22 U.S. ports would come under the control of DP World if it is allowed to acquire P&O's U.S. port operations. This includes critical ports in New York, New Jersey, Baltimore, Miami, New Orleans, Mississippi, and Texas. And it reportedly includes two ports in Texas used by the Army, and through which approximately 40 percent of equipment shipped to our troops in Iraq has flowed.

Yet, CFIUS decided in less than 30 days that this deal did not pose a security threat to the U.S. There was no full and thorough 45 day investigation, which in my view was mandated by law. Indeed, the Byrd Amendment to Exon-Florio requires a full 45 day investigation if two conditions are met: first, that the acquirer is controlled or acting on behalf of a foreign government; and second, if the acquisition could affect U.S. national security. Both of these conditions are clearly met in this case.

There also appears to have been no consultation with Members of Congress on the DP World issue. In October, Deputy Treasury Secretary Kimmitt testified that he and his agency support more effective communication with Members of Congress to enhance the transparency of CFIUS. I ask where that communication was with respect to DP World.

Certainly, I understand the desire for protecting privacy, but that does not

excuse the lack of any real consultation with Congress and the resulting lack of transparency. This is an issue of checks and balances, which exist to protect Americans. And the protection of Americans must never be subordinated to foreign interests.

But there are other problems with CFIUS that have become apparent through the DP World case. Indeed, we recently learned that neither Secretary Snow nor President Bush knew about the DP World acquisition. Not even Secretary Snow's deputy knew about the matter while it was undergoing the initial 30 day review.

Now, given Secretary Snow's history with CSX, whose port operations were acquired by DP World in 2004, his lack of involvement was the right thing. I only wish that it had been intentional.

And when it comes to the President, I would simply ask this question: When operations at 22 critical U.S. ports are to be sold to a company controlled and owned by a foreign government, one with a questionable security history with respect to terrorism and WMD proliferation, why wasn't the President made aware of the deal?

In a March 1 New York Times article, the President was quoted as saying that "If there was any doubt in my mind, or people in my Administration's mind, that our ports would be less secure or the American people endangered, this deal wouldn't go forward."

I frankly have no idea how the President could reach this conclusion. There has been no thorough investigation, as required by law. The President did not even apparently know about the DP World deal until very recently. It is precisely this kind of superficial determination that has the American people so worried about their security—and rightly so.

If all of this is not evidence of a broken CFIUS process, then I do not know what is.

I know that some people would argue that the issue is not CFIUS—that the real issue is having adequate measures to protect our ports. Frankly, I think that both of these are major issues.

And if we look at the pathetic security situation at our Nation's ports today, that becomes quite clear. Only about 5 percent of the cargo that comes through our ports is actually inspected. Indeed, the resources available to the Department of Homeland Security to undertake port and container security are woefully inadequate. According to reports, U.S. Customs has only 80 inspectors to monitor the compliance of nearly 6,000 importers, who are currently charged with maintaining the security of their goods during transit. The Coast Guard is even worse off with 20 inspectors dedicated to assessing worldwide compliance with relevant international shipping and port facility security codes. That's 100 people for the whole world. And it is a problem that needs to be fixed.

But CFIUS reform is an indispensable part of the process of strengthening

U.S. national security. Indeed, the current problems are evident in other cases besides DP World. Most recently we learned about another deal with a Dubai-based company. That company, Dubai International Capital is seeking, as part of a \$1.2 billion deal, to acquire London-based Doncasters Group Ltd. Doncasters has operations in the U.S.—primarily in my home state of Connecticut and in Georgia.

True, in this case, CFIUS has decided to perform the full 45-day investigation. I'm glad that they have, because Doncasters is involved in the production of components for some of our most critical military equipment, including the M1 Abrams tank.

But while I'd like to think that the Doncasters investigation was begun on its own merits, I must admit that I find the timing of this investigation highly suspect. In fact, it appears that this investigation was not even launched until the DP World issue became public and stirred up some very legitimate concerns.

So as we can see, it is critically important that we reform the CFIUS process. We can not afford to sit and wait on this. The U.S. National Security Protection Act of 2006 would significantly strengthen CFIUS and thus our national security. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill, the U.S. National Security Act of 2006, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2380

*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 "U.S. National Security Protection Act of 2006".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States" or "CFIUS" means the committee established by the President under Executive Order 11858, May 7, 1975, and any successor thereto; and

(2) the term "intelligence community" has the same meaning as in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

#### SEC. 3. COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) CFIUS MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of Central Intelligence shall be members of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

(2) VICE CHAIRS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall serve as vice chairs of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

(b) SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall establish within the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States a Subcommittee on Intelligence, which shall be—

(1) chaired by the Director of National Intelligence; and

(2) comprised of the head of each member of the intelligence community.

#### SEC. 4. SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW OF CFIUS INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) INTELLIGENCE SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEWS OF INVESTIGATIONS.—

"(1) PRE-INVESTIGATION REVIEW AND COMMENT.—The Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States shall—

"(A) review information relating to a proposed merger, acquisition, or takeover, during the 15-day period following the date of receipt of such information, and before the commencement of any investigation under subsection (a) or (b); and

"(B) provide written comments on any determination by the President or CFIUS not to conduct an investigation under subsection (a).

"(2) POST-INVESTIGATION REVIEW AND COMMENT.—The Subcommittee on Intelligence of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States shall—

"(A) review each investigation conducted by the President or CFIUS under subsections (a) and (b); and

"(B) provide written comments on the results of each such investigation."

#### SEC. 5. TREATMENT OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AS AFFECTING NATIONAL SECURITY.

Section 721(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(b)) is amended by inserting after "commerce in the United States" the following: ", including any person that owns, controls, or operates any critical infrastructure, as defined in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e))."

#### SEC. 6. CERTIFICATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY DETERMINATIONS.

"(m) PRESIDENTIAL OR CHAIR CERTIFICATION OF THREAT DETERMINATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a final determination that an investigation under subsection (a) is not required with respect to a merger, acquisition, or takeover may be made only—

"(A) by the President, in any case in which the President is acting on the President's own behalf under subsection (a); or

"(B) by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense, in their respective capacities as chair and vice chairs of CFIUS, in any case in which CFIUS is acting as the President's designee under subsection (a).

"(2) CERTIFICATIONS REQUIRED.—

"(A) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS.—In any instance in which the President is acting on his or her own behalf under subsection (a), the President shall certify in writing to a final determination that an investigation under subsection (a) is not required with respect to a merger, acquisition, or takeover, and such certification requirement may not be delegated to any person.

"(B) CFIUS DETERMINATIONS.—In any instance in which CFIUS is acting as the President's designee under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Defense shall each certify in writing to a final determination that an investigation under subsection (a) is not required with respect to a merger, acquisition, or takeover, and such certification requirement may not be delegated to any person.

"(3) NONCONCURRENCE.—If there is not concurrence among the chair and vice chairs of CFIUS for purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the President shall make the final determination that an investigation under subsection

(a) is not required with respect to a merger, acquisition, or takeover, and the President shall certify such determination in writing.”.

#### SEC. 7. MANDATORY SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION.

Section 721(c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170(c)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “CONFIDENTIALITY OF” and inserting “SUBMISSION OF”;

(2) by striking “Any information or documentary material filed” and inserting the following:

“(1) REQUIRED SUBMISSIONS.—Each person controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government or foreign person shall—

“(A) notify the President or the President’s designee in writing of any proposed merger, acquisition, or takeover of any United States critical infrastructure (as defined in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e))); and

“(B) provide such information to the President or the President’s designee with respect to such proposed transaction as may be necessary for purposes of this section.

“(2) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—Any information or documentary material filed, either voluntarily or under paragraph (1).”.

#### SEC. 8. NOTICES OF REVIEWS AND INVESTIGATIONS AND QUARTERLY REPORTS REQUIRED.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) NOTICES OF REVIEWS AND INVESTIGATIONS AND QUARTERLY REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) NOTICES TO CONGRESS.—The President or the President’s designee shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress—

“(A) not later than 15 days after the date of receipt of written notification of a proposed or pending merger, acquisition, or takeover described in subsection (a) or (b); and

“(B) at the commencement of each investigation under subsection (a) or (b).

“(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, on a quarterly basis, submit to Congress a report on all mergers, acquisitions, and takeovers that were the subject of investigation or review under this section during the quarter, including any comments submitted under subsection (1)(2).

“(B) FORM.—Each report required under subparagraph (A) may be submitted in unclassified form, and may contain a classified annex.”.

#### SEC. 9. CFIUS AS PRESIDENT’S DESIGNEE UNDER DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT.

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DESIGNEE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President’s designee for purposes of this section shall be the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, established by order of the President in Executive Order 11858, May 7, 1975 (in this section referred to as ‘CFIUS’), or any successor thereto.”.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. ALLARD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS,

Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. THUNE, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. THOMAS):

S. 2381. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide line item rescission authority; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006. I am proud to say there are over 20 Senators who have joined me as original cosponsors of this legislation, including our colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY. I wish to thank Senator KERRY for his support, and for the support of all of the other original cosponsors who have joined me on this significant legislative reform proposal.

The legislation itself is long overdue. It is an authority provided in one version or another to 43 Governors today. It is an authority that has been requested by at least 11 Presidents, including Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, Ronald Reagan, and Bill Clinton.

The Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006, first outlined by President Bush yesterday, when enacted will provide the President and the Congress with a tool to surgically remove specific spending and targeted tax benefits from broader enacted legislation. Unlike the line item veto legislation that the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional in 1998, this is clearly constitutional.

The legislation builds upon current Presidential rescission authorities changing the current process to require Congress to act, one way or the other, on the President’s proposed removal of items in enacted law. This new procedure guarantees an up-or-down vote on the President’s proposed rescissions, without amendments.

I was trying to think how to describe this procedure when people ask, and one might think of it as similar to the Armed Forces BRAC Commission process. I am really talking about the approach, the procedure itself. By that, I mean that the President proposes and the Congress, under expedited procedures, within 10 days, approves or disapproves of the legislation that rescinds spending, including both appropriation items or entitlement spending. The one spending program which would be exempt from this process is Social Security.

The legislation is balanced in that it would also allow the President to eliminate revenue-losing provisions that provide Federal tax benefits to 100 or fewer beneficiaries or provide temporary or transitional relief to 10 or fewer beneficiaries.

I am encouraged by the broad bipartisan support for this reform legislation. I hope this Congress will act on the bill to provide us another tool to control unnecessary and wasteful spending in tax expenditures. It is just good government.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. —

*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 “Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006”.

#### SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) is amended by striking part C and inserting the following:

“PART C—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO

“EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PROPOSED RESCISSIONS

“SEC. 1021. (a) PROPOSED RESCISSIONS.—The President may propose, at the time and in the manner provided in subsection (b), the rescission of any dollar amount of discretionary budget authority or the rescission, in whole or in part, of any item of direct spending.

“(b) TRANSMITTAL OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

“(1) SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may transmit to Congress a special message proposing to rescind any dollar amount of discretionary budget authority or any item of direct spending.

“(B) CONTENTS OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Each special message shall specify, with respect to the budget authority or item of direct spending proposed to be rescinded—

“(i) the amount of budget authority or the specific item of direct spending that the President proposes be rescinded;

“(ii) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget authority or item of direct spending is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

“(iii) the reasons why such budget authority or item of direct spending should be rescinded;

“(iv) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect (including the effect on outlays and receipts in each fiscal year) of the proposed rescission;

“(v) to the maximum extent practicable, all facts, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the proposed rescission and the decision to effect the proposed rescission, and the estimated effect of the proposed rescission upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget authority or item of direct spending is provided; and

“(vi) a draft bill that, if enacted, would rescind the budget authority or item of direct spending proposed to be rescinded in that special message.

“(2) ENACTMENT OF RESCISSION BILL.—

“(A) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Amounts of budget authority or items of direct spending which are rescinded pursuant to enactment of a bill as provided under this section shall be dedicated only to deficit reduction and shall not be used as an offset for other spending increases.

“(B) ADJUSTMENT OF COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 5 days after the date of enactment of a rescission bill as provided under this section, the chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall revise levels under section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and adjust the committee allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to reflect the

rescission, and the appropriate committees shall report revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as appropriate.

“(C) ADJUSTMENTS TO CAPS.—After enactment of a rescission bill as provided under this section, the Office of Management and Budget shall revise applicable limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as appropriate.

“(c) PROCEDURES FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) INTRODUCTION.—Before the close of the second day of session of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, after the date of receipt of a special message transmitted to Congress under subsection (b), the majority leader or minority leader of each House shall introduce (by request) a bill to rescind the amounts of budget authority or items of direct spending, as specified in the special message and the President’s draft bill. If the bill is not introduced as provided in the preceding sentence in either House, then, on the third day of session of that House after the date of receipt of that special message, any Member of that House may introduce the bill.

“(B) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—The bill shall be referred to the appropriate committee. The committee shall report the bill without substantive revision and with or without recommendation. The committee shall report the bill not later than the fifth day of session of that House after the date of introduction of the bill in that House. If the committee fails to report the bill within that period, the committee shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the bill, and the bill shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

“(C) FINAL PASSAGE.—A vote on final passage of the bill shall be taken in the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before the close of the 10th day of session of that House after the date of the introduction of the bill in that House. If the bill is passed, the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, shall cause the bill to be transmitted to the other House before the close of the next day of session of that House.

“(2) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION.—A motion in the House of Representatives to proceed to the consideration of a bill under this subsection shall be highly privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

“(B) LIMITS ON DEBATE.—Debate in the House of Representatives on a bill under this subsection shall not exceed 4 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the bill. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to reconsider a bill under this subsection or to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill is agreed to or disagreed to.

“(C) APPEALS.—Appeals from decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to a bill under this section shall be decided without debate.

“(D) APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES.—Except to the extent specifically provided in this section, consideration of a bill under this section shall be governed by the Rules of the House of Representatives. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill introduced pursuant to the provisions of this section under a suspension of the rules or under a special rule.

“(3) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

“(A) MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION.—A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill under this subsection in the Senate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed is agreed to or disagreed to.

“(B) LIMITS ON DEBATE.—Debate in the Senate on a bill under this subsection, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith (including debate pursuant to subparagraph (D)), shall not exceed 10 hours, equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

“(C) APPEALS.—Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a bill under this subsection shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

“(D) MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a bill under this subsection is not debatable.

“(E) MOTION TO RECOMMEND.—A motion to recommend a bill under this subsection is not in order.

“(F) CONSIDERATION OF THE HOUSE BILL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Senate has received the House companion bill to the bill introduced in the Senate prior to the vote required under paragraph (1)(C), then the Senate may consider, and the vote under paragraph (1)(C) may occur on, the House companion bill.

“(ii) PROCEDURE AFTER VOTE ON SENATE BILL.—If the Senate votes, pursuant to paragraph (1)(C), on the bill introduced in the Senate, then immediately following that vote, or upon receipt of the House companion bill, the House bill shall be deemed to be considered, read the third time, and the vote on passage of the Senate bill shall be considered to be the vote on the bill received from the House.

“(d) AMENDMENTS AND DIVISIONS PROHIBITED.—No amendment to a bill considered under this section shall be in order in either the Senate or the House of Representatives. It shall not be in order to demand a division of the question in the House of Representatives (or in a Committee of the Whole). No motion to suspend the application of this subsection shall be in order in the House of Representatives, nor shall it be in order in the House of Representatives to suspend the application of this subsection by unanimous consent.

“(e) TEMPORARY PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time as the President transmits to Congress a special message pursuant to subsection (b), the President may direct that any dollar amount of discretionary budget authority proposed to be rescinded in that special message shall not be made available for obligation for a period not to exceed 180 calendar days from the date the President transmits the special message to Congress.

“(2) EARLY AVAILABILITY.—The President may make any dollar amount of discretionary budget authority deferred pursuant to paragraph (1) available at a time earlier than the time specified by the President if the President determines that continuation of the deferral would not further the purposes of this Act.

“(f) TEMPORARY PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time as the President transmits to Congress a special message pursuant to subsection (b), the President may suspend the execution of any item of direct spending proposed to be rescinded in that special message for a period not to exceed 180 calendar days from the date

the President transmits the special message to Congress.

“(2) EARLY AVAILABILITY.—The President may terminate the suspension of any item of direct spending at a time earlier than the time specified by the President if the President determines that continuation of the suspension would not further the purposes of this Act.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘appropriation law’ means any general or special appropriation Act, and any Act or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations;

“(2) the term ‘deferral’ has, with respect to any dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, the same meaning as the phrase ‘deferral of budget authority’ defined in section 1011(1) in Part B (2 U.S.C. 682(1));

“(3) the term ‘dollar amount of discretionary budget authority’ means the entire dollar amount of budget authority and obligation limitations—

“(A) specified in an appropriation law, or the entire dollar amount of budget authority required to be allocated by a specific proviso in an appropriation law for which a specific dollar figure was not included;

“(B) represented separately in any table, chart, or explanatory text included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law;

“(C) required to be allocated for a specific program, project, or activity in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which budget authority is provided in an appropriation law;

“(D) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items specified in an appropriation law or included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law; or

“(E) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items required to be provided in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which dollar amount of discretionary budget authority is provided in an appropriation law;

“(4) the terms ‘rescind’ or ‘rescission’ mean to modify or repeal a provision of law to prevent:

“(A) budget authority from having legal force or effect;

“(B) in the case of entitlement authority, to prevent the specific legal obligation of the United States from having legal force or effect; and

“(C) in the case of the food stamp program, to prevent the specific provision of law that provides such benefit from having legal force or effect.

“(5) the term ‘direct spending’ means budget authority provided by law (other than an appropriation law); entitlement authority; and the food stamp program;

“(6) the term ‘item of direct spending’ means any specific provision of law enacted after the effective date of the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006 that is estimated to result in a change in budget authority or outlays for direct spending relative to the most recent levels calculated pursuant to section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and included with a budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, and with respect to estimates made after that budget submission that are not included with it, estimates consistent with the economic and technical assumptions underlying

the most recently submitted President's budget; and

"(7) the term 'suspend the execution' means, with respect to an item of direct spending or a targeted tax benefit, to stop for a specified period, in whole or in part, the carrying into effect of the specific provision of law that provides such benefit.

"(8)(A) The term 'targeted tax benefit' means—

"(i) any revenue-losing provision that provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to 100 or fewer beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in any fiscal year for which the provision is in effect; and

"(ii) any Federal tax provision that provides temporary or permanent transitional relief for 10 or fewer beneficiaries in any fiscal year from a change to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(B) A provision shall not be treated as described in subparagraph (A)(i) if the effect of that provision is that—

"(i) all persons in the same industry or engaged in the same type of activity receive the same treatment;

"(ii) all persons owning the same type of property, or issuing the same type of investment, receive the same treatment; or

"(iii) any difference in the treatment of persons is based solely on—

"(I) in the case of businesses and associations, the size or form of the business or association involved;

"(II) in the case of individuals, general demographic conditions, such as income, marital status, number of dependents, or tax-return-filing status;

"(III) the amount involved; or

"(IV) a generally-available election under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(C) A provision shall not be treated as described in subparagraph (A)(ii) if—

"(i) it provides for the retention of prior law with respect to all binding contracts or other legally enforceable obligations in existence on a date contemporaneous with congressional action specifying such date; or

"(ii) it is a technical correction to previously enacted legislation that is estimated to have no revenue effect.

"(D) For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

"(i) all businesses and associations that are members of the same controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

"(ii) all qualified plans of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

"(iii) all holders of the same bond issue shall be treated as a single beneficiary; and

"(iv) if a corporation, partnership, association, trust or estate is the beneficiary of a provision, the shareholders of the corporation, the partners of the partnership, the members of the association, or the beneficiaries of the trust or estate shall not also be treated as beneficiaries of such provision.

"(E) For the purpose of this paragraph, the term 'revenue-losing provision' means any provision that results in a reduction in Federal tax revenues for any one of the two following periods—

"(i) the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective; or

"(ii) the period of the 5 fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective.

"(F) The terms used in this paragraph shall have the same meaning as those terms have generally in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, unless otherwise expressly provided.

"(h) APPLICATION TO TARGETED TAX BENEFITS.—The President may propose the repeal of any targeted tax benefit in any bill that includes such a benefit, under the same conditions, and subject to the same Congress-

sional consideration, as a proposal under this section to rescind an item of direct spending."

(b) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.—Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "and 1017" and inserting "1017, and 1021"; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking "section 1017" and inserting "sections 1017 and 1021".

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 1(a) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by—

(A) striking "Parts A and B" before "title X" and inserting "Parts A, B, and C"; and

(B) striking the last sentence and inserting at the end the following new sentence: "Part C of title X also may be cited as the 'Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006.'"

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by deleting the contents for part C of title X and inserting the following:

"PART C—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO

"Sec. 1021. expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions."

(d) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act or the amendments made by it is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by it shall not be affected by the holding.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply only to any dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, or targeted tax benefit provided in an Act enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I join with Senators FRIST, MCCAIN, and others as a cosponsor of legislation to establish a Presidential line item veto. This is a fiscally prudent measure which could reduce wasteful spending and bring down our Nation's deficit.

The proposal would give the President the authority to strike wasteful spending measures from legislation, to ensure that the American taxpayer is not footing the bill for projects that are not national priorities. I applaud President Bush for putting forth this initiative, which would be significant progress in the fight to reduce non-essential spending.

Throughout our country's history, the line item veto has enjoyed a long line of bipartisan support, with Presidents such as Ulysses Grant, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan, and Bill Clinton calling for the authority. Additionally, the power has been given to Governors in 43 of the 50 States.

I am pleased that the proposed legislation would require the President to send rescission proposals back to Congress for final passage. Not only does this make the legislation consistent with the Constitution, it also limits the scope of any President's veto authority, as proposed changes will need congressional approval.

I am heartened to see this call for fiscal responsibility from President Bush. I have joined as a cosponsor of this legislation because it will be impossible for us to reduce our national debt and

balance the Federal budget unless we curb wasteful spending. I have been an advocate for the pay-as-you-go budget rule, which would require Congress to pay for any new spending or tax cuts, and will continue to press for its adoption.

Since chronic deficits add to the burden of debt we are bequeathing to future generations, congressional spending must be reigned in, and I am pleased to support this proposal which is one tool that can improve spending discipline in Washington.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. REID, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2382. A bill to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer health benefits plans to individuals who are not Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2382

*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 "Small Employers Health Benefits Program Act of 2006".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this Act, the terms "member of family", "health benefits plan", "carrier", "employee organizations", and "dependent" have the meanings given such terms in section 8901 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) OTHER TERMS.—In this Act:

(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" has the meaning given such term under section 3(6) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(6)). Such term shall not include an employee of the Federal Government.

(2) EMPLOYER.—The term "employer" has the meaning given such term under section 3(5) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(5)), except that such term shall include only employers who employed an average of at least 1 but not more than 100 employees on business days during the year preceding the date of application. Such term shall not include the Federal Government.

(3) HEALTH STATUS-RELATED FACTOR.—The term "health status-related factor" has the meaning given such term in section 2791(d)(9) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-91(d)(9)).

(4) OFFICE.—The term "Office" means the Office of Personnel Management.

(5) PARTICIPATING EMPLOYER.—The term "participating employer" means an employer that—

(A) elects to provide health insurance coverage under this Act to its employees; and

(B) is not offering other comprehensive health insurance coverage to such employees.

(C) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES IN DETERMINATION OF EMPLOYER SIZE.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2):

(1) APPLICATION OF AGGREGATION RULE FOR EMPLOYERS.—All persons treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated as 1 employer.

(2) EMPLOYERS NOT IN EXISTENCE IN PRECEDING YEAR.—In the case of an employer which was not in existence for the full year prior to the date on which the employer applies to participate, the determination of whether such employer meets the requirements of subsection (b)(2) shall be based on the average number of employees that it is reasonably expected such employer will employ on business days in the employer's first full year.

(3) PREDECESSORS.—Any reference in this subsection to an employer shall include a reference to any predecessor of such employer.

(D) WAIVER AND CONTINUATION OF PARTICIPATION.—

(1) WAIVER.—The Office may waive the limitations relating to the size of an employer which may participate in the health insurance program established under this Act on a case by case basis if the Office determines that such employer makes a compelling case for such a waiver. In making determinations under this paragraph, the Office may consider the effects of the employment of temporary and seasonal workers and other factors.

(2) CONTINUATION OF PARTICIPATION.—An employer participating in the program under this Act that experiences an increase in the number of employees so that such employer has in excess of 100 employees, may not be excluded from participation solely as a result of such increase in employees.

(E) TREATMENT OF HEALTH BENEFITS PLAN AS GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—A health benefits plan offered under this Act shall be treated as a group health plan for purposes of applying the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) except to the extent that a provision of this Act expressly provides otherwise.

### SEC. 3. HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR NON-FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(A) ADMINISTRATION.—The Office shall administer a health insurance program for non-Federal employees and employers in accordance with this Act.

(B) REGULATIONS.—Except as provided under this Act, the Office shall prescribe regulations to apply the provisions of chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to the greatest extent practicable to participating carriers, employers, and employees covered under this Act.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—In no event shall the enactment of this Act result in—

(1) any increase in the level of individual or Federal Government contributions required under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, including copayments or deductibles;

(2) any decrease in the types of benefits offered under such chapter 89; or

(3) any other change that would adversely affect the coverage afforded under such chapter 89 to employees and annuitants and members of family under that chapter.

(D) ENROLLMENT.—The Office shall develop methods to facilitate enrollment under this Act, including the use of the Internet.

(E) CONTRACTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.—The Office may enter into contracts for the performance of appropriate administrative functions under this Act.

(F) SEPARATE RISK POOL.—In the administration of this Act, the Office shall ensure that covered employees under this Act are in a risk pool that is separate from the risk pool maintained for covered individuals under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(G) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require a carrier that is participating in the program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to provide health benefits plan coverage under this Act.

### SEC. 4. CONTRACT REQUIREMENT.

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Office may enter into contracts with qualified carriers offering health benefits plans of the type described in section 8903 or 8903a of title 5, United States Code, without regard to section 5 of title 41, United States Code, or other statutes requiring competitive bidding, to provide health insurance coverage to employees of participating employers under this Act. Each contract shall be for a uniform term of at least 1 year, but may be made automatically renewable from term to term in the absence of notice of termination by either party. In entering into such contracts, the Office shall ensure that health benefits coverage is provided for individuals only, individuals with one or more children, married individuals without children, and married individuals with one or more children.

(B) ELIGIBILITY.—A carrier shall be eligible to enter into a contract under subsection (a) if such carrier—

(1) is licensed to offer health benefits plan coverage in each State in which the plan is offered; and

(2) meets such other requirements as determined appropriate by the Office.

(C) STATEMENT OF BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each contract under this Act shall contain a detailed statement of benefits offered and shall include information concerning such maximums, limitations, exclusions, and other definitions of benefits as the Office considers necessary or desirable.

(2) ENSURING A RANGE OF PLANS.—The Office shall ensure that a range of health benefits plans are available to participating employers under this Act, at least one of which shall be a plan that provides the same benefits as the government-wide plan available to Federal employees as described in section 8903(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(3) PARTICIPATING PLANS.—The Office shall not prohibit the offering of any health benefits plan to a participating employer if such plan is eligible to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

(4) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—With respect to all nationwide plans other than the plan required under paragraph (2), the Office shall develop a benefit package that shall be offered in the case of a contract for a health benefit plan that is to be offered on a nationwide basis.

(D) STANDARDS.—The minimum standards prescribed for health benefits plans under section 8902(e) of title 5, United States Code, and for carriers offering plans, shall apply to plans and carriers under this Act. Approval of a plan may be withdrawn by the Office only after notice and opportunity for hearing to the carrier concerned without regard to subchapter II of chapter 5 and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(E) CONVERSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A contract may not be made or a plan approved under this section if the carrier under such contract or plan does not offer to each enrollee whose enrollment in the plan is ended, except by a cancellation of enrollment, a temporary extension of coverage during which the individual may exer-

cise the option to convert, without evidence of good health, to a nongroup contract providing health benefits. An enrollee who exercises this option shall pay the full periodic charges of the nongroup contract.

(2) NONCANCELLABLE.—The benefits and coverage made available under paragraph (1) may not be canceled by the carrier except for fraud, over-insurance, or nonpayment of periodic charges.

(F) REQUIREMENT OF PAYMENT FOR OR PROVISION OF HEALTH SERVICE.—Each contract entered into under this Act shall require the carrier to agree to pay for or provide a health service or supply in an individual case if the Office finds that the employee, annuitant, family member, former spouse, or person having continued coverage under section 8905a of title 5, United States Code, is entitled thereto under the terms of the contract.

### SEC. 5. ELIGIBILITY.

An individual shall be eligible to enroll in a plan under this Act if such individual—

(1) is an employee of an employer described in section 2(b)(2), or is a self employed individual as defined in section 401(c)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(2) is not otherwise enrolled or eligible for enrollment in a plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

### SEC. 6. ALTERNATIVE CONDITIONS TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PLANS.

(A) TREATMENT OF EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of enrollment in a health benefits plan under this Act, an individual who had coverage under a health insurance plan and is not a qualified beneficiary as defined under section 4980B(g)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated in a similar manner as an individual who begins employment as an employee under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) PREEXISTING CONDITION EXCLUSIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each contract under this Act may include a preexisting condition exclusion as defined under section 9801(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) EXCLUSION PERIOD.—A preexisting condition exclusion under this subsection shall provide for coverage of a preexisting condition to begin not later than 6 months after the date on which the coverage of the individual under a health benefits plan commences, reduced by the aggregate 1 day for each day that the individual was covered under a health insurance plan immediately preceding the date the individual submitted an application for coverage under this Act. This provision shall be applied notwithstanding the applicable provision for the reduction of the exclusion period provided for in section 701(a)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1181(a)(3)).

(C) RATES AND PREMIUMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Rates charged and premiums paid for a health benefits plan under this Act—

(A) shall be determined in accordance with this subsection;

(B) may be annually adjusted subject to paragraph (3);

(C) shall be negotiated in the same manner as rates and premiums are negotiated under such chapter 89; and

(D) shall be adjusted to cover the administrative costs of the Office under this Act.

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—In determining rates and premiums under this Act, the following provisions shall apply:

(A) IN GENERAL.—A carrier that enters into a contract under this Act shall determine that amount of premiums to assess for coverage under a health benefits plan based on an community rate that may be annually adjusted—

(i) for the geographic area involved if the adjustment is based on geographical divisions that are not smaller than a metropolitan statistical area and the carrier provides evidence of geographic variation in cost of services;

(ii) based on whether such coverage is for an individual, two adults, one adult and one or more children, or a family; and

(iii) based on the age of covered individuals (subject to subparagraph (C)).

(B) LIMITATION.—Premium rates charged for coverage under this Act shall not vary based on health-status related factors, gender, class of business, or claims experience.

(C) AGE ADJUSTMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to subparagraph (A)(iii), in making adjustments based on age, the Office shall establish no more than 5 age brackets to be used by the carrier in establishing rates. The rates for any age bracket may not vary by more than 50 percent above or below the community rate on the basis of attained age. Age-related premiums may not vary within age brackets.

(ii) AGE 65 AND OLDER.—With respect to subparagraph (A)(iii), a carrier may develop separate rates for covered individuals who are 65 years of age or older for whom Medicare is the primary payor for health benefits coverage which is not covered under Medicare.

“(3) READJUSTMENTS.—Any readjustment in rates charged or premiums paid for a health benefits plan under this Act shall be made in advance of the contract term in which they will apply and on a basis which, in the judgment of the Office, is consistent with the practice of the Office for the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

(d) TERMINATION AND REENROLLMENT.—If an individual who is enrolled in a health benefits plan under this Act terminates the enrollment, the individual shall not be eligible for reenrollment until the first open enrollment period following the expiration of 6 months after the date of such termination.

(f) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF STATE LAW.—

(1) HEALTH INSURANCE OR PLANS.—

(A) LOCAL PLANS.—With respect to a contract entered into under this Act under which a carrier will offer health benefits plan coverage in a limited geographic area, State mandated benefit laws in effect in the State in which the plan is offered shall continue to apply to such health benefits plan.

(B) RATING RULES.—The rating requirements under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(2) shall supercede State rating rules for qualified plans under this Act, except with respect to States that provide a rating variance with respect to age that is less than the Federal limit or that provide for some form of community rating.

(2) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preempt—

(A) any State or local law or regulation except those laws and regulations described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1);

(B) any State grievance, claims, and appeals procedure law, except to the extent that such law is preempted under section 514 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; and

(B) State network adequacy laws.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the application of the service-charge system used by the Office for determining profits for participating carriers under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

#### SEC. 7. ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION BY CARRIERS THROUGH ADJUSTMENTS FOR RISK.

(a) APPLICATION OF RISK CORRIDORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall only apply to carriers with respect to health bene-

fits plans offered under this Act during any of calendar years 2007 through 2009.

(2) NOTIFICATION OF COSTS UNDER THE PLAN.—In the case of a carrier that offers a health benefits plan under this Act in any of calendar years 2007 through 2009, the carrier shall notify the Office, before such date in the succeeding year as the Office specifies, of the total amount of costs incurred in providing benefits under the health benefits plan for the year involved and the portion of such costs that is attributable to administrative expenses.

(3) ALLOWABLE COSTS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “allowable costs” means, with respect to a health benefits plan offered by a carrier under this Act, for a year, the total amount of costs described in paragraph (2) for the plan and year, reduced by the portion of such costs attributable to administrative expenses incurred in providing the benefits described in such paragraph.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF PAYMENT.—

(1) NO ADJUSTMENT IF ALLOWABLE COSTS WITHIN 3 PERCENT OF TARGET AMOUNT.—If the allowable costs for the carrier with respect to the health benefits plan involved for a calendar year are at least 97 percent, but do not exceed 103 percent, of the target amount for the plan and year involved, there shall be no payment adjustment under this section for the plan and year.

(2) INCREASE IN PAYMENT IF ALLOWABLE COSTS ABOVE 103 PERCENT OF TARGET AMOUNT.—

(A) COSTS BETWEEN 103 AND 108 PERCENT OF TARGET AMOUNT.—If the allowable costs for the carrier with respect to the health benefits plan involved for the year are greater than 103 percent, but not greater than 108 percent, of the target amount for the plan and year, the Office shall reimburse the carrier for such excess costs through payment to the carrier of an amount equal to 75 percent of the difference between such allowable costs and 103 percent of such target amount.

(B) COSTS ABOVE 108 PERCENT OF TARGET AMOUNT.—If the allowable costs for the carrier with respect to the health benefits plan involved for the year are greater than 108 percent of the target amount for the plan and year, the Office shall reimburse the carrier for such excess costs through payment to the carrier in an amount equal to the sum of—

- (i) 3.75 percent of such target amount; and
- (ii) 90 percent of the difference between such allowable costs and 108 percent of such target amount.

(3) REDUCTION IN PAYMENT IF ALLOWABLE COSTS BELOW 97 PERCENT OF TARGET AMOUNT.—

(A) COSTS BETWEEN 92 AND 97 PERCENT OF TARGET AMOUNT.—If the allowable costs for the carrier with respect to the health benefits plan involved for the year are less than 97 percent, but greater than or equal to 92 percent, of the target amount for the plan and year, the carrier shall be required to pay into the contingency reserve fund maintained under section 8909(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, an amount equal to 75 percent of the difference between 97 percent of the target amount and such allowable costs.

(B) COSTS BELOW 92 PERCENT OF TARGET AMOUNT.—If the allowable costs for the carrier with respect to the health benefits plan involved for the year are less than 92 percent of the target amount for the plan and year, the carrier shall be required to pay into the stabilization fund under section 8909(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, an amount equal to the sum of—

- (i) 3.75 percent of such target amount; and
- (ii) 90 percent of the difference between 92 percent of such target amount and such allowable costs.

(4) TARGET AMOUNT DESCRIBED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “target amount” means, with respect to a health benefits plan offered by a carrier under this Act in any of calendar years 2007 through 2011, an amount equal to—

(i) the total of the monthly premiums estimated by the carrier and approved by the Office to be paid for enrollees in the plan under this Act for the calendar year involved; reduced by

(ii) the amount of administrative expenses that the carrier estimates, and the Office approves, will be incurred by the carrier with respect to the plan for such calendar year.

(B) SUBMISSION OF TARGET AMOUNT.—Not later than December 31, 2006, and each December 31 thereafter through calendar year 2010, a carrier shall submit to the Office a description of the target amount for such carrier with respect to health benefits plans provided by the carrier under this Act.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each contract under this Act shall provide—

(A) that a carrier offering a health benefits plan under this Act shall provide the Office with such information as the Office determines is necessary to carry out this subsection including the notification of costs under subsection (a)(2) and the target amount under subsection (b)(4)(B); and

(B) that the Office has the right to inspect and audit any books and records of the organization that pertain to the information regarding costs provided to the Office under such subsections.

(2) RESTRICTION ON USE OF INFORMATION.—Information disclosed or obtained pursuant to the provisions of this subsection may be used by officers, employees, and contractors of the Office only for the purposes of, and to the extent necessary in, carrying out this section.

#### SEC. 8. ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION BY CARRIERS THROUGH REINSURANCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Office shall establish a reinsurance fund to provide payments to carriers that experience one or more catastrophic claims during a year for health benefits provided to individuals enrolled in a health benefits plan under this Act.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS.—To be eligible for a payment from the reinsurance fund for a plan year, a carrier under this Act shall submit to the Office an application that contains—

(1) a certification by the carrier that the carrier paid for at least one episode of care during the year for covered health benefits for an individual in an amount that is in excess of \$50,000; and

(2) such other information determined appropriate by the Office.

(c) PAYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a payment from the reinsurance fund to a carrier under this section for a catastrophic episode of care shall be determined by the Office but shall not exceed an amount equal to 80 percent of the applicable catastrophic claim amount.

(2) APPLICABLE CATASTROPHIC CLAIM AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable catastrophic episode of care amount shall be equal to the difference between—

(A) the amount of the catastrophic claim; and

(B) \$50,000.

(3) LIMITATION.—In determining the amount of a payment under paragraph (1), if the amount of the catastrophic claim exceeds the amount that would be paid for the healthcare items or services involved under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42

U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), the Office shall use the amount that would be paid under such title XVIII for purposes of paragraph (2)(A).

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “catastrophic claim” means a claim submitted to a carrier, by or on behalf of an enrollee in a health benefits plan under this Act, that is in excess of \$50,000.

(e) TERMINATION OF FUND.—The reinsurance fund established under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the first contract period becomes effective under this Act.

#### SEC. 9. CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND.

Beginning on October 1, 2010, the Office may use amounts appropriated under section 14(a) that remain unobligated to establish a contingency reserve fund to provide assistance to carriers offering health benefits plans under this Act that experience unanticipated financial hardships (as determined by the Office).

#### SEC. 10. EMPLOYER PARTICIPATION.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Office shall prescribe regulations providing for employer participation under this Act, including the offering of health benefits plans under this Act to employees.

(b) ENROLLMENT AND OFFERING OF OTHER COVERAGE.—

(1) ENROLLMENT.—A participating employer shall ensure that each eligible employee has an opportunity to enroll in a plan under this Act.

(2) PROHIBITION ON OFFERING OTHER COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH BENEFIT COVERAGE.—A participating employer may not offer a health insurance plan providing comprehensive health benefit coverage to employees other than a health benefits plan that—

(A) meets the requirements described in section 4(a); and

(B) is offered only through the enrollment process established by the Office under section 3.

(3) OFFER OF SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE OPTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A participating employer may offer supplementary coverage options to employees.

(B) DEFINITION.—In subparagraph (A), the term “supplementary coverage” means benefits described as “excepted benefits” under section 2791(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–91(c)).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except as provided in section 15, nothing in this Act shall be construed to require that an employer make premium contributions on behalf of employees.

#### SEC. 11. ADMINISTRATION THROUGH REGIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to provide for the administration of the benefits under this Act with maximum efficiency and convenience for participating employers and health care providers and other individuals and entities providing services to such employers, the Office is authorized to enter into contracts with eligible entities to perform, on a regional basis, one or more of the following:

(1) Collect and maintain all information relating to individuals, families, and employers participating in the program under this Act in the region served.

(2) Receive, disburse, and account for payments of premiums to participating employers by individuals in the region served, and for payments by participating employers to carriers.

(3) Serve as a channel of communication between carriers, participating employers, and individuals relating to the administration of this Act.

(4) Otherwise carry out such activities for the administration of this Act, in such manner, as may be provided for in the contract entered into under this section.

(5) The processing of grievances and appeals.

(b) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a contract under subsection (a), an entity shall prepare and submit to the Office an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Office may require.

(c) PROCESS.—

(1) COMPETITIVE BIDDING.—All contracts under this section shall be awarded through a competitive bidding process on a bi-annual basis.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—No contract shall be entered into with any entity under this section unless the Office finds that such entity will perform its obligations under the contract efficiently and effectively and will meet such requirements as to financial responsibility, legal authority, and other matters as the Office finds pertinent.

(3) PUBLICATION OF STANDARDS AND CRITERIA.—The Office shall publish in the Federal Register standards and criteria for the efficient and effective performance of contract obligations under this section, and opportunity shall be provided for public comment prior to implementation. In establishing such standards and criteria, the Office shall provide for a system to measure an entity’s performance of responsibilities.

(4) TERM.—Each contract under this section shall be for a term of at least 1 year, and may be made automatically renewable from term to term in the absence of notice by either party of intention to terminate at the end of the current term, except that the Office may terminate any such contract at any time (after such reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the entity involved as the Office may provide in regulations) if the Office finds that the entity has failed substantially to carry out the contract or is carrying out the contract in a manner inconsistent with the efficient and effective administration of the program established by this Act.

(d) TERMS OF CONTRACT.—A contract entered into under this section shall include—

(1) a description of the duties of the contracting entity;

(2) an assurance that the entity will furnish to the Office such timely information and reports as the Office determines appropriate;

(3) an assurance that the entity will maintain such records and afford such access thereto as the Office finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of the information and reports under paragraph (2) and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(4) an assurance that the entity shall comply with such confidentiality and privacy protection guidelines and procedures as the Office may require; and

(5) such other terms and conditions not inconsistent with this section as the Office may find necessary or appropriate.

#### SEC. 12. COORDINATION WITH SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS.

Benefits under this Act shall, with respect to an individual who is entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, be offered (for use in coordination with those medicare benefits) to the same extent and in the same manner as if coverage were under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

#### SEC. 13. PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this Act, the Office shall develop and implement an educational campaign to provide information to employers and the general public concerning the health insurance program developed under this Act.

(b) ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year and 2 years after the implemen-

tation of the campaign under subsection (a), the Office shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes the activities of the Office under subsection (a), including a determination by the office of the percentage of employers with knowledge of the health benefits programs provided for under this Act.

(c) PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

#### SEC. 14. APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office, such sums as may be necessary in each fiscal year for the development and administration of the program under this Act.

#### SEC. 15. REFUNDABLE CREDIT FOR SMALL BUSINESS EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to refundable credits) is amended by redesignating section 36 as section 37 and inserting after section 35 the following new section:

##### “SEC. 36. SMALL BUSINESS EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES.

“(a) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—In the case of a qualified small employer, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal to the sum of—

“(1) the expense amount described in subsection (b), and

“(2) the expense amount described in subsection (c), paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

“(b) SUBSECTION (b) EXPENSE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The expense amount described in this subsection is the applicable percentage of the amount of qualified employee health insurance expenses of each qualified employee.

“(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable percentage is equal to—

“(i) 25 percent in the case of self-only coverage,

“(ii) 35 percent in the case of family coverage (as defined in section 220(c)(5)), and

“(iii) 30 percent in the case of coverage for two adults or one adult and one or more children.

“(B) BONUS FOR PAYMENT OF GREATER PERCENTAGE OF PREMIUMS.—The applicable percentage otherwise specified in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by 5 percentage points for each additional 10 percent of the qualified employee health insurance expenses of each qualified employee exceeding 60 percent which are paid by the qualified small employer.

“(c) SUBSECTION (c) EXPENSE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The expense amount described in this subsection is, with respect to the first credit year of a qualified small employer which is an eligible employer, 10 percent of the qualified employee health insurance expenses of each qualified employee.

“(2) FIRST CREDIT YEAR.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘first credit year’ means the taxable year which includes the date that the health insurance coverage to which the qualified employee health insurance expenses relate becomes effective.

“(d) LIMITATION BASED ON WAGES.—With respect to a qualified employee whose wages at an annual rate during the taxable year exceed \$25,000, the percentage which would (but for this section) be taken into account as the percentage for purposes of subsection (b)(2) or (c)(1) for the taxable year shall be reduced by an amount equal to the product of such

percentage and the percentage that such qualified employee's wages in excess of \$25,000 bears to \$5,000.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER.—The term ‘qualified small employer’ means any employer (as defined in section 2(b)(2) of the Small Employers Health Benefits Program Act of 2006) which—

“(A) is a participating employer (as defined in section 2(b)(5) of such Act),

“(B) pays or incurs at least 60 percent of the qualified employee health insurance expenses of each qualified employee for self-only coverage, and

“(C) pays or incurs at least 50 percent of the qualified employee health insurance expenses of each qualified employee for all other categories of coverage.

“(2) QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified employee health insurance expenses’ means any amount paid by an employer for health insurance coverage under such Act to the extent such amount is attributable to coverage provided to any employee while such employee is a qualified employee.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR AMOUNTS PAID UNDER SALARY REDUCTION ARRANGEMENTS.—No amount paid or incurred for health insurance coverage pursuant to a salary reduction arrangement shall be taken into account under subparagraph (A).

“(3) QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified employee’ means, with respect to any period, an employee (as defined in section 2(b)(1) of such Act) of an employer if the total amount of wages paid or incurred by such employer to such employee at an annual rate during the taxable year exceeds \$5,000 but does not exceed \$30,000.

“(ii) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT.—For each taxable year after 2007, the dollar amounts specified for the preceding taxable year (after the application of this subparagraph) shall be increased by the same percentage as the average percentage increase in premiums under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins over the preceding calendar year.

“(B) WAGES.—The term ‘wages’ has the meaning given such term by section 3121(a) (determined without regard to any dollar limitation contained in such section).

“(f) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of section 52 shall apply.

“(g) CREDITS FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Any credit which would be allowable under subsection (a) with respect to a qualified small business if such qualified small business were not exempt from tax under this chapter shall be treated as a credit allowable under this subpart to such qualified small business.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period “, or from section 36 of such Code”.

(2) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the last item and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 36. Small business employee health insurance expenses

“Sec. 37. Overpayments of tax”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

#### SEC. 16. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 10(e), this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply to contracts that take effect with respect to calendar year 2007 and each calendar year thereafter.

### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2910. Mr. FRIST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2911. Mr. FRIST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2912. Mr. FRIST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2913. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra.

SA 2914. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2915. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2916. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2917. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2918. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2906 submitted by Ms. SNOWE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2919. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2905 submitted by Ms. SNOWE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2920. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2905 submitted by Ms. SNOWE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2921. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2906 submitted by Ms. SNOWE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2922. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2905 submitted by Ms. SNOWE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2923. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2924. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency

in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2925. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2926. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2927. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2928. Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2929. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2930. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2931. Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2932. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2349, supra.

### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2910. Mr. FRIST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to bill S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 2, line 5, and insert the following:

(A) by striking “for a 1-time only obligation and expenditure”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$750,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”;

SA 2911. Mr. FRIST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to bill S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 2, line 5, and insert the following:

(A) by striking “for a 1-time only obligation and expenditure”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$750,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”;

SA 2912. Mr. FRIST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2899 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) to the bill S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of



bill S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 5 through 17, and insert the following:

(C) by striking paragraph (2); and  
(2) in subsection (b), by striking “September 30, 2007” and inserting “September 30, 2006”.

**SA 2924.** Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ HONEST SERVICES ACT OF 2006.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Honest Services Act of 2006”.

(b) **HONEST SERVICES FRAUD INVOLVING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 1351. Honest services fraud involving members of Congress**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Whoever knowingly and willfully executes, or attempts to execute, a scheme or artifice to defraud and deprive the United States, the Congress, or the constituents of a Member of Congress, of the right to the honest services of a Member of Congress by—

“(1) offering and providing to a Member of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress, anything of value, with the intent to influence the performance of an official act; or

“(2) being a Member of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress, accepting anything of value or holding an undisclosed financial interest, with the intent to be influenced in performing an official act; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **HONEST SERVICES.**—The term ‘honest services’ includes the right to conscientious, loyal, faithful, disinterested, and unbiased service, to be performed free of deceit, undue influence, conflict of interest, self-enrichment, self-dealing, concealment, bribery, fraud, and corruption.

“(2) **OFFICIAL ACT.**—The term ‘official act’—

“(A) has the meaning given that term in section 201(a)(3) of this title; and

“(B) includes supporting and passing legislation, placing a statement in the Congressional Record, participating in a meeting, conducting hearings, or advancing or advocating for an application to obtain a contract with the United States Government.

“(3) **UNDISCLOSED FINANCIAL INTEREST.**—The term ‘undisclosed financial interest’ includes any financial interest not disclosed as required by statute or by the Standing Rules of the Senate.

“(c) **NO INFERENCE AND SCOPE.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

“(1) create any inference with respect to whether the conduct described in section 1351 of this title was already a criminal or civil offense prior to the enactment of this section; or

“(2) limit the scope of any existing criminal or civil offense.”.

(2) **CHAPTER ANALYSIS.**—The chapter analysis for chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end, the following:

“1351. Honest services fraud involving Members of Congress.”.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL TO INVESTIGATE AND PROSECUTE HONEST SERVICES FRAUD, BRIBERY, GRAFT, AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OFFENSES.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, including the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, and the Federal Bureau of Investigations, \$25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, to increase the number of personnel to investigate and prosecute violations of section 1351 and sections 201, 203 through 209, 1001, 1341, 1343, and 1346 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this section.

**SA 2925.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ SPOUSE LOBBYING MEMBERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 207(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **SPOUSES.**—Any person who is the spouse of a Member of Congress and who was not serving as a registered lobbyist at least 1 year prior to the election of that Member of Congress to Federal office or at least 1 year prior to his or her marriage to that Member of Congress and who, after the election of such Member, knowingly lobbies on behalf of a client for compensation any Member of Congress or is associated with any such lobbying activity by an employer of that spouse shall be punished as provided in section 216 of this title.”.

(b) **GRANDFATHER PROVISION.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any spouse of a Member of Congress serving as a registered lobbyist on the date of enactment of this Act.

**SA 2926.** Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ RESTORATION TO JUDICIARY OF POWER TO DECIDE TRADEMARK AND TRADE NAME CASES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution of the United States of America vests “judicial Power” exclusively in the courts. Section 2 of Article III states that this “judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties...”. In interpreting Article III of the Constitution, the Supreme Court in *Muskrat v. United States* defined the term “judicial power” to mean “the right to determine actual controversies arising between adverse litigants, duly instituted in courts of proper jurisdiction”.

(2) In 1996, a holder of a trademark registration issued by the Patent and Trademark Office asserted trademark infringement and other claims in a United States district court against an alleged infringer. The plaintiff’s claims for relief were based upon laws and treaties of the United States, including the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) and the Inter-American

Convention for Trademark and Commercial Protection.

(3) In October 1998, just prior to commencement of the trial, the alleged infringer procured an amendment to the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(b) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-88). That amendment is commonly referred to as “section 211” and has been of singular benefit to that defendant in the courts.

(4) Subsections (a)(2) and (b) of section 211 provide that “No United States court shall recognize, enforce, or otherwise validate any assertion of rights” of certain trademarks or commercial names of the type at issue in the litigation referred to in paragraph (2). Subsection (a)(1) of section 211 also rescinds the general authority permitting payment of the fees necessary for registration and renewal of such trademarks with the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(5) The intended and actual effect of section 211 is to strip United States courts of the authority to decide the ownership and enforceability of such trademarks and trade names, including those at issue in the litigation described in paragraph (2). As a result of section 211, the plaintiff in the litigation was prevented from asserting the plaintiff’s infringement claim. By preventing the payment of fees for trademark registration and renewal in the Patent and Trademark Office, section 211 also denies parties the ability to preserve claims of ownership in such trademarks pending judicial determination of enforcement rights.

(6) Section 211 is not needed for the courts to reach equitable results with respect to the United States trademark and trade name rights of foreign nationals who have suffered from confiscation of their businesses at home. It has been the longstanding practice of the Federal courts to do equity in adjudicating disputes involving such rights.

(7) Repeal of section 211 is necessary and desirable to restore to the courts the power to determine the ownership and enforceability of all trademarks and trade names and to preserve trademark registrations pending such determinations.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to restore to the judiciary the power to decide all trademark and trade name cases arising under the laws and treaties of the United States, and for other purposes.

(c) **RESTORATION OF JUDICIAL POWERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 211 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(b) of division A of Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-88) is repealed.

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out the repeal made by paragraph (1), including removing any prohibition on transactions or payments to which subsection (a)(1) of section 211 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 applied.

(3) **AUTHORITY OF COURTS.**—United States courts shall have the authority to recognize, enforce, or otherwise validate any assertion of rights in any mark or trade name based on common law rights or registration or under subsection (b) or (e) of section 44 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1126 (b) or (e)) or based on any treaty to which the United States is a party.

**SA 2927.** Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE III—CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS OFFICE**

**SEC. 301. ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS OFFICE.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the legislative branch an independent authority to be known as the Congressional Ethics Office, and to be headed by a Congressional Ethics Officer.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer shall be appointed in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) **APPOINTMENT.**—The majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives, and the chairman and the ranking member of the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate shall nominate the Congressional Ethics Officer at the beginning of a Congress. The Congressional Ethics Officer shall be confirmed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(c) **TERMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer shall serve a term of 2 years and may be reappointed for 2 additional terms.

(2) **DEATH OR RESIGNATION.**—In the case of the death or resignation of the Congressional Ethics Officer a successor shall be appointed in the same manner to serve the remaining term of that Congressional Ethics Officer.

(d) **REMOVAL.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer may be removed only by resolution of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(e) **DUTIES.**—It shall be the duty of the Congressional Ethics Officer to—

(1) receive requests for review of an allegation described in section 302(b);

(2) make such informal preliminary inquiries in response to such a request as the Congressional Ethics Officer deems to be appropriate;

(3) if, as a result of those inquiries, the Congressional Ethics Officer determines that a full investigation is not warranted, submit a report pursuant to section 302(f); and

(4) if, as a result of those inquiries, the Congressional Ethics Officer determines that there is probable cause, the Congressional Ethics Officer—

(A) may determine a full investigation is warranted and conduct such investigation; and

(B) shall provide a full report of the investigation which shall be available for public inspection to either the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate or the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives.

(f) **COMPENSATION OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS OFFICER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which he or she is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Congressional Ethics Officer.

(2) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer and members of the Congressional Ethics Officer staff shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Congressional Ethics Officer.

(g) **STAFF.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint, and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as are necessary to enable the Congressional Ethics Officer to perform his or her duties. The staff of the Congressional Ethics Office shall be nonpartisan.

(2) **STAFF COMPENSATION.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of that title.

(3) **DETAILLEES.**—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Congressional Ethics Officer without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(4) **TEMPORARY SERVICES.**—The Congressional Ethics Officer may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals that do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of that title.

(5) **STAFFING.**—Except at a time when additional personnel are needed to assist the Congressional Ethics Officer in his or her review of a particular request for review under section 302, the total number of staff personnel employed by or detailed to the Congressional Ethics Officer under this subsection shall not exceed 50.

(h) **INAPPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

**SEC. 302. REVIEW OF ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT AND VIOLATIONS OF ETHICS LAWS.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section, the term “officer or employee of Congress” means—

(1) an elected officer of the Senate or the House of Representatives who is not a member of the Senate or the House of Representatives;

(2) an employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives, any committee or subcommittee of the Senate or the House of Representatives, or any member of the Senate or the House of Representatives;

(3) an employee of the Vice President if such employee’s compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; and

(4) an employee of a joint committee of Congress.

(b) **REQUEST FOR REVIEW.**—Any person, including a person who is not an officer or employee of Congress, may present to the Congressional Ethics Officer a request to review and investigate an allegation of—

(1) improper conduct that may reflect upon the Senate or the House of Representatives;

(2) a significant violation of law;

(3) a violation of the Senate Code of Official Conduct (rules XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL, XLI, and XLII of the Standing Rules of the Senate) or the ethics rules of the House of Representatives; or

(4) a significant violation of a rule or regulation of the Senate or the House of Representatives, relating to the conduct of a person in the performance of his or her duties as a member, officer, or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(c) **SWORN STATEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A request for review under subsection (b) shall be accompanied by a

sworn statement, made under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, of facts within the personal knowledge of the person making the statement alleging improper conduct or a violation described in subsection (b).

(2) **FALSE STATEMENT.**—If the Congressional Ethics Officer determines that any part of a sworn statement presented under paragraph (1) may have been a false statement made knowingly and willfully, the Congressional Ethics Officer may refer the matter to the Attorney General for prosecution.

(d) **PROTECTION FROM FRIVOLOUS CHARGES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person who—

(A) knowingly files with the Congressional Ethics Office a false complaint of misconduct on the part of any legislator or any other person shall be subject to a \$10,000 fine or the cost of the preliminary review, whichever is greater, and up to 1 year in prison; or

(B) encourages another person to file a false complaint of misconduct on the part of any legislator or other person shall be subject to a \$10,000 fine or the cost of the preliminary review, whichever is greater, and up to 1 year in prison.

(2) **SUBSEQUENT COMPLAINTS.**—Any person subject to either of the penalties in paragraph (1) may not file a complaint with the Congressional Ethics Office again.

(3) **BAN ON FILINGS PRIOR TO ELECTION.**—The Congressional Ethics Office may not accept charges filed in the—

(A) 30 days prior to a primary election for which the Member in question is a candidate; and

(B) 60 days prior to a general election for which the Member in question is a candidate.

(e) **SUBPOENA.**—The Congressional Ethics officer may bring a civil action to enforce a subpoena only when directed to do so by the adoption of a resolution by the Senate or the House of Representatives, as appropriate.

(f) **REFERRAL OF REPORTS TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS OF THE SENATE, THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OR THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If, after making preliminary inquiries, the Congressional Ethics Officer finds probable cause that a violation of the ethics rules has occurred, the Congressional Ethics Officer shall submit to the members of the Senate, members of the House of Representatives, and the Department of Justice a report that—

(A) states findings of fact made as a result of the inquiries;

(B) states any conclusions that may be drawn with respect to whether there is substantial credible evidence that improper conduct or a violation of law may have occurred; and

(C) states its reasons for concluding that further investigation is not warranted.

(2) **NO ACTION.**—After submission of a report under paragraph (1), no action may be taken in the Senate or the House of Representatives to impose a sanction on a person who was the subject of the Congressional Ethics Officer’s inquiries on the basis of any conduct that was alleged in the request for review and sworn statement.

**SEC. 303. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.**

The Congressional Ethics Officer shall—

(1) periodically report to Congress any changes to the ethics law and regulations governing Congress that the Congressional Ethics Officer determines would improve the investigation and enforcement of such laws and regulations; and

(2) provide an annual report to Congress on the number of ethics complaints and a description of the ethics investigations undertaken during the prior year.

**SA 2928.** Mr. KERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**TITLE III—CONGRESSIONAL PENSION ACCOUNTABILITY**

**SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Congressional Pension Accountability Act”.

**SEC. 302. DENIAL OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8312(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; or”, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) was convicted of an offense described in subsection (d), to the extent provided by that subsection.”; and

(2) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) with respect to the offenses described in subsection (d), to the period after the date of conviction.”.

(b) OFFENSES DESCRIBED.—Section 8312 of such title 5 is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e), and by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) The offenses to which subsection (a)(3) applies are the following:

“(1) An offense within the purview of—

“(A) section 201 of title 18 (bribery of public officials and witnesses); or

“(B) section 371 of title 18 (conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States), to the extent of any conspiracy to commit an act which constitutes an offense within the purview of such section 201.

“(2) Perjury committed under the statutes of the United States or the District of Columbia in falsely denying the commission of any act which constitutes an offense within the purview of a statute named by paragraph (1), but only in the case of the statute named by subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1).

“(3) Subornation of perjury committed in connection with the false denial or false testimony of another individual as specified by paragraph (2).

An offense shall not be considered to be an offense described in this subsection except if or to the extent that it is committed by a Member of Congress (as defined by section 2106, including a Delegate to Congress).”.

(c) ABSENCE FROM UNITED STATES TO AVOID PROSECUTION.—Section 8313(a)(1) of such title 5 is amended by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “or”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for an offense described under subsection (d) of section 8312; and”.

(d) NONACCRUAL OF INTEREST ON REVENUES.—Section 8316(b) of such title 5 is amended by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; or”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(3) if the individual was convicted of an offense described in section 8312(d), for the period after the conviction.”.

**SEC. 303. CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.**

The Constitutional authority for this title is the power of Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, and the power to ascertain compensation for Congressional service under Article I, Section 6 of the United States Constitution.

**SA 2929.** Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 114. PROHIBITING ADVOCATING FOR EARMARK IN WHICH THERE EXISTS A FINANCIAL INTEREST.**

Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“13. No Member of the Senate may advocate to include an earmark in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (including an accompanying joint statement of managers thereto) if the Member has a financial interest in such earmark.”.

**SA 2930.** Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 5, line 21, after “hours” insert “or 1 business day, whichever is longer.”.

On page 6, line 7, after “hours” insert “or 1 business day, whichever is longer.”.

**SA 2931.** Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 114. BUYING VOTES.**

Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“13. No Member of the Senate shall condition the inclusion of language to provide funding for an earmark in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report thereof) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (including an accompanying joint statement of managers thereto) on any vote cast by the Member of the Senate in whose State the project will be carried out.”.

**SA 2932.** Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; as follows:

Add at the end of the bill add the following:

**TITLE III—ADDITIONAL TRANSPARENCY AND ENFORCEMENT**

**SEC. 301. DISCLOSURE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESSIONAL AND SENIOR CONGRESSIONAL STAFF OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS.**

(a) SENATE.—Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13. (a) A Member of the Senate shall not negotiate or have any arrangement concerning prospective private employment if a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest exists.

“(b)(1) An employee of the Senate earning in excess of 75 percent of the salary paid to a Senator shall notify the Committee on Ethics that he or she is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective private employment if a conflict of interest or

the appearance of a conflict of interest may exist.

“(2) The disclosure and notification under this subparagraph shall be made within 3 business days after the commencement of such negotiation or arrangement.

“(3) An employee to whom this subparagraph applies shall recuse himself or herself from any matter in which there is a conflict of interest for that Member or employee under this rule and notify the Select Committee on Ethics of such recusal.

“(c)(1) The Select Committee on Ethics shall develop guidelines concerning conduct which is covered by this paragraph.

“(2) The Select Committee on Ethics shall maintain a current public record of all notifications received under subparagraph (a) and of all recusals under subparagraph (c).”.

(b) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply in lieu of section 109 of this Act.

**SEC. 302. ETHICS REVIEW OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS BY EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIALS.**

Section 208 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by inserting after “the Government official responsible for appointment to his or her position” the following: “and the Office of Government Ethics”; and

(B) by striking “a written determination made by such official” and inserting “a written determination made by the Office of Government Ethics, after consultation with such official.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “the official responsible for the employee’s appointment, after review of” and inserting “the Office of Government Ethics, after consultation with the official responsible for the employee’s appointment and after review of”; and

(3) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by striking “Upon request” and all that follows through “Ethics in Government Act of 1978.” and inserting “In each case in which the Office of Government Ethics makes a determination granting an exemption under subsection (b)(1) or (b)(3) to a person, the Office shall, not later than 3 business days after making such determination, make available to the public pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 105 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, and publish in the Federal Register, such determination and the materials submitted by such person in requesting such exemption.”; and

(B) by striking “the agency may withhold” and inserting “the Office of Government Ethics may withhold”.

**SEC. 303. WRONGFULLY INFLUENCING A PRIVATE ENTITY’S EMPLOYMENT DECISIONS OR PRACTICES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 226. Wrongfully influencing a private entity’s employment decisions by a Member of Congress**

“Whoever, being a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress or an employee of either House of Congress, with the intent to influence on the basis of partisan political affiliation an employment decision or employment practice of any private entity—

“(1) takes or withholds, or offers or threatens to take or withhold, an official act; or

“(2) influences, or offers or threatens to influence, the official act of another; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both, and may be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.”.

(b) NO INFERENCE.—Nothing in section 226 of title 18, United States Code, as added by

this section, shall be construed to create any inference with respect to whether the activity described in section 226 of title 18, United States Code, was already a criminal or civil offense prior to the enactment of this Act, including sections 201(b), 201(c), and 216 of title 18, United States Code.

(c) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“226. Wrongfully influencing a private entity’s employment decisions by a Member of Congress.”.

**SEC. 304. BAN ON GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph 1(a)(2) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following: “This clause shall not apply to a gift from a lobbyist.”.

(b) RULES COMMITTEE REVIEW.—The Committee on Rules and Administration shall review the present exceptions to the Senate gift rule and make recommendations to the Senate not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act on eliminating all but those which are absolutely necessary to effectuate the purpose of the rule.

(c) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply in lieu of section 106 of this Act.

**SEC. 305. PROHIBITION ON PRIVATELY FUNDED TRAVEL.**

Paragraph 2(a)(1) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking “an individual” and inserting “an organization recognized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is not affiliated with any group that lobbies before Congress”.

**SEC. 306. PROHIBITING LOBBYIST ORGANIZATION AND PARTICIPATION IN CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph 2 of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) A Member, officer, or employee may not accept transportation or lodging on any trip sponsored by an organization recognized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 covered by this paragraph that is planned, organized, requested, arranged, or financed in whole, or in part by a lobbyist or foreign agent, or in which a lobbyist participates.

“(h) Before a Member, officer, or employee may accept transportation or lodging otherwise permissible under this paragraph from any person, such Member, officer, or employee shall obtain a written certification from such person (and provide a copy of such certification to the Select Committee on Ethics) that—

“(1) the trip was not planned, organized, requested, arranged, or financed in whole, or in part by a registered lobbyist or foreign agent and was not organized at the request of a registered lobbyist or foreign agent;

“(2) registered lobbyists will not participate in or attend the trip; and

“(3) the person did not accept, from any source, funds specifically earmarked for the purpose of financing the travel expenses. The Select Committee on Ethics shall make public information received under this subparagraph as soon as possible after it is received.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph 2(c) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(1) by striking “of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed”;

(2) in clause (5), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(3) in clause (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) a description of meetings and events attended during such travel, except when

disclosure of such information is deemed by the Member or supervisor under whose direct supervision the employee works to jeopardize the safety of an individual or otherwise interfere with the official duties of the Member, officer, or employee.”.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Paragraph 2(e) of rule XXXV is amended to read as follows:

“(e) The Secretary of the Senate shall make available to the public all advance authorizations, certifications, and disclosures filed pursuant to subparagraphs (a) and (h) as soon as possible after they are received.”.

(d) APPLICATION.—The provisions of this section shall apply in addition to the requirements of section 107(a).

**SEC. 307. ADDITIONAL LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(b) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) a certification that the lobbying firm or registrant has not provided, requested, or directed a gift, including travel, to a Member or employee of Congress in violation of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The requirements of this Act shall not apply to the activities of any political committee described in section 301(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

**SEC. 308. PENALTY FOR FALSE CERTIFICATION IN CONNECTION WITH CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL.**

(a) CIVIL FINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever makes a false certification in connection with the travel of a Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress (within the meaning given those terms in section 207 of title 18, United States Code), under paragraph 2(h) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, shall, upon proof of such offense by a preponderance of the evidence, be subject to a civil fine depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

(2) MAXIMUM FINE.—The maximum fine per offense under this section depends on the number of separate trips in connection with which the person committed an offense under this subsection, as follows:

(A) FIRST TRIP.—For each offense committed in connection with the first such trip, the amount of the fine shall be not more than \$100,000 per offense.

(B) SECOND TRIP.—For each offense committed in connection with the second such trip, the amount of the fine shall be not more than \$300,000 per offense.

(C) ANY OTHER TRIPS.—For each offense committed in connection with any such trip after the second, the amount of the fine shall be not more than \$500,000 per offense.

(3) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General may bring an action in United States district court to enforce this subsection.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly and willfully fails to comply with any provision of this section shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both.

(2) CORRUPTLY.—Whoever knowingly, willfully, and corruptly fails to comply with any provision of this section shall be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both.

**SEC. 309. INCREASED CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.**

Section 7 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1606) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) CIVIL PENALTY.—” before “Whoever”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly and willfully fails to comply with any provision of this section shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both.

“(2) CORRUPTLY.—Whoever knowingly, willfully, and corruptly fails to comply with any provision of this section shall be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both.”.

**SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONFERENCE COMMITTEE PROTOCOLS.**

It is the sense of Senate that—

(1) conference committees should hold regular, formal meetings of all conferees that are open to the public;

(2) all conferees should be given adequate notice of the time and place of all such meetings;

(3) all conferees should be afforded an opportunity to participate in full and complete debates of the matters that such conference committees may recommend to their respective Houses;

(4) all matters before a conference committee should be resolved in conference by votes on the public record; and

(5) existing rules should be enforced and new rules adopted in the Senate to shine the light on special interest legislation that is enacted in the dead of night.

**SEC. 311. ACTUAL VOTING REQUIRED IN CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS.**

Rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

“8. Each Senate member of a conference committee shall be afforded an opportunity at an open meeting of the conference to vote on the full text of the proposed report of the conference.”.

**NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS**

**COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I wish to inform Members that the Committee on Small Business & Entrepreneurship will hold a public hearing to consider, “The President’s fiscal year 2007 Budget Request and Legislative Proposals for the SBA” on Thursday, March 9, 2006 at 10 a.m., in room 428A Russell Senate Office Building. The Honorable Hector Barreto, SBA Administrator, will testify.

The Chair urges every member to attend.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS**

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks.

The hearing will be held on Tuesday, March 14th, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to review the President’s proposed budget for the National Park Service fiscal year 2007.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Tom Lillie, David Szymanski, or Sara Zecher.

## PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs will hold a hearing on March 14, 2006, entitled "GSA Contractors Who Cheat on Their Taxes and What Should Be Done About It." The March 14 hearing will be the third hearing on Federal contractors with unpaid tax debt. In February 2004, the subcommittee held a hearing entitled "DOD Contractors Who Cheat on Their Taxes, which examined the IRS' failure to collect \$3 billion in unpaid taxes owed by contractors doing business with the Department of Defense, DOD, and getting paid with taxpayer dollars. In June 2005, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled "Civilian Contractors Who Cheat on Their Taxes", which identified an additional \$3.3 billion in unpaid taxes and demonstrated that the problem of tax delinquent Federal contractors is not confined to DOD. Because of the potential revenue that could be collected by the Federal Payment Levy Program from non-DOD contractors, the subcommittee expanded the coverage of the investigation to include contractors at other Federal agencies who receive Federal contract payments and are delinquent in paying their taxes. In the continuing investigation of Federal contractors who do not pay their taxes, the subcommittee plans to hold a hearing on March 14 on the General Service Administration's contractors who are tax delinquent. Federal contractors who owe taxes are still allowed to do business with the Federal Government. The hearing will explore the extent to which these contractors are tax delinquent and what can be done about it.

The subcommittee hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, March 14, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Raymond V. Shepherd, III, Staff Director and Chief Counsel to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 7, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., to receive testimony from combatant commanders on their military strategy and operational requirements, in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the Future Years Defense Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 7, 2006, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on "Assessing the Current Oversight and Operation of Credit Rating Agencies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Tuesday, March 7, 2006, at 10 a.m. on Rural Telecom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate and on Tuesday, March 7 at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to discuss the goal of energy independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 7, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 7, 2006, at 10 a.m. in SD-430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 7, 2006, to hear the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The hearing will take place in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 7, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sub-

committee on Strategic Forces be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 7, 2006, at 2:45 p.m., in open session to receive testimony on the nuclear weapons and defense environmental cleanup activities of the Department of Energy in review of the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years nuclear security program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 8. 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 proceed to a period of morning business for up to 30 minutes, with the first 15 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee and the final 15 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee; further, that the Senate then resume consideration of S. 2349, the lobbying reform bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the Senate will resume consideration of the lobbying reform bill tomorrow. Senators who have amendments to this bill should be working with bill managers, as they are trying to expedite the amendment process. Senators should expect full days this week as we work toward passage of this bill.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRIST. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it be in order for the Democratic leader to offer an amendment to the lobbying reform bill, and following his statement, the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2006—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2349) to provide greater transparency in the legislative process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2932 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2349 (Purpose: To provide additional transparency in the legislative process)

Mr. REID. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 2932.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the 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. REID. Mr. President, when we returned from the winter recess, this Democratic minority acted decisively by introducing S. 2180, which we call the Honest Leadership Act. We put reform to paper and established the baseline for the Senate by getting caucuswide support for what we believe is a very tough and comprehensive reform piece of legislation.

Much of what we worked for as a caucus has now gained bipartisan support. I appreciate the work done by Senators LOTT and DODD. I appreciate the work done by Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS. I especially appreciate the work of the committee members, both Democrats and Republicans.

What we have now is a molding of both the bill that came out of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Rules Committee. That bill included a significant portion of the bill we introduced. I compliment and applaud the two committees for getting us to the point where we are.

There are aspects of the reported bills that need to be strengthened. As far as these measures now before the Senate, we want them to be consistent with legislation we introduced earlier this year. The amendment I have offered does that.

The amendment would make a number of changes to the pending bill. It would prohibit sitting Members of the Senate and senior legislative and executive branch employees from negotiating for private sector employment where a conflict or appearance of a conflict exists.

This amendment would impose criminal penalties in order to put a stop to the system of what many believe is a system of corruption that developed under the so-called K Street project. The K Street project was a form of institutionalized corruption in which Members of Congress limited access to government offices and influence over policy matters, or threatened to do so, as a means of forcing corporations, trade associations, and lobbying firms to hire Republicans and to tilt their political contributions to Republicans. It is a pay-to-play scheme as blatant and arrogant as anyone has seen in Congress.

This amendment increases civil and criminal penalties under the Lobbying Disclosure Act for individuals who knowingly and willingly file false information.

This amendment puts an end to the dead-of-night legislating and the prac-

tice of shutting Members and the public out of conference committee proceedings.

One of our real complaints since we have become a minority is the majority does not even go through the sham of holding a conference. They just march over in someone's office and say: This is what the bill is going to be.

That is not the way things previously were done. We had public meetings where there were debates and votes in public. That is what we want to be the future of this Senate. This amendment requires the conference committees hold regular formal open meetings and that each member of the conference be afforded an opportunity to vote on the full text of the bill in open session.

This amendment prohibits all gifts from lobbyists, including meals. This amendment goes beyond simple disclosure and prohibits outside interests who advocate before the Congress from paying for travel for Members and staff, and bans most privately funded travel by companies, groups, business associations, and other special interests that lobby Congress. There would be a limited exemption for travel sponsored by 501(c)(3) tax-exempt charities and educational groups that would be required to certify that lobbyists did not finance, organize, or participate in the travel.

We worked hard to get this bill to the Senate. I hope this amendment will give us the bipartisan support we need to strengthen this legislation now before the Senate.

I am disappointed we have heard today that the House Republican leaders have stated that they prefer a partisan approach, something different than we have had in the Senate to this point. The House Republican leaders have said they intend to tack regulation of 527 groups onto their yet-to-be-seen lobbying reform bill. They also want to pair regulation of 527 groups with measures to weaken McCain-Feingold laws in a way that would principally benefit the majority.

In fact, these are the only clear priorities House Republican leaders appear to have for their bill. That is where the House Republicans' narrow interest lies. Theirs is a partisan goal of changing the rules of our campaign finance system to hedge against the possibility of Republican election losses this fall. They think if you cannot win under the rules, then change them. That is what the House Republican leaders plan.

What we have in the Senate, to this point, has been bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans. What has been talked about in the House today is anti-reform legislation. Our Senate leaders—and I am directing my attention principally to the two committees—have rejected this effort and, again, I congratulate them for that.

As Senator DODD so aptly put it yesterday, campaign finance reform is much larger than the narrow question of 527 groups. The House Republican

leaders want to shut those down because of the perception that these groups benefit Democrats. But what about trade associations which engage in the same types of activities? What about these foundations that we have heard so much about lately that pay relatives and friends and campaign workers? We know these trade associations engage in activities because we have seen their handiwork in advertisements, political advertisements for Republican candidates up this cycle. They were also active in 2004.

Yet the trade associations engaging in these activities are even less regulated than 527 groups. They are not required, as 527s are, to disclose their expenditures and their donors. They operate in the shadows. These groups principally benefit Republicans.

We also need to crack down on abuses of foundations, as I mentioned, and charities which are used by Members for personal gain or for campaign purposes. Curiously, we do not hear Republican calls to regulate any of these activities.

So what Senator DODD and I say is, if we are going to have a debate on foundations, trade associations, and 527s, let's have a debate on that and not try to bury what we have on the floor, an Honest Leadership and Open Government Act. I understand it is a way that the House thinks it will take this bill down. But as Senator DODD said, if this comes back from a conference and this is the issue, there will not be lobbying reform. That would be very unfair, wrong for this institution.

As important as these campaign finance issues are, they are on the periphery, really, of the big issue; that is, how do we pay for campaigns? Is public financing—which some Senators believe is the right way to go—where we need to go? That is why a debate should be on campaign finance reform and not trying to muddle up and confuse the Senate on the issue now before us.

Lobbying reform, of all things, should not be twisted into a vehicle exploited by one party to gain electoral advantage. If that is a path which is chosen, it will be a poison pill. The legislation will come down. I hope this does not happen. We have worked with Republicans so far to make sure this issue does not get entangled with campaign finance reform, such as the public funding of campaigns or the regulation of these 527 groups. I hope we can continue to do that.

This amendment is, in effect, an effort to plug the holes that were not placed in this legislation by the Rules Committee and the Homeland Security Committee. I hope we have a good debate on this issue. This is not something that should take a long time. I have told the distinguished majority leader this is no attempt to stall this legislation. I have told the majority leader that unless there are issues outside of what the two committees did that are within their jurisdiction, we

have no intention of offering a myriad of issues we have Members clamoring to offer—issues on the port security deal, minimum wage, all kinds of things dealing with health care. There is a long list of issues we want to bring up as soon as possible, but we are not going to do it on this legislation. We believe this should be for lobbying reform. So I think it needs the good faith of both parties to see if we can move down that road.

I have asked my caucus, if they want to speak on this issue, to do it as soon as they can, hopefully in the morning when we come in. It would be good if we could have a vote before we go to our respective lunches. The majority has a Steering Committee meeting every Wednesday. We have a special caucus tomorrow. It would be good if we could wrap up the vote before then.

Mr. President, I wish everyone a good evening. Good night.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:13 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 8, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 7, 2006:

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL E. RANNEBERGER, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KENYA.

ROBERT F. GODEC, 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 TUNISIA.

##### FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

PHILIP D. MOELLER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2010, VICE PATRICK HENRY WOOD III, RESIGNED.

JON WELLINGHOFF, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2008, VICE WILLIAM LLOYD MASSEY, TERM EXPIRED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RICHARD CAPKA, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, VICE MARY E. PETERS, RESIGNED.

##### CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

JERRY GAYLE BRIDGES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE, VICE MICHELLE GUILLERMIN, RESIGNED.

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

##### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY J. WRIGHT, 0000

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be colonel

WILLIAM M. ROGERS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be lieutenant colonel

KEVIN D. BROOKS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major

THOMAS L. REMPFER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major

STEPHEN R. GERINGER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major

JAMES D. BONE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major

CLINTON E. ABELL, 0000

ANTHONY L. ALEXANDER, 0000

TROY F. ALLEY, 0000

JEFFREY J. AUTREY, 0000

PHILIP G. BASCOM, 0000

ROBERT A. BELDE, 0000

THOMAS R. BERANEK, 0000

SHELLA D. BEVILLE, 0000

ADITYA A. BHAGWAT, 0000

SALLYANNE BINIUTI, 0000

CHRISTOPHER R. BISHOP, 0000

KEITH W. BLOUNT, 0000

JENNIFER J. BODART, 0000

MAUREN A. BOUSQUET, 0000

AMY R. CARPENTER, 0000

JOHN D. CATOE, 0000

CARL E. CHAMPION, JR., 0000

WAYNE L. CHAPPELLE, 0000

GABRIELLE D. CHILDS, 0000

GREGORY S. CHURCHILL, 0000

BEVERLY J. COKEY, 0000

ANGELA J. P. COOY, 0000

DAVID D. CORDRY, 0000

KEVIN R. COSTELLO, 0000

RARRICK D. CUNNINGHAM, 0000

JOSHUA W. DEVINE, 0000

DONALD O. DIEMER, 0000

TAM T. DINH, 0000

JOEL R. DIXON, 0000

MELANIE L. DRESSLER, 0000

DAVID E. EATON, 0000

JAMES D. EBERT, 0000

GARTH A. ELLIOTT, 0000

BARBARA T. EMBRY, 0000

TIM W. FILZEN, 0000

HOLLY D. FITZPATRICK, 0000

SEAN K. FITZPATRICK, 0000

MARCIO J. FLETES, 0000

MACHEL E. FOSTER, 0000

JOHN S. FRAZEE, 0000

VIVIANLE B. FREEMAN, 0000

KATHY L. FULLERTON, 0000

MARCEL P. GARR, 0000

DANIEL L. GLAZIER, 0000

JOSE J. GOMEZ, 0000

JEFFREY L. GOODIE, 0000

MARK R. GRUBER, 0000

JENNIFER L. GRIMWALD, 0000

EDWIN GUZMAN, 0000

MICHAEL G. HAINE, 0000

VANESSA L. HALE, 0000

RANDI L. HAMM, 0000

JAMES F. HANSON, 0000

JOEL R. HILL, 0000

MICHAEL S. HOLMES, 0000

SHERY L. KAUFFMAN, 0000

CANDICE A. LAGASSE, 0000

HALLIE D. LANDRETH, 0000

ROBERTA A. LENSKI, 0000

JUAN C. LEON, 0000

STEPHEN G. LONG, 0000

TIMOTHY A. LOOMIS, 0000

VICKI A. LUMLEY, 0000

CHRISTIAN L. LYONS, 0000

RYAN W. MARSH, 0000

NICHOLAS R. MARSHALL, 0000

THEODORE P. MASINO II, 0000

SCOTT R. MATTES, 0000

TEG W. MCBRIDE, 0000

JOHN C. MCGEE, 0000

MISTIE S. MCPDALIN, 0000

RANDALL D. MCVAY, 0000

NICHOLAS A. MILAZZO, 0000

PAUL J. MILAZZO, 0000

PHILIP E. MILLER, 0000

CYNTHIA L. MITCHELL, 0000

SPRING M. MYERS, 0000

JOLENE R. NORRIS, 0000

ALAN D. OGLE, 0000

SUZANA OH, 0000

MATTHEW W. OSTLER, 0000

VANHSENG PHANTHAVONG, 0000

TIMOTHY O. RENTZ, 0000

RISA C. RIEPMA, 0000

JONATHAN S. SAMS, 0000

SHERY J. SEGRAM, 0000

DEBORAH K. SIRRATT, 0000

SOO A. SOHN, 0000

TINA L. SOOTS, 0000

LAURENCE W. STUDER, 0000

TODD A. TICE, 0000

SAMANTHA TIMM, 0000

TRENA D. TOCHTROP, 0000

DIANE M. TODD, 0000

MICHAEL VALERIO, 0000

KELLY J. VANDENBOS, 0000

JENNIFER T. VECCHIONE, 0000

DARNELL E. WALKER, 0000

KENDRA J. WARNER, 0000

RICHARD A. WEBER, 0000

MARC D. WEISHAAR, 0000

ANNE K. WHITIS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major

ROSALIND L. ABDULKHALIK, 0000

JESSE ACEVEDO, 0000

RANDALL E. ACKERMAN, 0000

GILBERT A. ACOSTA, 0000

MARC M. ADAIR, 0000

CHARLES D. ADAMS, 0000

DANIEL C. ADCOCK, 0000

MILTON JOHN ADDISON, 0000

RYAN J. AERNI, 0000

JEREMY S. AGTE, 0000

JASON T. AGUILERA, 0000

PETER A. AGUIRRE, JR., 0000

KRISTOPHER H. O. AHLERS, 0000

REBECCA L. AINSLIE, 0000

JAMES D. AKERS, 0000

LAURIE ANN ALBARINO, 0000

SONNYER ALBERDETONCASTRO, 0000

TODD J. ALDRICH, 0000

JOSEPH R. ALKIRE II, 0000

ANDREW L. ALLEN, 0000

RUSSELL B. ALLEMAN, 0000

ROBERT S. ALLEMAN, 0000

AARON D. ALMENDINGER, 0000

ANTONIO ALVARADO, 0000

GRACIE C. ALVAREZ, 0000

AIMEE C. ALYSTAD, 0000

JOSEPH P. AMATO, 0000

BENJAMIN D. AMBERS, 0000

KAYLEEN M. AMERSON, 0000

ERIC K. AMISSAH, 0000

KELLY K. AMMON, 0000

CAROLYN F. AMMONS, 0000

JOHN M. AMODEO, 0000

CHERI M. ANDERSEN, 0000

BRIAN P. ANDERSON, 0000

CHRISTEN V. ANDERSON, 0000

GRETCHEN E. ANDERSON, 0000

JOE W. ANDERSON, 0000

KYLE G. ANDERSON, 0000

MATTHEW P. ANDERSON, 0000

ROBERT S. ANDERSON, 0000

SCOTT E. ANDERSON, 0000

TOBIN G. ANDERSON, 0000

TORIE B. ANDERSON, 0000

CHAD W. ANNUNZIATA, 0000

NOEMI ANTONDOMENICO, 0000

VERONICA V. ANTONOLA, 0000

ANTHONY F. ANTONINO, 0000

ERIK J. ANTON, 0000

WILLIAM E. ANTONIUS, 0000

JON G. APPELT, 0000

NATHANIEL ARDS, JR., 0000

JEREMY R. ARMAGOST, 0000

CARL R. ARMOUR, 0000

ROBERT ARMOUR, JR., 0000

JASON F. ARNOLD, 0000

MICHAEL D. ARNOLD, JR., 0000

ORBELIN ARREOLA, 0000

DAVID A. ARRIGLIO, 0000

WILLIAM H. ASHFORD, 0000

DAVID M. ASHLEY, 0000

NAOMI M. ASHWORTH, 0000

LAMONT ATKINS, 0000

DAVID A. ATKINSON, 0000

MATTHEW C. ATKINSON, 0000

CHRISTOPHER J. AUGERI, 0000

ROBERT K. AULT, 0000

ATHANASIA C. AUSTIN, 0000

PETER G. AXTELL, 0000

CURTIS P. AYERS IV, 0000

CHRISTOPHER E. BACKUS, 0000

BRYAN J. BAILEY, 0000

KATHERINE M. BAILEY, 0000

MICHAEL C. BAILEY, 0000

RANDY S. BAILEY, 0000

MATTHEW B. BAKER, 0000

JEFFREY A. BALDWIN, 0000

PAUL D. BALDWIN, 0000

JEFFREY B. BANKS, 0000

KATHARINE C. BARBER, 0000

SEAN K. BARDEN, 0000

TERRY R. BARENBERG, 0000

ERNEST J. BARINGER IV, 0000

DANIEL P. BARKER, 0000

MARGARET A. BARKER, 0000

AARON R. BARNES, 0000

MATTHEW THOMAS BARNES, 0000

WILEY L. BARNES, 0000

ROBERT B. BARNETT, 0000

CATHER

ALEXANDER D. BASCO, 0000  
MELVIN E. BASKERVILLE, JR., 0000  
MATTHEW L. BAUGH, 0000  
ALAN F. BAUM, 0000  
MELEAH L. BAUMAN, 0000  
JOHN A. BAYCURA, 0000  
BRIAN O. BEALES, 0000  
TODD W. BEARD, 0000  
ROBERT C. BEARDEN, 0000  
WILLIAM W. BEATTY, 0000  
JAMES D. BEATY, 0000  
JONATHAN N. BEAVERS, 0000  
JASON L. BECK, 0000  
JAMES A. BECKER, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER T. BECKMAN, 0000  
JASEN J. BECKMAN, 0000  
KRISTI L. BECKMAN, 0000  
GREGG C. BEEBER, 0000  
SCOTT J. BELANGER, 0000  
LORI R. BELL, 0000  
AFIA I. BELLABELLA, 0000  
CARY M. BELMEAR, 0000  
JOHN F. BELO, 0000  
BRIAN L. BELSON, 0000  
MARSAILLUS BELTON, 0000  
MARTIN BENAVIDEZ, 0000  
FRANCIS M. BENEDICT, 0000  
ANNETTE I. BENNETT, 0000  
DAVID J. BENNETT, 0000  
JUDSON L. BENNETT III, 0000  
KYLE A. BENWITZ, 0000  
JONATHAN T. BERARDINELLI, 0000  
BERNARD L. BERCK, JR., 0000  
JENNIFER A. BERENGER, 0000  
MATTHEW R. BERG, 0000  
KEVIN S. BERGAN, 0000  
MATTHEW M. BERGGREN, 0000  
SCOTT E. BERGREN, 0000  
JOE A. BERNARDI, 0000  
GARY E. BERNBECK, 0000  
CHAD R. W. BIEHL, 0000  
CHANDLER L. BIGELOW, 0000  
GEOFFREY O. BILLINGSLEY, 0000  
JASON A. BINKS, 0000  
JAMES T. BINS, 0000  
JULIE I. BIRT, 0000  
BENJAMIN W. BISHOP, 0000  
DANIEL P. BISHOP, 0000  
JAMES R. BISHOP, 0000  
BENJAMIN J. BJERK, 0000  
CHRISTOPHEN J. BLACK, 0000  
KENNETH L. BLACK, 0000  
JAMES L. BLACKMAN, 0000  
SHANE M. BLACKMER, 0000  
HEATHER W. BLACKWELL, 0000  
WILLIAM T. BLADEN, 0000  
ARON M. BLAIR, 0000  
ANGIE I. BLAIR, 0000  
JOSEPH T. BLAIR, 0000  
DICK J. BLAKEMORE, 0000  
ALAN E. BLANCHARD, 0000  
MONICA M. BLAND, 0000  
EDWIN A. BLIVINS, 0000  
RONALD K. BLOME, 0000  
TARA J. BLOSE, 0000  
DARRIN T. BLUME, 0000  
BRYAN L. BOBECK, 0000  
KEVIN M. BOBLETT, 0000  
TIMOTHY J. BODE, 0000  
JAMES G. BODINE, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER P. BODLEY, 0000  
RANDALL D. BOERSMA, 0000  
JEFFREY W. BOGAR, 0000  
STEVEN E. BOGUE, 0000  
JOSHUA E. BOHNART, 0000  
MICHAEL B. BOND, 0000  
DENISE M. BONDS, 0000  
JAMES D. BONE, 0000  
CORINNE M. BONNER, 0000  
ERNEST L. BONNER, 0000  
ROBERT J. BONNER, 0000  
DANIEL R. BOORTZ, 0000  
WILLIAM P. BOOTH, 0000  
JASON R. BORCHERS, 0000  
PHILLIP G. BORN, 0000  
TIMOTHY J. BOS, 0000  
BRAD M. BOUDREAU, 0000  
JONATHAN P. BOULET, 0000  
MICHAEL A. BOWLBY, 0000  
BENJAMIN L. BOYD, 0000  
DAVID J. BOYD, 0000  
MICHAEL B. BYER, 0000  
JEFFREY D. BRACH, 0000  
KEVIN BRACKIN, 0000  
MATTHEW J. BRADLEY, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER P. BRADY, 0000  
AMANDA D. BRANDT, 0000  
MATTHEW L. BRANDT, 0000  
RICHARD W. BRANSON, 0000  
JEANNE M. BRASSEUR, 0000  
MARK F. BRAUN, 0000  
MARCUS D. BRAZELL, 0000  
JONATHAN H. BREINGAN, 0000  
MAXIMILIAN K. BREMER, 0000  
MATTHEW C. BRENNER, 0000  
JAMES E. BRICKNER, 0000  
TY C. BRIDGE, 0000  
SCOTT D. BRODEUR, 0000  
DANIEL N. BROOKER, 0000  
JERRY M. BROOKS, JR., 0000  
ANTHONY T. BROWN, 0000  
ANTHONY T. BROWN, 0000  
BRYAN D. BROWN, 0000  
DARIN T. BROWN, 0000  
JIMMY K. BROWN, 0000  
MARK BROWN, 0000  
MATTHEW T. BROWN, 0000  
MICHAEL L. BROWN, 0000  
RICHARD KEVIN BROWN, JR., 0000  
THOMAS W. BROWN, 0000  
SEONG M. BROWNELL, 0000  
DAVID F. BRUNK, 0000  
MICHELLE R. BRUNSWICK, 0000  
SCOTT A. BRYANT, 0000  
GEORGE M. BUCH, JR., 0000  
BARTON K. BUCHANAN, 0000  
WILLIAM A. BUCKINGHAM, 0000  
MATTHEW D. BUEHLER, 0000  
WADE A. BUHLER, 0000  
THOMAS R. BULTHAUS, 0000  
JASON B. BURCH, 0000  
TRACY K. BURGE, 0000  
JAMES E. BURGESS, 0000  
KIRSTEN G. BURGESS, 0000  
DANIEL C. BURTZ, 0000  
BENJAMIN C. BUSCH, 0000  
BRETT A. BUSH, 0000  
RICHARD E. BUSH, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER M. BUSQUE, 0000  
JAY E. BUTTERFIELD, 0000  
ALICIA M. BUTTON, 0000  
KENNETH B. BUTTREY, 0000  
BRENT S. BYWATER, 0000  
ROLAND I. CADIZ, 0000  
ANDREW C. CAGGIANO, 0000  
JEFFREY B. CAIN, 0000  
MONIPA C. CAINES, 0000  
ANTHONY M. CALABRESE, 0000  
VERONICA J. CALLIGAN, 0000  
CASEY A. CALLISTER, 0000  
JEFFREY A. CALVERT, 0000  
ANDREW J. CAMPBELL, 0000  
CHRISTINA M. CAMPBELL, 0000  
HARRIET L. CAMPBELL, 0000  
JASON S. CAMPBELL, 0000  
KIM N. CAMPBELL, 0000  
MICHAEL J. CAMPBELL, 0000  
ROBERT H. CAMPBELL, 0000  
RYAN A. CAMPBELL, 0000  
JOSEPH L. CAMPO, 0000  
JEAN L. CAMPS, 0000  
MICHAEL T. CANCELLARE, 0000  
RODOLFO T. CANCINO, JR., 0000  
STEVEN ANDREW CANN, 0000  
APRIL J. CANTWELL, 0000  
JOHN J. CAPLINGER, 0000  
ANTHONY R. CARAGAN, 0000  
ERNESTO J. CARCAMO, 0000  
RYAN K. CARIGNAN, 0000  
BRYAN C. CARLSON, 0000  
DAVID W. CARLSON, 0000  
MICHELLE C. CARNIS, 0000  
BETH ANN CARPENTER, 0000  
MARK D. CARPENTER, 0000  
ANTHONY B. CARR, 0000  
JAMES R. CARROLL, 0000  
JASON O. CARROLL, 0000  
JOHN M. CARROS, 0000  
DESMOND R. CARTER, 0000  
JEFFREY F. CARTER, 0000  
REBECCA H. L. CARTER, 0000  
RICHARD D. CARTER, JR., 0000  
ARTHUR D. CARTWRIGHT, 0000  
BRUCE A. CARVER, 0000  
RICHARD P. CARVER, 0000  
ALANA R. CASANOVA, 0000  
FRANCISCO CASANOVA, 0000  
SCOTT D. CASE, 0000  
BRANDON A. CASEY, 0000  
MICHAEL J. CASEY, 0000  
DAHNYELL M. CASI, 0000  
JASKA T. CASON, 0000  
RACHEL CASTELTON, 0000  
TAMMIE I. CATAZARO, 0000  
CHRISTINE A. CATRIB, 0000  
SEAN ANDREW L. CELL, 0000  
JASON R. CEMINSKY, 0000  
MARSHALL F. CHALVERUS, 0000  
MARK E. CHAMBERLIN, 0000  
JAMES I. CHAMBERS, 0000  
ROBERT V. CHAMBERS, 0000  
SIU FAT JOHN CHAN, 0000  
JEAN PAUL CHAUSSÉ, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER R. CHERRY, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER E. CHILDRESS, 0000  
JASON A. CHURCH, 0000  
MATTHEW E. CLAPP, 0000  
CHAD G. CLARK, 0000  
JASON T. CLARK, 0000  
JOSHUA D. CLARK, 0000  
MICHAEL A. CLARK, 0000  
RAFAEL C. CLARK, 0000  
SCOTT H. CLARK, 0000  
EDWARD G. CLARKE IV, 0000  
JENNIFER A. CLAVENNA, 0000  
WALTER CLAY, 0000  
DANIEL C. CLAYTON, 0000  
CHAD W. CLEMENTZ, 0000  
BRIAN M. CLIFFORD, 0000  
MARK B. CLIFFORD, 0000  
DORIS M. CLUFF, 0000  
ERIN C. CLUFF, 0000  
JESSICA L. CLUNE, 0000  
RICHARD R. COALSON, JR., 0000  
WILLIAM E. COBB, 0000  
BRADLEY L. COCHRAN, 0000  
STEVEN M. COCHRAN, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER D. CODDINGTON, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER S. CODY, 0000  
DANIEL J. COE, 0000  
MICHAEL A. COE, 0000  
RICHARD A. COE, 0000  
JEFFREY S. COHEN, 0000  
JOHNSTON A. COIL, 0000  
JAMIE C. COKER, 0000  
SEVERINE R. COLBORG, 0000  
CLAYTON J. COLE, 0000  
MATTHEW J. COLEMAN, 0000  
DENVER J. COLLINS, 0000  
JUSTIN K. COLLINS, 0000  
MICHAEL W. COLLINS, 0000  
ROBERTO R. COLON, 0000  
BENJAMIN D. CONDE, 0000  
AARON C. CONDEL, 0000  
SCOTT T. CONDIT, 0000  
RAY D. CONLEY, 0000  
RYAN T. CONSIDIE, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER M. CONSUEGRA, 0000  
ANNEMARIE CONTRERAS, 0000  
MATHEW A. CONTRERAS, 0000  
MICHAEL J. CONWAY, 0000  
BENJAMIN M. COOK, 0000  
THOMAS A. COOK, 0000  
MARCUS L. COOLEY, 0000  
DAMON G. COON, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER M. COOPER, 0000  
JEFFREY B. COOPER, 0000  
JOHN D. COOPER, 0000  
OMAR F. CORAL, 0000  
CHRISTIAN P. CORNETTE, 0000  
PAUL S. CORNWELL, 0000  
MARK H. CORRAO, 0000  
EDITH I. CORREAPEREZ, 0000  
ALEX CORTES, 0000  
SEAN J. COSDEN, 0000  
LAZARO M. COSTA, JR., 0000  
DAVID R. COTE, 0000  
KEVIN COUSIN, 0000  
AMY M. COX, 0000  
JOSEPH L. COX, 0000  
CYNTHIA C. COY, 0000  
DAVID P. COYLE, 0000  
BRIAN J. COYNE, 0000  
JEFFREY C. CRAIG, JR., 0000  
GREGORY F. CRAVEN, 0000  
ADRIANNA CREECH, 0000  
CHARLES T. CREECH, 0000  
JONATHAN M. CREER, 0000  
BRIAN E. CREIGHTON, 0000  
DOUGLAS O. CREVISTON, 0000  
JERRY L. CRIGGER, JR., 0000  
MATTHEW T. CRILL, 0000  
BRIAN G. CRUZ, 0000  
MIGUEL A. CRUZ, 0000  
FELIX J. CRUZMONTANEZ, 0000  
PATRICIA A. CSANK, 0000  
JEFFREY B. CUCUEL, 0000  
MAURICE G. CULLE, 0000  
LOUIS S. CUMMING, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER M. CUNNINGHAM, 0000  
MATTHEW T. CUNNINGHAM, 0000  
THORSTEN H. CURCIO, 0000  
SCOVILL W. CURRIN, 0000  
CAMERON M. CURRY, 0000  
ALEXANDER D. CURTIS, 0000  
ANN M. CURTIS, 0000  
BRIAN R. CUSSON, 0000  
GREGORY K. CYRUS, 0000  
JONATHAN M. DAGLEY, 0000  
LISA K. DAHL, 0000  
RYAN R. DAHL, 0000  
MICHAEL D. DAILEY, 0000  
CHADD M. DALBEC, 0000  
MARK A. DALY, 0000  
IZA Q. DAM, 0000  
MARK K. DANGER, 0000  
THOMAS D. DANIEL, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER C. DANIELS, 0000  
BART W. DARNELL, 0000  
KEVIN L. DAUGHERTY, 0000  
MICHAEL L. DAVID, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER J. DAVIS, 0000  
GREGORY A. DAVIS, 0000  
JONATHAN G. DAVIS, 0000  
MATTHEW L. DAVIS, 0000  
MICHAEL N. DAVIS, 0000  
MICHAEL P. DAVIS, 0000  
EDWARD W. DAWNS, 0000  
RICHARD O. DAY, 0000  
FREDERICK T. DEAKINS, 0000  
DARTAGNAN R. DEANDA, 0000  
JOEL R. DEBOER, 0000  
JAMES R. DEDONIC, 0000  
BRIAN A. DECENNARO, 0000  
KIRK A. DETTRICH, 0000  
RAMON CARLOS F. DEJESUS, 0000  
JOHN D. DELBARRIO, 0000  
ANTONIO C. DELELLO, 0000  
KORI M. DELWICHE, 0000  
DAVID W. DENGLER, 0000  
GAVIN W. DEPEW, 0000  
ANGELA C. DEREIX, 0000  
JOHN C. L. DEREIX, 0000  
ANDREW E. DEROSA, 0000  
MICHAEL L. DEROSA, 0000  
JAMES M. DETWEILER, 0000  
SCOTT A. DEVENISH, 0000  
WENDY A. DEVENISH, 0000  
JOHN W. DEVINCENZO, 0000  
ALEXANDER F. DEVOLE, 0000  
LEES DEWALL, JR., 0000  
BRIAN M. DEWITT, 0000  
KENNETH D. DEWLEN, 0000  
NICHOLL R. DIAZ, 0000  
ANTHONY DIAZ, 0000  
CHAD DIAZ, 0000  
JOEY L. DIBLE, 0000  
RICHARD R. DICKENS, 0000  
ROY A. DIETZMAN, 0000  
JASON T. DIGIACOMO, 0000  
JOHN M. DILLARD, 0000  
JOSEPH T. DILLIS, 0000

DAVID M. DINES, 0000  
 JOHN D. DISEBASTIAN, 0000  
 JOHN C. DOBBIN, 0000  
 TRAVIS G. DOKE, 0000  
 BERRETT J. DOMAN, 0000  
 MATTHEW R. DOMSALLA, 0000  
 JACK DONAHUE, JR., 0000  
 WILLIAM R. DONALDSON, 0000  
 COLIN P. DONNELLY, 0000  
 JEFFREY W. DONNITHORNE, 0000  
 JOEL A. DOPP, 0000  
 PHILIP C. DORSCH, 0000  
 EURETHA T. DOTSON, 0000  
 JASON D. DOTTER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER S. DOTUR, 0000  
 BALLARD SHERRYANN DOUGLAS, 0000  
 TYRONE D. DOUGLAS, 0000  
 DANIEL D. DOYLE, 0000  
 JAMES S. DOYLE, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. DROST, 0000  
 SCOTT B. DUBSKY, 0000  
 BRIAN T. DUFFY, 0000  
 SCOTT A. DUHAIME, 0000  
 JOHN E. DUKES, JR., 0000  
 CHARLES E. DUNAWAY, 0000  
 JOHN C. DUNCAN, 0000  
 JUSTIN H. DUNCAN, 0000  
 MAURICE L. DUNN, 0000  
 MICHAEL W. DUNN, 0000  
 MATTHEW F. DURKIN, 0000  
 BRADLEY S. DYER, 0000  
 JOHN M. DYER, 0000  
 JEROLD S. DYKE, 0000  
 MARNITA THOMPSON EADDIE, 0000  
 LEONARDUS S. EASON, 0000  
 MICHAEL T. EBNER, 0000  
 OCTAVIO F. ECHEVARRIA, 0000  
 JASON A. ECKBERG, 0000  
 BOND R. EDDY, 0000  
 CHARLES E. EDDY, 0000  
 CLARENCE L. EDER, 0000  
 ANITA M. EDMONDS, 0000  
 WILLIAM W. EDMUNDS III, 0000  
 GORDON T. EDWARDS III, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. EDWARDS, 0000  
 ROGER EFRIMSEN, 0000  
 MITZI L. EGGER, 0000  
 ERIC E. EIBE, 0000  
 JASON D. EICHHORST, 0000  
 JASON C. EISENREICH, 0000  
 CHRISTIAN G. ELENBAUM, 0000  
 JULIE ELIZABETH ELENBAUM, 0000  
 SEAN R. ELLARS, 0000  
 DAVID M. ELLIOTT, 0000  
 JEFFREY R. ELLIOTT, 0000  
 DAVID S. ELLIS, 0000  
 EDWARD J. ELLIS, 0000  
 HANS K. ELLISON, 0000  
 DARREN L. ELLISOR, 0000  
 BROCK B. EMBRY, 0000  
 DENISE B. EMERY, 0000  
 JOHN W. ENGLERT, 0000  
 JASON R. ENGLUND, 0000  
 ERIC W. ENSLEY, 0000  
 KEITH R. ENSOR, 0000  
 DAVID C. EPPERSON, 0000  
 LISA L. A. EPPERSON, 0000  
 KRISTOPHER J. EPPS, 0000  
 BRIAN F. ERB, 0000  
 RAYMOND R. ESCORPIZO, 0000  
 JOHN F. ESHMAN, JR., 0000  
 MICHELLE C. ESTES, 0000  
 GIOVANNI J. ESTRADA, 0000  
 MICKKEY R. EVANS, 0000  
 WILLIAM M. EVANS, JR., 0000  
 WILLIAM W. EVANS, JR., 0000  
 REESE D. EVERS, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. EYON, 0000  
 TODD R. EWY, 0000  
 BRAD D. EYCHNER, 0000  
 ERIC B. FAGERLAND, 0000  
 IAN M. FAIRCHILD, 0000  
 BRIAN J. FAIRWEATHER, 0000  
 NOLAN T. FAJOTA, 0000  
 JAWAD FAROOQ, 0000  
 TIMOTHY A. FARR, 0000  
 MARK T. FARRISH, 0000  
 JAMES M. FAUSEY, 0000  
 MATTHEW S. FEHRMAN, 0000  
 PETER P. FENG, 0000  
 KEVIN W. FENNO, 0000  
 IAIN D. M. FERGUSON, 0000  
 SONYA D. FERRERA, 0000  
 MARK A. FERRERO, 0000  
 MILA L. FESLER, 0000  
 MATTHEW U. FITZGER, 0000  
 JASON R. FICK, 0000  
 JEREMY A. FIELDS, 0000  
 ANTHONY S. FIGIERA, 0000  
 PAUL G. FILCEK, 0000  
 JAMES A. FINLAYSON, 0000  
 DANIEL M. FISCHER, 0000  
 QUINN R. FISCHER, 0000  
 KEITH K. FISHER, 0000  
 KENNETH A. FISHER, 0000  
 SCOTT V. FITZNER, 0000  
 RICHARD F. FLAMAND II, 0000  
 JONATHAN F. FLANDERS, 0000  
 JASON C. FLEMING, 0000  
 RANDY R. FLORES, 0000  
 JAY T. FLOTTMANN, 0000  
 THOMAS A. FLOWERS, 0000  
 DERRICK J. FLOYD, 0000  
 JOSEPH A. FLYNN, 0000  
 DANIELLE D. FOLSOM, 0000  
 NATHAN G. FORBES, 0000  
 BRYAN P. FORD, 0000  
 BENJAMIN D. FOREST, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER D. FORMAN, 0000  
 BYRON P. FORMWALT, 0000  
 BRET L. FORNELLIUS, 0000  
 MATTHEW G. FORSYTH, 0000  
 ROBERT J. FOSTER, 0000  
 TIMOTHY W. FOX, 0000  
 DERON L. FRAILIE, 0000  
 JAMES D. FRAILEY, 0000  
 JONATHAN J. FRAMPTON, 0000  
 STEPHEN R. FRANCE, 0000  
 ROBERT B. FRANCIS, 0000  
 JOANN K. FRANK, 0000  
 JOSEPH A. FRANKINO, 0000  
 GEORGE FRANKLIN, JR., 0000  
 JASON M. FRAZEE, 0000  
 GLEN A. FRAZIER, 0000  
 JERRY L. FRAZIER, 0000  
 KARL D. FREDERICK, 0000  
 TIMOTHY A. FREDERICK, JR., 0000  
 JULIE A. FREEDMAN, 0000  
 BRIAN K. FREEMAN, 0000  
 ERIC FREEMAN, 0000  
 PETER T. FREEMAN, 0000  
 ROBERT M. FREES, 0000  
 RAMONA D. FREIMUTH, 0000  
 JOEL P. FREYENHAGEN, 0000  
 LUCAS A. FRICKE, 0000  
 ERIC W. FRITH, 0000  
 HEATH W. FRYE, 0000  
 JEFF E. FUGATE, JR., 0000  
 JAMES G. FULKS, JR., 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER K. FULLER, 0000  
 JIMMY D. FULLER, 0000  
 ALISTAIR D. FUNGE, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. FURNESS, 0000  
 KEVIN D. GAEU, 0000  
 KRISTIN L. GALLOWAY, 0000  
 DOUGLAS S. GARAVANTA, 0000  
 GLENN D. GARAY, 0000  
 MARC J. GARCEAU, 0000  
 MARCOS GARCIA, JR., 0000  
 TIMOTHY L. GARMOR, 0000  
 ROGER J. GARNES, JR., 0000  
 CRAIG A. GARRETT, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. GARRETT, 0000  
 ROBERT E. GARRISON, 0000  
 CHARLES E. GATES, JR., 0000  
 JOSEPH M. GATES, 0000  
 ANGEL M. GAUD, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER A. GAY, 0000  
 F. SELWYN GAY III, 0000  
 SARAH J. GEIGER, 0000  
 CLAIR M. GEISHAUSER, 0000  
 KEITH S. GEMPLER, 0000  
 MATTHEW T. GENELIN, 0000  
 LEE G. GENTILE, JR., 0000  
 STEVEN T. GEOHAGAN, 0000  
 JEFFREY T. GERAGHTY, 0000  
 CHANCE W. GERAY, 0000  
 STEPHEN A. GERKEN, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. GERNEY, 0000  
 BORIS M. GERSHMAN, 0000  
 WALTER D. GIBBINS, 0000  
 DANE F. GIBSON, 0000  
 ERIC L. GIBSON, 0000  
 TODD C. GIGGY, 0000  
 COLLIN S. GILBERT, 0000  
 CRAIG M. GILES, 0000  
 MICHELE A. GILL, 0000  
 GREGORY W. GILLELAND, 0000  
 RODNEY A. GILLEN, 0000  
 BRADLEY C. GILLEY, 0000  
 KOUJIP. GILLIS, 0000  
 DAVID W. GILMORE, 0000  
 BRIAN D. GILPATRICK, 0000  
 JASON R. GINN, 0000  
 MATTHEW J. GINNATY, 0000  
 CHERY E. GITTENS, 0000  
 JON E. GIULIETTI, 0000  
 FRANK J. GLAVIC, 0000  
 MATTHEW G. GLEN, 0000  
 JENNIFER S. GOLDTHWAITE, 0000  
 JOSEPH R. GOLEMBIEWSKI, 0000  
 KEVEN J. GOLLA, 0000  
 CESSAR GONZALEZ, 0000  
 ERIC H. GONZALEZ, 0000  
 FRANCISCO R. GONZALEZ, JR., 0000  
 KIMBERLY A. GONZALEZ, 0000  
 REYNALDO GONZALEZ, JR., 0000  
 BRETT J. GOODEN, 0000  
 LAURA G. GOODMAN, 0000  
 MATTHEW G. GOODMAN, 0000  
 MICHAEL C. GOODMAN, 0000  
 RICHARD A. GOODMAN, 0000  
 SCOTT A. GOODMAN, 0000  
 STEVEN T. GRACE, 0000  
 BRYAN L. GRADY, 0000  
 ALLEN GRADNIGO, JR., 0000  
 LYMAN D. GRAHAM III, 0000  
 JOHN M. GRAVER, 0000  
 KEVIN C. GREEN, JR., 0000  
 MARSHAL W. GREEN, 0000  
 MELVIN D. GREEN III, 0000  
 PATRICK W. GREENLEAF, 0000  
 RICHARD J. GREENMAN, 0000  
 CHADWICK D. GREER, 0000  
 AIMEE N. GREGG, 0000  
 NICHOLAS H. GREGOR, 0000  
 KAREN J. GREGORY, 0000  
 LESTER M. GREGORY, 0000  
 CHAD G. GREINER, 0000  
 JOHN C. GREVEN, 0000  
 BRYAN T. GRIFFITH, 0000  
 ANDREW C. GRIGGS, 0000  
 BRENT W. GRIME, 0000  
 MATTHEW M. GROLEAU, 0000  
 DANIEL L. GROSS, 0000  
 MATTHEW J. GROSSEN, 0000  
 TERRY L. GROSSEHMIG, 0000  
 ROBERT E. GROVER, 0000  
 PETER J. GRYZEN, 0000  
 MARK D. GUILLORY, 0000  
 JAMES R. GUMP, 0000  
 CYNTHIA L. GUNDERSON, 0000  
 SEAN K. GUSTAFSON, 0000  
 LEE C. GUTHRIE, 0000  
 BRIAN L. GYOVAI, 0000  
 RYAN E. HADEN, 0000  
 MARK R. HADLEY, 0000  
 SHAWN D. HAGAN, 0000  
 SAUL D. HAGE, 0000  
 JAMES A. HAGEMAN, 0000  
 ANDREA M. HAGEN, 0000  
 GUY R. HAGEN, 0000  
 PAUL HAJDU, 0000  
 TIMOTHY D. HALE, 0000  
 NOELLE D. HALL, 0000  
 SHANE N. HALL, 0000  
 BRENDAN L. HALLORAN, 0000  
 NICHOLAS A. HALUPKA, 0000  
 TODD M. HALVERSON, 0000  
 BRIDGET V. HAMACHER, 0000  
 SHANE J. HAMACHER, 0000  
 JEFFREY A. HAMLIN, 0000  
 WILLIAM R. HAMILL, 0000  
 JOHN W. HAMILTON, 0000  
 PAUL T. HAMILTON, 0000  
 WILLIAM H. HAMILTON III, 0000  
 JAMES M. HAMMA, 0000  
 DAVID K. HAMMER, 0000  
 DAVID A. HAMMERSCHMIDT, 0000  
 RAY C. HAMMOND, JR., 0000  
 PATRICIA L. HAMRICK, 0000  
 THOMAS W. HANCOCK, 0000  
 MATTHEW C. HANDLEY, 0000  
 RAYMOND F. HANDBRICH, 0000  
 GAGE E. HANDEY, 0000  
 TIMOTHY P. HANEY, 0000  
 CHARLES D. HANCKS, 0000  
 CORY M. HANNA, 0000  
 ROBERT L. HANOVICH, JR., 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER F. HANSEN, 0000  
 TRACY R. HARDISON, 0000  
 BRYCE R. HARDY, 0000  
 JACK F. HARMAN, 0000  
 LEWIS B. HARPER, JR., 0000  
 CHAD MARTIN HARRIS, 0000  
 DANIEL A. HARRIS, 0000  
 MICHAEL B. HARRIS, 0000  
 NICHOLE M. HARRIS, 0000  
 TAMMIE L. HARRIS, 0000  
 DARYL D. HART, 0000  
 ERIC C. HARTEN, 0000  
 JOHN P. HARTIGAN III, 0000  
 JAMES HARTMETZ, 0000  
 STEPHEN M. HARVEY, 0000  
 WILLIAM P. HARVEY, 0000  
 ERIC S. HASSINGER, 0000  
 TRAVIS J. HAWKER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER S. HAWKINS, 0000  
 JOHN W. HAWKINS, JR., 0000  
 BRIAN C. HAYNES, 0000  
 KYLE B. HEAD, 0000  
 NATHAN J. HEALY, 0000  
 JEREMIAH S. HEATHMAN, 0000  
 MARK D. HEDDEN, 0000  
 ERIC J. HEDENBERG, 0000  
 RICHELLE M. HEFLIN, 0000  
 DEREK B. HELF, 0000  
 DAVID O. HEIST, 0000  
 FRANK HELLSTERN, JR., 0000  
 JEFFREY M. HEMMES, 0000  
 KEITH T. HENDERLONG, 0000  
 BRYAN S. HENDERSON, 0000  
 RONALD E. HENDERSON, 0000  
 MATTHEW S. HENRY, 0000  
 TRAVIS W. HERBELIN, 0000  
 KRISTIN KOBARG HERDER, 0000  
 MATTHEW L. HERDER, 0000  
 JOSEPH E. HERNANDEZ, 0000  
 RENE D. HERNANDEZ, 0000  
 TIMOTHY A. HERRITAGE, 0000  
 WENDELL S. HERTZELLE, 0000  
 IVAN M. HERWICK, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. HESSE, 0000  
 IAN R. HESPER, 0000  
 JERRY R. HICKY, 0000  
 CLIFTON L. HICKS, 0000  
 JAMES T. HICKS, 0000  
 JOHN G. HIGBY, 0000  
 MATTHEW K. HIGGINS, 0000  
 PATRICK N. HILGENDORF, 0000  
 DANIEL R. HILL, 0000  
 ERIN R. HILLBAND, 0000  
 KRISS K. HINDERS, 0000  
 MATTHEW D. HINKLE, 0000  
 CRAIG W. HINKLEY, 0000  
 BENJAMIN D. HINTON, 0000  
 MISTY A. HITCHCOCK, 0000  
 RYAN D. HOBERT, 0000  
 CRAIG A. HODGES, 0000  
 FREDERICK R. HOESCHLER, 0000  
 PAIGE D. HOPFART, 0000  
 KATHERINE F. HOFFMEYER, 0000  
 MICHAEL R. HOGSED, 0000  
 JASON T. HOKAJ, 0000  
 JESSICA D. HOLLINGER, 0000  
 FRED M. HOLLINGSWORTH, 0000  
 SLOAN L. HOLLIS, 0000  
 BENJAMIN A. HOLLG, 0000  
 MARK A. HOLMES, 0000  
 JOHN E. HOLOVICH, SR., 0000  
 DAWN M. HOLRATH, 0000

JOHN C. HOLT, 0000  
 AUSTIN LINNELL HOLTHAUS, 0000  
 WILLIAM D. HOLYFIELD, 0000  
 JAMES D. HOOD, 0000  
 DAVID B. HOOTEN, 0000  
 AARON M. HOPPER, 0000  
 SCOTT M. HOPPER, 0000  
 MATTHEW E. HORIN, 0000  
 BETH K. HORINE, 0000  
 MICHAEL G. HORLBECK, 0000  
 FRANCISCO M. HORNSBY, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. HOROWITZ, 0000  
 MARK A. HORTON, 0000  
 ERIC W. HOSAFROS, 0000  
 BRANDT L. HOUSE, 0000  
 ROBERT C. HOUSTON, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. HOWARD, 0000  
 NATHAN R. HOWARD, 0000  
 DENNIS H. HOWELL, 0000  
 GASPAR B. HOWELL, 0000  
 HELEN J. HOWELL, 0000  
 WILLIAM J. HOWERY, 0000  
 CHARLES A. HUBER, 0000  
 KATHLEEN S. HUBSCHER, 0000  
 RYAN J. HUCKABAY, 0000  
 COLIN R. HUCKINS, 0000  
 MARK L. HUDNALL, 0000  
 BRIAN M. HUEATHER, 0000  
 FRANCIS RICHARD HUGHES, 0000  
 KIRK HUGHES, 0000  
 MICHAEL E. HUGHES, 0000  
 ERIC M. HUISKENS, 0000  
 SARA M. HUISS, 0000  
 CAELI A. HULL, 0000  
 JASON I. HUMBLE, 0000  
 HEATHER M. HUNN, 0000  
 JESSE W. HUNT, 0000  
 WILLIAM H. HUNTER, 0000  
 ANDREW B. HUNTOON, 0000  
 KYLE R. HURWITZ, 0000  
 STEPHEN H. HUTCHINSON, 0000  
 PAUL A. HUTCHISON, 0000  
 WAYNE R. HUTCHISON, 0000  
 COURTNEY C. HUTT, 0000  
 JAY E. HUTZELL, 0000  
 ROSS G. IACOMINI, 0000  
 PAUL R. IHRIG, 0000  
 JASON A. ILG, 0000  
 DAMON A. INGRAM, 0000  
 DREW M. IRMISCHER, 0000  
 BURNETT K. ISENBERG II, 0000  
 TODD A. IVENER, 0000  
 MICHELLE L. IVERY, 0000  
 ANDREAS H. IX, 0000  
 SWAMINATHAN B. IYER, 0000  
 DENNIS E. JACK, 0000  
 THEOPHILUS D. JACKMAN, 0000  
 CLAYTON F. JACKSON, 0000  
 DOUGLAS D. JACKSON, 0000  
 HANK D. JACKSON, 0000  
 PATRICK A. JACKSON, 0000  
 ROBERT J. JACKSON, 0000  
 SARAH E. JACKSON, 0000  
 JIMMY T. JACOBSON, 0000  
 JOHN M. JACOBUS, 0000  
 PIOTR R. JAHOLKOWSKI, 0000  
 MICHAEL L. JAMES, 0000  
 MICHAEL B. JAMOOM, 0000  
 STEPHANIE A. JARDINE, 0000  
 KEITH A. JASMIN, 0000  
 BERT B. JEAN, 0000  
 COTINA R. JENKINS, 0000  
 CHAD W. JENNINGS, 0000  
 JAMES A. JERNIGAN, 0000  
 DERYK W. JETER, 0000  
 JAMES W. JETER III, 0000  
 ANDREW M. JETT, 0000  
 DAVID B. JOERRES, 0000  
 FELIX S. JOHNFINS, 0000  
 ANDRE T. JOHNSON, 0000  
 ANGELA L. JOHNSON, 0000  
 CARL D. JOHNSON, 0000  
 DAVID A. JOHNSON, 0000  
 ERIC A. JOHNSON, 0000  
 GREGG S. JOHNSON, 0000  
 JARED M. JOHNSON, 0000  
 JASON D. JOHNSON, 0000  
 KEITH C. JOHNSON, 0000  
 LEIGH C. JOHNSON, 0000  
 MAX E. JOHNSON, 0000  
 MITCHELL R. JOHNSON, 0000  
 OLIVER R. JOHNSON, JR., 0000  
 SCOTT E. JOHNSON, 0000  
 THOMAS E. JOHNSON, JR., 0000  
 CHARLES E. JONES, 0000  
 HUNTER KENT JONES, 0000  
 JASON L. JONES, 0000  
 JEREMY L. JONES, 0000  
 KEVIN T. JONES, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. JONES, 0000  
 TIMOTHY L. JONES, 0000  
 TIMOTHY L. JONES, 0000  
 TIMOTHY L. JONES, 0000  
 GARDNER J. JOYNER, 0000  
 LORENA M. JUAREZ, 0000  
 LAMONT A. JUBECK, 0000  
 JENNIFER S. JUDD, 0000  
 MICHAEL P. JULATON, 0000  
 ANDREW L. JULSON, 0000  
 NED JUNE, 0000  
 BRIAN W. KABAT, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER J. KADALA, 0000  
 THOMAS D. KANAK III, 0000  
 STEVEN M. KATSARIS, 0000  
 RICHARD A. KATTAU, 0000  
 SONYA K. KAUFFMAN, 0000  
 KENNETH R. KAUFF, 0000

CHRISTOPHER S. KAY, 0000  
 DAVID MICHAEL KAZISKA, 0000  
 SEAN R. KEAVENEY, 0000  
 DUSTIN D. KECK, 0000  
 LOREN D. KEENAN, 0000  
 JASON E. KEENEY, 0000  
 RYAN P. KEENEY, 0000  
 KEVIN D. KEICHER, 0000  
 GEORGE R. KEITH, 0000  
 STEPHANIE R. KELLEY, 0000  
 IAN W. KEMP, 0000  
 ALBERT A. KENNEDY, 0000  
 DONALD R. KENNEDY, 0000  
 KELLIE LYNN KENT, 0000  
 GRAHAM G. KEPFER, 0000  
 SEAN M. KERRIGAN, 0000  
 DIMITRI KESI, 0000  
 JANETTE D. KETCHUM, 0000  
 STEVEN A. KETCHUM, 0000  
 SHARIFUL M. KHAN, 0000  
 KORY E. KHOURY, 0000  
 ADAM J. KIEDA, 0000  
 PATRICK D. KIELB, 0000  
 TREVOR M. KILDARE, 0000  
 KEVIN S. KIM, 0000  
 TREVOR G. KIMBAL, 0000  
 ROBIN D. KIMBROUGH, 0000  
 MICHAEL D. KING, 0000  
 RONALD J. KING, 0000  
 MIA P. KINSEY, 0000  
 JESSE A. KIRSTEIN, 0000  
 SEAN H. KISSINGER, 0000  
 CHARLES KISTLER, 0000  
 BRYAN M. KITCHIN, 0000  
 MICHAEL E. KLAPMEYER, 0000  
 DAIN O. KLEIV, 0000  
 JEFFERY W. KLEMSTINE, 0000  
 RICHARD E. KLETSCSKA, 0000  
 KYLE W. KLOECKNER, 0000  
 ERIK J. KNAUFF, 0000  
 BRIAN M. KNIGHT, 0000  
 TODD T. KNIGHT, 0000  
 CANYON D. KNOP, 0000  
 ROBERT G. KNOWLTON, 0000  
 CHAD R. KOBIELUSH, 0000  
 JAMES A. KODAT, 0000  
 ANDREW J. KOEGL, 0000  
 KEVIN M. KOENIG, 0000  
 JAY K. KOETTITZ, 0000  
 DAVID A. KOEWLER, 0000  
 DONNA LYNN KOHOUT, 0000  
 STEVEN O. KOHUT, 0000  
 DALE A. KOLOMAZNIK, 0000  
 THOMAS A. KOORY, 0000  
 BRAD J. KORNRICH, 0000  
 JOHN R. KORSEDAL IV, 0000  
 KYLE R. KORVER, 0000  
 JOHN M. KOS, 0000  
 KEVIN R. KOTULA, 0000  
 JEFFREY J. KOTZ, 0000  
 MICHAEL KOWAL, 0000  
 GREG W. KOZBINSKI, 0000  
 TAYLOR E. KRENKEL, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER D. KRETSINGER, 0000  
 STACY A. KRUEZIGER, 0000  
 DENNIS J. KRILL, JR., 0000  
 GREGORY J. KRINO, 0000  
 SEAN A. KROLIKOWSKI, 0000  
 JACOB E. KROFOG, 0000  
 KEVIN W. KRSUL, 0000  
 JOHN S. KRUCZYNSKI, 0000  
 CHERISH L. KRUTIL, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER J. KUDLACZ, 0000  
 TIMOTHY P. KUEHNE, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. KUESTER, 0000  
 JEFFREY D. KUHN, 0000  
 COLBY J. KUHN, 0000  
 JAE H. KWAK, 0000  
 SAMUEL KWAN, 0000  
 MELISSA M. LACEY, 0000  
 HEATHER A. LADD, 0000  
 TODD J. LAFORTUNE, 0000  
 BRIAN S. LAIDLAW, 0000  
 DAVID J. LAIRD, 0000  
 TOM C. LATTINEN, 0000  
 JEFF A. LANGOUR, 0000  
 JAMES B. LANDERS, 0000  
 PERRY D. LANDRUM, 0000  
 FRANK P. LANDRY III, 0000  
 KALLIROI LAGONIK LANDRY, 0000  
 NEWSPELL LANEY, JR., 0000  
 MARC A. LANGOHR, 0000  
 SCOTT E. LANIS, 0000  
 THOMAS S. LANKFORD, 0000  
 JOHN B. LANTZ, 0000  
 BRIAN P. LANZIERI, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER LAPIETRA, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER J. LARDNER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER LARKIN, 0000  
 SCOTT G. LAROCHE, 0000  
 AARON J. LAROSE, 0000  
 PETER L. LARSEN, 0000  
 PETER S. LASCH, 0000  
 WILLIAM S. LATIMER, 0000  
 OLIN O. LAU, 0000  
 ANDREW S. LAUER, 0000  
 RICHARD F. LAUER, 0000  
 JASON E. LAUTECH, 0000  
 JUSTIN W. LAWADOUR, 0000  
 BARRY J. LAWLOR, 0000  
 ANDREW G. LAWRENCE, 0000  
 MICHAEL P. LAWRENCE, 0000  
 PAUL R. LAWRENZ, 0000  
 BRIAN W. LEBENZ, 0000  
 ANGELA C. LECHOWICK, 0000  
 BRYAN K. LEE, 0000  
 CHRISTY N. LEE, 0000

JAMES LEE, 0000  
 ROBERT A. LEE, 0000  
 THOMAS LEE, 0000  
 THOMAS S. LEE, 0000  
 JONATHAN W. LEFFLER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER J. LEONARD, 0000  
 NICHOLAS J. LEONELLI, 0000  
 KELLY K. LEUNING, 0000  
 WARDELL G. LEVY, 0000  
 MATTHEW E. LEWIN, 0000  
 DANIELLE M. LEWIS, 0000  
 GREGORY R. LEWIS, 0000  
 MARK C. LEWIS, 0000  
 MICHAEL M. LEWIS, 0000  
 TRAVIS W. LEWIS, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER A. LI, 0000  
 CHRISTIAN F. LICHTER, 0000  
 KATHERINE A. E. LILLY, 0000  
 C. EVERETT LILYA, 0000  
 MICHAEL E. LIM, 0000  
 ANDREW W. LIND, 0000  
 AARON T. LINDERMAN, 0000  
 STEVEN A. LINDQUIST, 0000  
 STEPHEN B. LINDSEY, 0000  
 CHRISTIAN J. LINGENFELDER, 0000  
 SCOTT E. LINTNER, 0000  
 ANDREW J. LIPINA, 0000  
 ERIC R. LIPP, 0000  
 JOHN E. LITTECKY, 0000  
 SAMUEL A. LITTLE, 0000  
 BRADLEY M. LITTLETON, 0000  
 JEREMY E. LLOYD, 0000  
 ANDRE M. LOBO, 0000  
 JOHN C. LOFTON III, 0000  
 LUKE S. LOKOWICH, 0000  
 HOWARD S. LOLLER, 0000  
 FRANCES K. LOMINACK, 0000  
 JASON T. LONG, 0000  
 JESSE R. LONG, 0000  
 MARK L. LONG, 0000  
 MATTHEW J. LONG, 0000  
 ROBERT A. LONG, 0000  
 ROBERT F. LONG, 0000  
 VALARIE A. LOPEZ, 0000  
 DAVE A. LOPEZ, 0000  
 GABRIEL N. LOPEZ, 0000  
 HECTOR G. LOPEZ, 0000  
 JASON B. LOTT, 0000  
 CHARLES T. LOVE, JR., 0000  
 JAMES R. LOVEWELL, 0000  
 TAMMY K. C. LOW, 0000  
 DONALD C. LOWE, 0000  
 GREGORY B. LOWE, 0000  
 KATE W. LOWE, 0000  
 SEAN E. LOWIE, 0000  
 WILLIAM E. LOWERY, 0000  
 JAMES C. LOZIER, 0000  
 TIMOTHY M. LUCAS, 0000  
 AARON P. LUMPKIN, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. LUTERZO, 0000  
 ALBERTO LUYANDO III, 0000  
 JESSICA M. LUYANDO, 0000  
 ROB S. LUZADER, 0000  
 BONAR A. LUZEY, 0000  
 ROBERT E. LYMAN, 0000  
 PHILIP W. LYNCH, 0000  
 SCOTT D. LYNCH, 0000  
 SHARON I. LYNN, 0000  
 DAVID C. LYONS, 0000  
 HEATHER A. LYONS, 0000  
 RICHARD R. I. MACALINO, 0000  
 JAMES C. MACH, JR., 0000  
 JANIS L. MACK, 0000  
 RICHARD R. MADER, 0000  
 SHAD E. MAGANN, 0000  
 LISA J. MAHON, 0000  
 KENNETH P. MAIN, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. MAKSYMOWICZ, 0000  
 CALEB ANDREW MALCOLM, 0000  
 ROBERTO MALDONADO, JR., 0000  
 JAMES L. MALEC, JR., 0000  
 MARSHALL G. MALHOT, 0000  
 LEO P. MANAHL, 0000  
 DANIEL J. MANGAN, 0000  
 RUSTIN K. MANGUM, 0000  
 IAN R. MANIRE, 0000  
 JAMES R. MANSARD, 0000  
 PATRICK J. MARTEUFEL, 0000  
 GEDEON H. MARIAM, 0000  
 JASON E. MARINO, 0000  
 ERIN M. MARKWITH, 0000  
 LOUIS J. MARNELL III, 0000  
 NICHOLAS J. MAROTTA, 0000  
 EDWARD F. MARQUEZ, JR., 0000  
 ROBERT L. MARSH, 0000  
 JOHN J. MARSHALL, 0000  
 RALPH D. MARSHALL II, 0000  
 WILLIAM L. MARSHALL, 0000  
 ANDREW L. MARTIN, 0000  
 ANDREW F. MARTIN, 0000  
 DOMINICK J. MARTIN, 0000  
 JASON S. MARTIN, 0000  
 JIM E. MARTIN, 0000  
 KEVIN C. MARTIN, 0000  
 KYLE R. MARTIN, 0000  
 WILLIAM R. MARTIN II, 0000  
 ALFRED R. MARTINEZ, 0000  
 MELCHIZEDEK T. MARTINEZ, 0000  
 RAUL MARTINEZ, 0000  
 RENE A. MARTINEZ, 0000  
 RUBEN MARTINEZ, 0000  
 DEREK P. MARVEL, 0000  
 JASON L. MASSIOLI, 0000  
 ROBERT L. MASSON, JR., 0000  
 CONNIE M. MASSEY, 0000  
 BRADFORD J. MATE, 0000  
 STEVEN S. MATHIS, 0000

THOMAS S. MATHIS, 0000  
 PEDRO ENRIQUE MATOS, 0000  
 CHARLES P. MATTINGLY, 0000  
 JASON M. MATYAS, 0000  
 CHRISTINE MAU, 0000  
 JAMES E. MAUNZ, 0000  
 MELVIN E. MAXWELL, JR., 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. MAY, 0000  
 DAVID J. MAY, 0000  
 DAVID W. MAY, 0000  
 MARLYS M. MAY, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. MAY, 0000  
 PAUL J. MAYKISH, 0000  
 MIKE MCALEENAN, 0000  
 MATTHEW W. MCANDREW, 0000  
 ROBERT K. MCCABE, 0000  
 WILLIAM E. MCCALLISTER, 0000  
 ROBERT F. MCCALLUM, 0000  
 RICKEY G. MCCANN, JR., 0000  
 KEVIN P. MCCARTHY, 0000  
 RONALD D. MCCARTY, 0000  
 DAVID M. MCCOY, 0000  
 GARRETT E. MCCOY, 0000  
 MICHAEL T. MCCOY, 0000  
 SCOTT A. MCCOY, 0000  
 NEIL P. MCCrackEN, 0000  
 PAUL G. MCCROSKY II, 0000  
 RICHARD A. MCCURDY, 0000  
 JASON D. MCCURRY, 0000  
 DOUGLAS B. MCDANIEL, 0000  
 ERIN S. MCDONALD, 0000  
 JAYSON M. MCDONALD, 0000  
 CHARLES A. MCELVAINE, 0000  
 VIVIAN R. K. MCFETERS, 0000  
 SHAWN P. MCGHEE, 0000  
 RICHARD E. MCGLAMORY, 0000  
 JAMES S. MCGREW, 0000  
 SCOTT E. MCINTOSH, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. MCKEE, 0000  
 DANIEL J. MCKELLER, 0000  
 THOMAS P. MCKINNIS, 0000  
 DANIEL J. MCLAGAN, 0000  
 MARJORIE K. W. MCLAGAN, 0000  
 WILBURN B. MCLAMB, 0000  
 SUZANNE G. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000  
 RICHARD F. MCMULLEN, 0000  
 SCOTT A. MEAKIN, 0000  
 JEFFREY S. MEANS, 0000  
 GARY W. MEARS, 0000  
 JOSEPH J. MEAUX III, 0000  
 JASON R. MEDINA, 0000  
 ERIN P. MEINDERS, 0000  
 ROBERT J. MEISTER, 0000  
 ESPRITO D. MILLER, 0000  
 APRIL D. MENCH, 0000  
 RICHARD MICHAEL MENCH, JR., 0000  
 EDWARD V. MENDONES, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER MERCENDETTI, 0000  
 DONALD E. MERCER, 0000  
 GLEN A. MERCIER, 0000  
 LARRY D. MERCIER, JR., 0000  
 ROGER R. MESSER, 0000  
 WILLIAM M. B. METZ, 0000  
 HEATHER K. MEYER, 0000  
 JOSEPH R. MEYER, 0000  
 TRINIDAD K. MEZA, 0000  
 ALARIC T. MICHAELIS, 0000  
 MATTHEW E. MIDDLETON, 0000  
 THAD R. MIDDLETON, 0000  
 MICHAEL V. MILLER, 0000  
 DOUGLAS R. MILLER, 0000  
 KENNETH S. MILLER, 0000  
 MARC A. MILLER, 0000  
 WENDY J. MILLER, 0000  
 DAVID MILLS, 0000  
 JASON T. MILLS, 0000  
 DAVID M. MILNER, 0000  
 KYLE A. MINARIK, 0000  
 SCOTT C. MINAS, 0000  
 ANTHONY MINCEI, 0000  
 DWIGHT D. MINNICK, 0000  
 KEVIN V. MINOR, 0000  
 ANTHONY L. MIRANDA, 0000  
 HEATHER L. MITCHELL, 0000  
 MORGAN W. MITCHELL, 0000  
 MIRCEA A. MITRAN, 0000  
 CRAIG D. MOE, 0000  
 SHANE M. MOLOSKY, 0000  
 SEAN R. MONTEIRO, 0000  
 JEFF RYAN MONTGOMERY, 0000  
 MELISSA MOONBROWN, 0000  
 JASON R. MOONEY, 0000  
 APRIL A. MOORE, 0000  
 BRIAN D. MOORE, 0000  
 CRAIG A. MOORE, 0000  
 EUGENE A. MOORE III, 0000  
 SUZANNA J. MOORE, 0000  
 ANTONIO J. MORALES, 0000  
 JANELLE S. MORAN, 0000  
 CHARLES F. MORGAN, 0000  
 DAVID E. MORGAN, 0000  
 ERIC E. MORGAN, 0000  
 STEVEN W. MORITZ, 0000  
 MICHAEL C. MORMAN, 0000  
 ROSS C. MORRELL, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER B. MORRIS, 0000  
 JASON L. MORRIS, 0000  
 MARC O. MORRIS, 0000  
 DANIEL A. MORRISSEY, 0000  
 MATTHEW B. MORRISON, 0000  
 SANDRA R. MORROW, 0000  
 MICHAEL D. MOWRY, 0000  
 LEON H. MUELLEN, JR., 0000  
 RICHARD D. MUELLER, 0000  
 GERALD C. MULHOLEN, JR., 0000  
 JUSTIN A. MULKEY, 0000  
 GREGORY M. MULLER, 0000

DERCK J. MULLIN, 0000  
 KENNETH D. MULLINS, 0000  
 BRIAN R. MULLOY, 0000  
 ANTONIO MUNOZ, JR., 0000  
 MONTE T. MUNOZ, 0000  
 DANIEL J. MUNTER, 0000  
 DIZZY B. MURPHY, 0000  
 ERIC M. MURPHY, 0000  
 TAMARA C. MURPHY, 0000  
 JESSE L. MURRAY, 0000  
 SCOTT M. MURRAY, 0000  
 YIRA Y. MUSE, 0000  
 DARRELL A. MYERS, 0000  
 DERON R. MYERS, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. NAGY, 0000  
 ANTHONY M. NANCE, 0000  
 JOSH D. NASSEF, 0000  
 TODD A. NATHANIEL, 0000  
 KEVIN R. NATIONS, 0000  
 GUY A. NAVARRO, JR., 0000  
 RANDY S. NAYLOR, 0000  
 JULIO A. NEGRON, 0000  
 BRYAN PAUL NELSON, 0000  
 JEFFREY W. NELSON, 0000  
 KEITH L. NELSON, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. NELSON, JR., 0000  
 MICHAEL L. NELSON, 0000  
 TRAVIS C. NELSON, 0000  
 MARK C. NEMISH, 0000  
 VICTORIA L. NEMMERS, 0000  
 JOHN W. NEPTUNE, 0000  
 TODD J. NERLIN, 0000  
 DAVID A. NEWBERRY, 0000  
 STUART WESTON NEWBERRY, 0000  
 JOHN P. NEWBILL, 0000  
 CUONG T. NGUYEN, 0000  
 TINA H. NGUYEN, 0000  
 TUAN A. NGUYEN, 0000  
 MARCUS W. NICHOLS, 0000  
 THOMAS A. NIDAY, 0000  
 JASON R. NIELSEN, 0000  
 CRAIG M. NIEMAN, 0000  
 ALBERT NIEVES, 0000  
 ROSE M. NIKOVITS, 0000  
 GREGORY W. NIT, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. NOCHE, 0000  
 MICAH NODINE, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. NOLAN, 0000  
 JOEL C. NONNWEILER, 0000  
 AARON C. NORRIS, 0000  
 BRIAN P. NOWINSKI, 0000  
 LEO M. NOYES, 0000  
 JEREMY B. NYGREN, 0000  
 ROBERT K. OAKES III, 0000  
 ROY H. OBERHAUS, 0000  
 WILLIAM P. OBRIEN, 0000  
 BRIAN D. OCONNELL, 0000  
 ROBERT N. ODOM, 0000  
 HUGH M. O'DONNELL, 0000  
 WILLIAM J. O'DONNELL III, 0000  
 DEVIN O. ODOWD, 0000  
 FRANK C. O'FEARNA, 0000  
 TIMOTHY R. O'HARA, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. OHLMEYER, 0000  
 MATTHEW S. OHORO, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. OLSEN, 0000  
 JOSHUA M. OLSON, 0000  
 MATTHEW L. OLSON, 0000  
 ELIZABETH A. O'MALLEY, 0000  
 SCOTT A. O'MALLEY, 0000  
 BRIAN P. ONEILL, 0000  
 RICHARD M. OPPERHALL, 0000  
 MATTHEW M. ORLOWSKY, 0000  
 PATRICK J. OROURKE, 0000  
 SCOTT A. ORR, 0000  
 DAVID A. ORSCHHELL, 0000  
 JAY A. ORSON, 0000  
 STEVEN H. OSBORNE, 0000  
 ENRIQUE A. OTI, 0000  
 NATHANIEL B. OTT, 0000  
 OAHM M. OVIEDO, 0000  
 DAVID B. OWEN, 0000  
 JAMES P. OWEN, 0000  
 JOSHUA G. PACEY, 0000  
 MILKO R. PADILLA, 0000  
 DAVID A. PAFFORD, 0000  
 THOMAS P. PAGANO, 0000  
 KIRK C. PALMBERG, 0000  
 TIMOTHY C. PALMER, 0000  
 DAMIAN D. PANAJIA, 0000  
 DAVID A. PAPINEAU, 0000  
 JASON C. PARISSO, 0000  
 ROBERT M. PARKER, 0000  
 TARA S. PARKER, 0000  
 MICHAEL B. PARKS, 0000  
 RUSSELL B. PARRAMORE, 0000  
 RAYMOND G. PARTLOW, 0000  
 YORK W. PASANEN, 0000  
 WILLIAM P. PASTEWAIT, 0000  
 ANDREW E. PATE, 0000  
 KAREN STEWART PATRICK, 0000  
 DAVID K. PATTERSON, 0000  
 DAVID S. PATTERSON, 0000  
 TRACY W. PATTERSON, 0000  
 DOUGLAS C. PATTON, 0000  
 JEFFREY M. PAUL, 0000  
 JASON P. PAVELCHAK, 0000  
 BRICK G. PAXTON, 0000  
 HERMAN C. PAYNE, 0000  
 HERMAN M. PAYNE, 0000  
 ROBERT E. PEACOCK, 0000  
 GEORGE A. PEASANT, 0000  
 DAVID R. PECK, 0000  
 KENNETH E. PEDERSEN, 0000  
 HARLAND F. PELLE, 0000  
 BRIAN R. PEETE, 0000  
 ROBERT K. PEKAREK, 0000

ANTHONY J. PELKINGTON, 0000  
 DANIEL T. PEMPEL, 0000  
 DAVID PENA, 0000  
 AARON D. PEPKOWITZ, 0000  
 DAVID P. PEPPER, 0000  
 JEFFREY D. PERCY, 0000  
 MATTHEW J. PERE, 0000  
 ELEANOR S. PEREDO, 0000  
 VICTOR M. PEREIRA, 0000  
 TODD J. PERLMAN, 0000  
 ADAM D. PERRY, 0000  
 EDWARD C. PETERS, 0000  
 MARK T. PETERS II, 0000  
 KEVIN M. PETERSON, 0000  
 CAREY E. PETTIT, 0000  
 PHILLIP A. PETRO, 0000  
 STEPHEN H. PEUTE, 0000  
 DAVID A. PFAHLER, 0000  
 AUDREY G. PFINGSTON, 0000  
 STEVEN A. PHELPS, 0000  
 STEPHEN PHILLIPS, 0000  
 JOSHUA J. PICCIRILLO, 0000  
 DAMIEN F. PICKART, 0000  
 GREGORY B. PICKETTE, 0000  
 PATRICIA Y. PIE, 0000  
 JULIANNA W. PIEPKORN, 0000  
 ORRIN C. PIERCE, 0000  
 JOHN M. PILONG, 0000  
 STEPHEN J. PINCHAK, 0000  
 DAVID L. PITTNER, 0000  
 KIRSTIN L. PLAGGE, 0000  
 DAVID M. PLAVAN, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER J. PLOURDE, 0000  
 LYNN LOUISE PLUNKETT, 0000  
 JAMES A. W. POINTER, 0000  
 JOHN F. POLKOWSKI, 0000  
 RYAN D. PONTIUS, 0000  
 JOHN A. PORCHE, 0000  
 TIMOTHY W. PORTER, 0000  
 JEREMY P. POTVIN, 0000  
 GARRET L. POUAR, 0000  
 LEBERT T. POWELL, 0000  
 ORVAL A. POWELL, 0000  
 JENNIFER A. PRAH, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. PRAH, 0000  
 SHELLEY PRESCOTT, 0000  
 ADAM G. PRICE, 0000  
 JAMES W. PRICE, 0000  
 LEE W. PRICE, 0000  
 JOHN K. PRINGLE, 0000  
 DANIEL W. PRITT, 0000  
 JOHN L. PROIETTI, 0000  
 JEREMY E. PROVENZANO, 0000  
 MELISSA D. PRUCE, 0000  
 ANDRE R. PRUDE, 0000  
 ROBERT A. PRUSSAK, 0000  
 DAVID R. PRYOR, 0000  
 MICHELLE L. PRYOR, 0000  
 SCOTT GRAYSON PUTNAM, 0000  
 DINA L. QUANICO, 0000  
 JEFFREY M. QUEEN, 0000  
 EDUARDO A. QUERO, 0000  
 STEVEN L. QUICK, 0000  
 ERIK N. QUIGLEY, 0000  
 CARLOS A. QUINONES, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. RADERMACHER, 0000  
 DANIEL C. RADICK, 0000  
 JASON J. RAFFERTY, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. RAFFERTY II, 0000  
 BRETT J. RAFTERY, 0000  
 JEREMY A. RALEY, 0000  
 ALEXANDER P. RALSTON, 0000  
 MICHAEL K. RAMBO, 0000  
 ABEL RAMOS, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER R. RANDALL, 0000  
 MARCUS D. RANDALL, 0000  
 ROBERT W. RANDALL, 0000  
 ERIC J. RANKE, JR., 0000  
 JAMES R. RANALLO, JR., 0000  
 MICHAEL C. RASBACH, 0000  
 DAVID A. RATCLIFFE, 0000  
 DAVID E. RAYMAN, 0000  
 TRISHA B. RAYNOHA, 0000  
 BRADLEY D. READ, JR., 0000  
 DANIEL J. REBECKY, 0000  
 AMANDA E. REDASH, 0000  
 BRYAN K. REDASH, 0000  
 CARRIE E. REDD, 0000  
 PETERS. REDDAN, 0000  
 EDWARD J. REEDER, 0000  
 BRIAN L. REEB, 0000  
 JENNIFER K. REED, 0000  
 JERRY P. REEDY, 0000  
 KURT N. REGLING, 0000  
 CHRIS E. REICHARDT, 0000  
 ROBERT B. REID, 0000  
 PATRICK G. REIMER, 0000  
 ROBERT D. REIMER, 0000  
 JOEL A. REINER, 0000  
 CARRIE A. REINHARDT, 0000  
 DOUGLAS C. REISING, 0000  
 JASON M. REPAK, 0000  
 JASON SANCHEZ RESLEY, 0000  
 FRANK N. REYES, 0000  
 GERARDO REYES, 0000  
 RAMSAMOOJ J. REYES, 0000  
 DAVID C. J. RHODES, 0000  
 KEVIN R. RHODES, 0000  
 PATRICIA L. RHODES, 0000  
 STEPHEN E. RHODES, 0000  
 GILBERT A. RIBODI, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. RICE, 0000  
 ROBERT M. RICH, 0000  
 MICHAEL F. RICHARDS II, 0000  
 MARK D. RICHEY, 0000  
 MICHAEL D. RICHMOND, 0000  
 MARK J. RICHTER, 0000

JEROD G. RICK, 0000  
 LESLIE P. RICK, 0000  
 DAVID A. RICKARDS, 0000  
 KEVIN S. RICKMAN, 0000  
 JUSTIN A. RIDDLE, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. RIDER, JR., 0000  
 SCOTT W. RIDER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER S. RIGGEN, 0000  
 BRIAN L. RIGGS, 0000  
 JONATHAN D. RITSCHHEL, 0000  
 TAMIKO L. RITSCHHEL, 0000  
 KEVIN A. RIVERO, 0000  
 WILLIAM E. ROACH, 0000  
 ROBERT E. ROBB, 0000  
 JEFFERY L. ROBERTS, 0000  
 JOHN C. ROBERTS, 0000  
 CLAYTON E. ROBINSON, 0000  
 DAVID H. ROBINSON, 0000  
 FORD M. ROBINSON, 0000  
 JOHN D. ROCHE, 0000  
 ERIC J. ROCKHOLD, 0000  
 ROY V. ROCKWELL, 0000  
 JAIME A. RODRIGUEZ, 0000  
 JUNE F. RODRIGUEZ, 0000  
 JEANNIE A. ROELICH, 0000  
 CHAD A. ROGERS, 0000  
 THOMAS C. ROGERS, 0000  
 WILLIAM S. ROGERS, 0000  
 DANIEL S. ROHLINGER, 0000  
 JONATHAN M. ROMAINE, 0000  
 GEOFFREY J. ROMANOWICZ, 0000  
 RICHARD J. ROMANSKI, 0000  
 JOSEPH C. ROMEO, 0000  
 DANIEL T. RONNEBERG, 0000  
 ETIENNE G. ROSAMONT, 0000  
 PEDRO L. ROSARIO, 0000  
 DAVID M. ROSS, 0000  
 DINAH L. ROSS, 0000  
 JAMES F. ROSS, JR., 0000  
 JOSEPH J. ROTH, 0000  
 FRANCOIS H. ROY, II, 0000  
 JONATHAN S. ROYER, 0000  
 DANIEL J. RUBERA, 0000  
 JOSEPH D. RUCKER, 0000  
 WALTER D. RUDD, 0000  
 JASON M. RUESCHHOFF, 0000  
 JASON M. RULO, 0000  
 ABIGAIL L. RUSCETTA, 0000  
 ANDREW W. RUSH, 0000  
 CAMERON F. RUSS, 0000  
 DOUGLAS S. RUSSELL, 0000  
 ROBERT V. RUSSELL, 0000  
 RUSSELL J. RUTAN, 0000  
 CHAD E. C. RYTHER, 0000  
 DENNIS M. SABATINO, 0000  
 JOSEF E. SABLATURA, 0000  
 JEFFREY A. SALEM, 0000  
 KELLY M. SAMS, 0000  
 PETER A. L. SANDNESS, 0000  
 MARK A. SANDOR, 0000  
 JOSEPH D. SANDUK, 0000  
 RAMIRO C. SANTOYO III, 0000  
 DANIEL M. SAUCER, 0000  
 MARCUS F. SAULEY, 0000  
 LYNN E. SAVAGE, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. SAVILLE, 0000  
 GORDON D. SAWSER, 0000  
 MICHAEL M. SAX, 0000  
 ERIC D. SCHARNOWSKI, 0000  
 JOHN J. SCHAUBERS IV, 0000  
 JAMESON D. SCHEBEL, 0000  
 TRAVIS J. SCHEEL, 0000  
 STEPHEN L. SCHEIN, 0000  
 NICOLAS J. SCHINDELER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER C. SCHLAK, 0000  
 JAMES C. SCHMEHL, 0000  
 SHANNON L. SCHNEIDER, 0000  
 MATTHEW A. SCHNOOR, 0000  
 DONALD E. SCHOFIELD II, 0000  
 RICHARD G. SCHOGGINS, 0000  
 PETER W. SCHOLL, 0000  
 HENRY C. SCHOTT, JR., 0000  
 MARK A. SCHULMAN, 0000  
 MAUREEN A. SCHUMANN, 0000  
 LAWRENCE J. SCHUTZ, 0000  
 NATHAN C. SCOTAC, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. SCOTT, 0000  
 DAVID A. SCOTT, 0000  
 JOHN DANIEL SCOTT II, 0000  
 JUSTIN T. SCOTT, 0000  
 YEHOI SCOTT, 0000  
 JOSEPH R. SCROGGINS, 0000  
 BARRY R. SECREST, 0000  
 GEORGE A. SEFZIK, 0000  
 TIMOTHY F. SEHNEM, 0000  
 DAVID C. SEITZ, 0000  
 DAVID L. SEITZ, 0000  
 JASON T. SELF, 0000  
 PETER A. SELKEY, JR., 0000  
 JAMES D. SELLNOW, 0000  
 CHRISTIAN A. SENN, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER SENSENEY, 0000  
 SHAWN A. SERPASS, 0000  
 MARIO A. SERNA, 0000  
 JASON R. SETTLE, 0000  
 JOHN M. SEVIER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER A. SEYMORE, 0000  
 DEVID L. SHANKS, 0000  
 JOHN G. SHAPLEIGH, 0000  
 GRANT BROOKE SHARPE, 0000  
 JOSEPH L. SHEFFIELD, 0000  
 JEROME K. SHELDON, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. SHELDON, 0000  
 SAMANTHA L. SHELTON, 0000  
 VINCE P. SHELTON, 0000  
 FRED S. SHEPHERD, 0000  
 MICHAEL R. SHEPHERD, 0000

CHRISTOPHER J. SHIELDS, 0000  
 EILEEN M. SHIELDS, 0000  
 MARK A. SHOEMAKER, 0000  
 ERIC M. SHONTZ, 0000  
 DAVID R. SHORT, 0000  
 MELINDA A. SHORTEN, 0000  
 JON L. SHUMATE, 0000  
 JOSEPH P. SIBERSKI, 0000  
 TRACEY E. SILFIES, 0000  
 JAMEY P. SILLENCE, 0000  
 CHAD A. SILVA, 0000  
 MATTHEW M. SIMMONS, 0000  
 TIMOTHY J. SIMMONS, 0000  
 CHRISTIAN G. SIMMS, 0000  
 STEVEN A. SIMONE, 0000  
 EDWARD H. SIMPSON, 0000  
 RYAN K. SIMPSON, 0000  
 SANJIT SINGH, 0000  
 JAMY L. SIRMANS, 0000  
 KENNETH SHELBERT SITLER, 0000  
 KEVIN L. SITLER, 0000  
 TRAVIS D. SJOSTEDT, 0000  
 KELLY A. SKALKO, 0000  
 JAMES D. SKELTON, 0000  
 WILLIAM W. SKINNER III, 0000  
 ERIC W. SKIPPER, 0000  
 PAUL M. SKIPWORTH, 0000  
 DAVID M. SLAYDON, 0000  
 MARK ROBERT SLOAN, 0000  
 DAVID W. SMALL, 0000  
 PIERRE R. SMIT, 0000  
 ALBERT E. SMITH, 0000  
 ANDREW M. SMITH, 0000  
 ANTHONY L. SMITH, 0000  
 BENJAMIN T. SMITH, 0000  
 BLAKE JASON SMITH, 0000  
 DANIEL W. SMITH III, 0000  
 DAVID J. SMITH, 0000  
 ERIN M. SMITH, 0000  
 EVAN V. SMITH, 0000  
 JAMES E. SMITH, 0000  
 JESSE D. SMITH, 0000  
 JOHN G. SMITH, 0000  
 MATTHEW H. SMITH, 0000  
 SUSANA S. SMITH, 0000  
 TONIA L. SMITH, 0000  
 VERONICA E. SMITH, 0000  
 STEPHEN P. SNEELSON, 0000  
 BRIAN L. SNYDER, 0000  
 PATRICK S. SNYDER, 0000  
 DARREN D. SOKOL, 0000  
 JONATHAN M. SONGER, 0000  
 YVONNE S. SOROKIN, 0000  
 NOELLE M. SOSA, 0000  
 WILLIAM G. SOSNOWSKI, 0000  
 PETER S. SOTO, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER J. SOUTHARD, 0000  
 JOCELYN L. SOUTHERLAND, 0000  
 ROBERT L. SOUTHERLAND, 0000  
 ANDREW A. SOUZA, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. SOVITSKY, 0000  
 JEFFREY R. SPARROW, 0000  
 CHAD A. SPELTMAN, 0000  
 JAMES H. SPENCER, 0000  
 ANDRE R. SPICER, 0000  
 MITCHELL R. SPILLERS, JR., 0000  
 EDWARD T. SPINELLI, 0000  
 ERIC J. SPRINGER, 0000  
 DANIEL C. STPIERRE, 0000  
 JAMES W. STAHL, 0000  
 KIMBERLEE R. STAMETS, 0000  
 DERRICK D. STAMOS, 0000  
 SCOTT M. STANFORD, 0000  
 MICHAEL D. STAPLETON, 0000  
 DONALD L. STARLING, 0000  
 WILLIAM B. STATA, 0000  
 DERRICK N. STEED, 0000  
 ANDREW J. STEFFEN, 0000  
 CHAD A. STEFFEY, 0000  
 RICHARD E. STEGGERDA, 0000  
 OWEN D. STEPHENS, 0000  
 THOMAS E. STEPHENSON, 0000  
 SEAN E. STEVENS, 0000  
 JAN L. STILWELL, 0000  
 CLINTON W. STINSON, 0000  
 BRYAN A. STONE, 0000  
 JUDSON E. STONE, 0000  
 BARRY A. STOUT, 0000  
 WILLIAM M. STOVER, 0000  
 DAWN M. STRAIGHT, 0000  
 STEVEN A. STRAIN, 0000  
 JOHN C. STRATTON, 0000  
 MATTHEW B. STRATTON, 0000  
 MICHAEL C. STRATTON, 0000  
 THOMAS A. STRATTON, 0000  
 KELLY L. STRONG, 0000  
 ERIC M. STRUMPF, 0000  
 WAYNETTA GENTRY STUART, 0000  
 CHEN Y. SU, 0000  
 PATRICK C. SUERMANN, 0000  
 JOHN D. SULLIVAN, 0000  
 KRISTOPHER M. SULLIVAN, 0000  
 SCOTT T. SULLIVAN, 0000  
 SEAN S. SULLIVAN, 0000  
 JOSE E. SUMANGIL, 0000  
 SEAN P. SUTHERLAND, 0000  
 KEVIN K. SUTTERFIELD, 0000  
 GARY A. SWAIN, 0000  
 JAMES E. SWANNER, 0000  
 TIMOTHY W. SWANSON, 0000  
 RYAN S. SWEENEY, 0000  
 MARTIN D. SWERT, 0000  
 BRETT T. SWIGERT, 0000  
 STEPHEN C. SWIGERT, 0000  
 JAMAL J. TABEE, 0000  
 ALEX D. TACEY, 0000  
 MATTHEW C. TACKETT, 0000

STEVEN WAYNE TAIT, 0000  
 KIRSTIE I. TALBOT, 0000  
 STANLEY J. TALLMAN, 0000  
 JEFFREY M. TANG, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. TARABORELLI, JR., 0000  
 ELI C. TATE, 0000  
 IAN S. TATE, 0000  
 ROY R. TATE, JR., 0000  
 MICHAEL B. TATUM, 0000  
 ANDREW J. TAYLOR, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER A. TAYLOR, 0000  
 JASON T. TAYLOR, 0000  
 LAURA E. TAYLOR, 0000  
 STEPHEN T. TAYLOR, 0000  
 TERENCE G. TAYLOR, 0000  
 TIMOTHY J. TAYLOR, 0000  
 CRAIG L. TAYMAN, 0000  
 KEVIN B. TEMPLIN, 0000  
 PETER G. TERREBONNE, JR., 0000  
 VINCENT M. TERRELL, 0000  
 KATRINA A. TERRY, 0000  
 LUIS R. THEN, 0000  
 BRYAN W. THOMAS, 0000  
 CRAIG E. THOMAS, 0000  
 DILTRICE M. THOMAS, 0000  
 JAMES G. THOMAS II, 0000  
 JEREMY B. THOMAS, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. THOMAS, 0000  
 BRADLEY H. THOMPSON, 0000  
 BRIAN A. THOMPSON, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER L. THOMPSON, 0000  
 LANE D. THOMPSON, 0000  
 MARK J. THOMPSON, 0000  
 SHAWN O. THOMPSON, 0000  
 MARY L. THOMSON, 0000  
 GREGORY D. THORNTON, 0000  
 RODNEY M. THURMAN, 0000  
 CASEY J. TIDGUEWELL, 0000  
 JASON J. TIEGEN, 0000  
 MARICO L. TIPPETT, 0000  
 SARAH K. TOBIN, 0000  
 MICHAEL C. TODD, 0000  
 MATTHEW D. TONDINI, 0000  
 RONALD A. TORNESE, 0000  
 ROBERT R. TORRES, 0000  
 JERRY TOWNSEND II, 0000  
 JAMES M. TRACHIER, 0000  
 JOHN D. TRAN, 0000  
 DOUGLAS P. TRASK, 0000  
 JOHN H. TRAXLER, 0000  
 BRIAN R. TREDWAY, 0000  
 JOEL E. TREJO, 0000  
 TRENT W. TRIPPLE, 0000  
 TRAVIS W. TROTTER, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER D. TROYER, 0000  
 JASON R. TRUDEL, 0000  
 CONSTANTINE TSOUKATOS, 0000  
 AARON A. TUCKER, 0000  
 JAMES P. TUITTE, 0000  
 ROBERT W. TURNER, 0000  
 SUSUMU UCHIYAMA, 0000  
 KENNETH D. UNDERWOOD, 0000  
 DAVID N. UNRUH, 0000  
 MANUEL J. URIBE, 0000  
 DENNIS W. UYECHE, 0000  
 TARA R. VALENTINE, 0000  
 JERRY M. VAN DYKE, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER S. VANCE, 0000  
 THOMAS B. VANCE, JR., 0000  
 JERRY J. VANDEWELE, 0000  
 JEFFREY S. VANDUSEN, 0000  
 BARRY J. VANEK, 0000  
 SPENCER T. VANMETER, 0000  
 MATTHEW T. VANMETER, 0000  
 DANIEL L. VANOSTRAND, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER E. VASQUEZ, 0000  
 FRANK C. VASSAR, 0000  
 BRADY P. VAUGHN, 0000  
 KOREY B. VAUGHN, 0000  
 PETER VEGA, 0000  
 SAMMY DIAZ VEGA, 0000  
 OMAR A. VELASCO, 0000  
 MARGARET F. VENCIOUS, 0000  
 DAVID A. VERNUSKY, 0000  
 THOMAS B. VESELKA, 0000  
 LORI A. VESSELS, 0000  
 MICHAEL W. VETTER, 0000  
 SHANE M. VETTER, 0000  
 MARTIN R. VIDAL, 0000  
 DOUGLAS W. VIEWEG, 0000  
 DAVID L. VILLA, 0000  
 MIGUEL E. VILLABREAL, 0000  
 JUSTIN M. VINCENT, 0000  
 GRANT T. VINEYARD, 0000  
 SHAD D. VINSON, 0000  
 JILENE M. VIVIAN, 0000  
 ALYCIA M. VROSH, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. WACHTER, 0000  
 TED A. WAHOSKE, 0000  
 PAUL J. WAHTE, 0000  
 ANTHONY L. WALKER, 0000  
 BRADLEY C. WALKER, 0000  
 IAN L. WALKER, 0000  
 JASON C. WALKER, 0000  
 MICHAEL D. WALKER, 0000  
 JAMES W. WALL, 0000  
 JEFFREY A. WALLACE, 0000  
 WILLIAM M. WALLIS, 0000  
 ERICK JOHN WALLMAN, 0000  
 LORRAINE M. WALLOWSKY, 0000  
 SHAWA P. WALRATH, 0000  
 STACY E. WALSER, 0000  
 BRENDAN P. WALSH, 0000  
 MICHAEL O. WALTERS, 0000  
 BRANDIE HELEN WALTON, 0000  
 BENJAMIN GRAY WARD, 0000  
 MARTHA J. WARD, 0000

PATRICK R. WARD, 0000  
 RANDY S. WARDAK, 0000  
 THERESA M. WARDAK, 0000  
 CATHERINE M. WARE, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. WARNER, 0000  
 RICHARD L. WARR, 0000  
 DANIEL E. WARRENSFORD, JR., 0000  
 MICHAEL WASHINGTON, 0000  
 MARK D. WASKOW, 0000  
 SCOTT G. WATERS, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER B. WATSON, 0000  
 MICHAEL S. WATSON, 0000  
 JEFFERY A. WEAK, 0000  
 JAMES C. WEAVER, 0000  
 JONATHAN D. WEBB, 0000  
 SAMANTHA WEEKS, 0000  
 MARK S. WEINER, 0000  
 JOHN S. WEIR, 0000  
 RANDALL L. WEITZEL, 0000  
 JEFFREY H. WELBORN, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER S. WELCH, 0000  
 JUSTIN B. WELLEN, 0000  
 LINWOOD E. WELLS, JR., 0000  
 KIMBERLY LEE WELTER, 0000  
 JAMES D. E. WENT, 0000  
 BRENT D. WENTHUR, 0000  
 WILLIAM W. WENZEL, 0000  
 RANDALL T. WETHINGTON, 0000  
 DERRICK J. WEYAND, 0000  
 GREG D. WHITAKER, 0000  
 DALE R. WHITE, 0000  
 GEORGEANN WHITE, 0000  
 JAMES D. WHITE, 0000  
 LYNELLE N. WHITE, 0000  
 RYAN W. WHITE, 0000  
 PAUL W. WHITFIELD, JR., 0000  
 JONATHAN C. WHITNEY, 0000  
 JUSTIN A. WHITSON, 0000  
 STACY S. WIDAUF, 0000  
 JASON T. WIEHRDT, 0000  
 DAVID A. WIELAND, 0000  
 COLIN C. WIEMER, 0000  
 MICHAEL A. WIGEN, 0000  
 JANINE O. J. WIGGINS, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER M. WILCOX, 0000  
 BRIAN K. WILKERSON, 0000  
 BRADY J. WILKINS, 0000  
 GARY M. WILLIAMS, 0000  
 JASON M. WILLIAMS, 0000  
 JOHN D. WILLIAMS, 0000  
 MICHAEL D. WILLIAMS, 0000  
 NICHOLE L. WILLIAMS, 0000  
 SARAH C. WILLIAMS, 0000  
 SEAN A. WILLIAMS, 0000  
 TERRY WILLIAMSON, 0000  
 ALAN L. WILLINGHAM, 0000  
 DARREN M. WILLIS, 0000  
 JAMES G. WILSON, 0000  
 KETH D. WILSON, 0000  
 RONALD E. WILSON, JR., 0000  
 SCOT C. WILSON, 0000  
 WAYNE W. F. WILSON, 0000  
 YVONNDE M. WILSON, 0000  
 AARON N. WILT, 0000  
 HEATH WIMBERLEY, 0000  
 JOSEPH H. WIMMER, 0000

ALEXANDRA E. WINKLER, 0000  
 JESSE V. WINTERS, 0000  
 BRIAN D. WITKOWSKY, 0000  
 JEFFREY S. WITT, 0000  
 THOMPSON C. WOFFORD III, 0000  
 BRIAN M. WOHLWINDER, 0000  
 JOHN A. WOJTOWICZ, 0000  
 KEITH M. WOLAK, 0000  
 MARK R. WOLFE, 0000  
 JOHN T. WOLINSKI, 0000  
 DANIEL R. WOODFORD, 0000  
 JOHN P. WOODRUFF, 0000  
 MARGARET E. WOOTEN, 0000  
 CHRISTOPHER WORDEN, 0000  
 CARRIE L. WORTH, 0000  
 PAUL S. WRIGHT, 0000  
 RASHEEM J. WRIGHT, 0000  
 MICHAEL C. WYATT, 0000  
 MATTHEW W. WYNN, 0000  
 BENJAMIN A. WYSACK, 0000  
 DONN C. YATES, 0000  
 JASON D. YEATTS, 0000  
 EDWARD YEE, 0000  
 GREGORY J. YOSCHAK, 0000  
 JEFFREY W. YOST, 0000  
 ANDREW S. YOUNG, 0000  
 GREGORY D. YOUNG, 0000  
 IAN A. YOUNG, 0000  
 ROBERT J. ZALIWSKI, 0000  
 MATTHEW J. ZAMISKA, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. ZEMAN, 0000  
 JOHN ZENZ, 0000  
 EBEN M. ZERBA, 0000  
 SHAO H. ZERBA, 0000  
 ERIC G. ZOOK, 0000  
 MICHAEL J. ZUHLSDORF, 0000  
 JESSE B. ZYDALLIS, 0000

## IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be colonel*

MAZEN ABBAS, 0000  
 PATRICIA L. OKEEPE, 0000

*To be lieutenant colonel*

THEODORE B. ASHFORD, 0000  
 GEORGE B. COX, 0000  
 BRENDA T. EDWARDS, 0000  
 ANTHONY D. GARCIA, 0000  
 JEAN D. HAYOT, 0000  
 THARRELL B. KAST, 0000  
 BENJAMIN S. LAMBERT, 0000  
 RANDIE L. ONEAL, 0000  
 GÖEFFREY P. PHILLIPS, 0000  
 MARK A. SCHREIBER, 0000  
 MILTON L. SHIPMAN, 0000  
 ROBERT D. SPESSERT, 0000

*To be major*

SCOTT R. ALLEN, 0000  
 TIMOTHY P. AUVIL, 0000  
 ERIC C. BLOOM, 0000

BRYAN L. BURROWS, 0000  
 PATRICK R. CAMPBELL, 0000  
 BRIAN K. CONNER, 0000  
 PAUL M. DAVIS, 0000  
 JAMES DAVIS, 0000  
 SONNIE D. DEYAMPERT, 0000  
 ROBERT A. DIXON, 0000  
 SCOTT D. GRANT, 0000  
 JOHN R. GRIFFIN, 0000  
 ALVA E. HART, 0000  
 DAVID S. HYLTON, 0000  
 ROBERT P. ISABELLA, 0000  
 LYNDON C. JOHNSON, 0000  
 WILLIAM S. KELLEY, 0000  
 DONAVAN LOCKLEAR, 0000  
 ROBERT L. SCHILLER, 0000  
 JOHN M. THANE, 0000  
 LANCE C. VARNEY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

LEE R. YOAKAM, 0000

*To be major*

TYSON J. WOOD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

*To be major*

CHRISTOPHER D. CARRIER, 0000

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

CHRISTOPHER RAMSEY, 0000

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on March 7, 2006 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

James Hardy Payne, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, which was sent to the Senate on September 29, 2005.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE  
HONORABLE PETER I. BREEN

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Peter I. Breen for his service as a District Court Judge in the great State of Nevada.

Peter was born in Reno, Nevada, November 8, 1939. His mother, Gwendolyn (Ingram), was born in Sparks, Nevada, in 1908. His father, Peter, was born in Eureka, Nevada, in 1901, was District Judge of the Fifth Judicial District from 1956 to 1967. His grandfather, Peter Breen, was District Judge of the Third Judicial District from 1901–1923.

Peter was raised and educated in Goldfield and Tonopah, Nevada, where he graduated from Tonopah High School in 1956. He graduated from the University of Nevada in 1960 and the University of Santa Clara Law School in 1963.

Peter practiced law both in Reno and Carson City from 1963 to 1973. From 1967 to 1970 he served as Deputy Attorney General. Following that, he was a partner with Emerson J. Wilson in the firm of Wilson and Breen, Ltd. at the time of his appointment to the bench. Governor O'Callaghan made his appointment to fill the newly created Department Seven effective January 2, 1974. Peter has been elected six times to the post without opposition.

The Washoe County Courthouse Historical and Preservation Society was formed in June 1999 by Peter for the purpose of restoration and preservation of the historical courthouse and its history. The Society instituted the Flag Day Celebration in 2000 and holiday lighting of the courthouse, and they have become popular traditions. Peter continues to serve as the Society's President. A commemoration of the recently restored historical courtroom is to occur in 2006.

On July 1, 1999, Peter instituted a Probate Court in the District Court and presides over its operation.

Peter instituted the Washoe County Adult Drug Court on July 1, 1995. He also created and presides over a Diversion Court for criminal offenders whose crimes are attributable to drug addiction or alcoholism. He has participated at the National Judicial College in Reno, Nevada, and National Association of Drug Court Professionals in several programs concerning the Drug Court movement. In November 2001, he established the first Mental Health Court in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the Honorable Peter I. Breen on the floor of the House today.

IN HONOR OF THE MONTEREY  
CIVIC CLUB

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Monterey Civic Club which is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year. The Monterey Civic Club was founded in 1906 with the purpose of working to improve, beautify and promote the welfare of Monterey and help preserve its rich history. Looking back, I would like to applaud the work they have done over the past 100 years, and I look forward to the work they will continue to undertake in the next 100 years.

The Monterey Civic Club is located in the "House of the Four Winds", a historic adobe built in the 1830s by Thomas Oliver Larkin, the first and only American Consul to Alta California. This house has undergone many uses, including: a store under Governor Alvarado during the American occupation, headquarters for Secretary of State H.W. Halleck, and the location of the first Hall of Records for the State of California. The Monterey Civic Club bought this historic adobe in 1914 and restored it. Today, "The House of the Four Winds" is home to what is believed to be the oldest women's clubhouse in continuous use in the United States.

Since its inception, the Monterey Civic Club has undertaken several projects and donated thousands of dollars to local charities dedicated to improving the quality of life in Monterey. Among its accomplishments are: building a bridge over muddy Del Monte Avenue in 1907, participating in adobe tours, maintaining and preserving the historic "House of the Four Winds", and the paintings and articles of historical significance located therein. Another of the club's beneficial endeavors is the lively and traditional "El Baile de Los Cascarones," a pre-Lent "Cascarone Ball" held annually since 1939. The ticket sales from this traditional Spanish ball go to local charities and maintenance of the adobe.

Mr. Speaker, it is organizations like the Monterey Civic Club, with their dedication to preserving and improving the character of our local communities that make life unique in this vast and beautiful nation of ours. A distinct sense of identity is created by building upon local heritage, creating pride in the community. It is this sense of local pride that influences people to get involved in their communities, initiating the type of citizen service that our democracy depends on. The Monterey Civic Club's 100th anniversary is a commendable achievement, and I salute the club's numerous accomplishments.

EDITORIAL OF PRESIDENT BUSH'S  
VISIT TO INDIA

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 2, 2006, The Post and Courier of Charleston, South Carolina, published the following editorial regarding President Bush's historic visit to India and the nuclear agreement between the United States and India.

HISTORIC RECONCILIATION WITH INDIA

President George W. Bush's whirlwind, five-day visit to South Asia is almost certain to have lasting significance. By visiting India, the world's largest democracy, and also making a previously unannounced stop in Afghanistan, one of the world's youngest developing democracies, the president continues to demonstrate his commitment to political freedom.

The embrace of India, after decades of strained relations, follows a five-year personal courtship by President Bush. It ranks as one of the president's most important diplomatic achievements. Its lasting success depends on maintaining the right balance in America's relationship with Pakistan, a vital strategic ally in the war against al-Qaida-led terrorism, and also with China. After three days in India, Mr. Bush flies on to Pakistan, the subcontinent's rival nuclear power and India's foe in three wars.

United States and Indian interests intersect in many areas: in the fight against Muslim terrorism; in promoting democracy through a joint Global Democracy Initiative and a new United Nations Democracy Fund; in combating threats to public health such as AIDS and pandemic flu; in developing new energy technologies, including nuclear energy; and in trade. Economic ties are strong. United States exports to India rose 30 percent in 2005, and despite the controversial outsourcing of American service jobs to India, the United States trade surplus with India was \$1.8 billion last year.

United States friendship with India also helps counterbalance China's rising economic and military power in the Asia region and keep the pressure on Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf to suppress Islamic fundamentalist movements. The administration's most controversial initiative towards India—a proposal to share peaceful nuclear technology with a nation that has not joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty—is moving forward. The president was conducting negotiations up to the last minute by telephone from Air Force One. If and when details are ironed out, and India opens its peaceful nuclear activities to international inspection, New Delhi will take its responsible place in the rank of the world's nuclear powers. That will place great pressure on Pakistan to follow suit.

The street demonstrations held to protest, peacefully, the president's visit, were mostly by Muslims. They served not only to underscore India's commitment to democracy, but also to emphasize by contrast the warm reception the president and first lady were given by Prime Minister Manmohan Singh,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

who broke with protocol to meet them at the airport.

Polls show that the vast majority of the Indian people welcome what Prime Minister Singh described as "an act of historic reconciliation." This visit is already being compared to Richard Nixon's breakthrough journey to Communist China. By forging a new era in United States relations with South Asia, the president continues to build a foreign policy legacy.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MARINE  
LANCE CPL. JOHN JOSHUA  
THORNTON, KILLED WHILE  
SERVING HIS COUNTRY IN IRAQ

### HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marine Lance Cpl. John Joshua Thornton, who was killed on Saturday, February 25, 2006, at the age of 22, while serving in Iraq. I recognize him today for his dedicated service to this country for the cause of freedom in a global community.

Throughout his life, Josh did everything 100 percent. As a child, he took over the role as head of the household, after his father, Robert, died in a work-related accident. He was always a great son, but became a man overnight. Josh always enjoyed weightlifting and martial arts, and by the age of 7, he received his first black belt. He loved to help people, and he taught at an after-school program for underprivileged youth. Josh was always very outgoing and brought joy to those who knew him.

It was Josh's dream to be a Marine since he was very little. In November 2004, he joined the Marine Corp, 2 years after graduating in the top of his class at Tolleson Union High School. Josh was assigned as a rifleman to 3rd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment and deployed to Iraq in September. As a Marine, he received the Combat Action Ribbon, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal and the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon. Tragically, on Saturday, February 25, he died of wounds received during an enemy mortar attack while serving in Ramadi, Iraq.

Joshua is survived by his mother, Rachel, brother, Kyle, and sister, Brianna.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity I have today, to recognize and honor Lance Cpl. John Joshua Thornton in front of my colleagues on the floor of the House of Representatives. I have been a longtime friend with his great, great grandmother Nita Andrews and her recently deceased husband, Ed Andrews.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LEGACY  
OF MR. AND MRS. BEN H. CARPENTER

### HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Mr. and Mrs. Ben H. Car-

pen. Their lifelong dedication to improving lives and communities in North Texas will be sorely missed. Ben Carpenter passed last Friday, March 3, at his home in Dallas. His wife, Betty Dupree, followed him in death on Sunday, March 5.

Mr. Carpenter's vision and astuteness as a business leader helped shepherd Dallas into a new role as an international city in the latter part of the 20th century. He ran one of the country's largest insurance companies, Southland Life Insurance, which was founded by his father, John Carpenter and later became Southland Financial Corp., for 30 years. In 1959, he built the city's tallest skyscraper, the Southland Center, which is now the Adam's Mark Hotel.

Mr. Carpenter's greatest legacy is Los Colinas, one of the most successful real estate developments in the United States. In the early 1970s he launched a plan to turn his family ranch into a world class residential and commercial community. Las Colinas now houses some 12,000 acres of apartments, homes, hotels, shopping centers, and company headquarters. The community is home to 40 Fortune 500 Companies today, including ExxonMobil, Nokia, Microsoft, and Kimberly Clark.

Mr. Carpenter served his country during World War II as a volunteer in the Army. He was awarded a Silver Star for his heroics in the China-Burma-India theater. Upon his graduation from the University of Texas at Austin in 1948, he married this lifelong love, Betty Ann Dupree.

Mrs. Carpenter will also be remembered for her commitment to service and giving spirit. She served as an officer and board member in several charitable organizations, including the Child Guidance Center of Dallas and the Irving Community Hospital. An active Presbyterian, she and her husband donated land for the creation of two new Presbyterian churches in the Dallas area. They also funded the construction of the Carpenter Chapel at the Presbyterian Hospital in Dallas.

Betty and Ben Carpenter were charitable contributors to multiple causes in North Texas. They provided land for the establishment of the Irving Arts Center and the Irving Community Hospital. Their generous gifts founded the Carpenter Family MBA Leadership Center and Carpenter Family MBA Leadership Endowment at the University of Texas at Austin, and the Ben H. and Betty Dupree Carpenter Endowment for Cardiovascular Research at the Heart, Lung, and Vascular Clinical Center of Excellence at St. Paul Hospital of Dallas.

Ben and Betty Carpenter's endeavors in both the business and service worlds have left an indelible mark on the city of Dallas and the state of Texas. I honor their lives and their legacy; North Texas would not be what it is today without their contributions.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF TED HODGES OF SALLINA, KANSAS

### HON. JERRY MORAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of

Ted Hodges, a high school student from Sallina, Kansas, who recently won the Kansas Voice of Democracy Audio Essay Competition. Ted's speech illustrates that our everyday activities are freedoms that should not be taken for granted. I would like to submit the text of his speech for the record to encourage the citizens of our Nation to cherish their freedoms.

#### HOW I DEMONSTRATE MY FREEDOM

I wake up, take a shower, get dressed, eat breakfast go to school I practice football, do my homework, talk with my family and friends, then go to bed. I go read the paper, go to church, watch TV. Each one of these simple, ordinary actions in itself seems mundane, but is actually a concrete expression of freedom that I enjoy daily. Going to school an indulgence? Attending church a privilege? Writing an essay a luxury? C'mon. Those are all things that we take for granted, right? They are things that I have to do!

In an address to Congress in 1941, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt enumerated four freedoms that every American should expect and protect: freedom of speech, freedom to worship, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. To me, this is a tremendous ideal that America has been defined by throughout the years. I am the everyday beneficiary of these four freedoms.

Firstly, I express my freedom of speech by doing things such as writing letters to the editor of my local newspaper, posting web logs on the internet, and also encouraging school board members to change various policies. All of these things I can do without fear of retribution. I can peacefully demonstrate or agitate for change on any subject. I can read articles in newspapers, magazines, and websites that represent every viewpoint of the political spectrum. I can make my own contributions, find my own voice.

The next freedom mentioned by President Roosevelt—freedom of religion—also is present in my life. Every day I see different religions. Christianity or Judaism, Muslim or Hindu: each of these has a place in this great nation. Some larger, some smaller, all tolerated. And not promoted or encouraged by the state or in our schools. I am free to offer a prayer to the God that I worship at any time, anywhere. Whether it's being a crucifer for the last eight years during my church's Sunday services or leading the team prayer after a hard-fought football game, I have that freedom.

Another freedom, freedom from fear, is too found in our society. Personally, I have the freedom to sleep well at night knowing that our troops are working diligently not only to preserve our way of life, but to also bring that opportunity to many others. A day does not go by that we should not be extremely appreciative to those who have stepped into the line of fire to keep our nation free from fear. Laws that will govern and protect me and my family whether we are black or white, male or female, young or old.

Freedom from want: Where do I start? I have all the privileges that the wealthiest nation on earth can give me. A strong school, competent teachers, good roads, and reliable energy. A hot shower. Food that's safe. Freedom from want is something that we as Americans utilize every second of every day.

As I look back on Franklin D. Roosevelt's four freedoms I begin to wonder, "How can I show my appreciation and demonstrate my own commitment to freedom?" The answer is shown in many of my every day actions.

By taking advantage of every opportunity bestowed upon me: working diligently at school so that I can become a better informed citizen. By exercising my religious

freedom to worship God as I choose. By not being afraid to voice my opinion. By becoming an active member of my community—doing volunteer work, serving on boards. By paying taxes and holding the government accountable. By working to improve the way of life for my descendants. By registering for the selective service and being ready to serve our country. And by being a dedicated, informed voter.

Living within the confines and routines of a typical teenager's life, freedom might seem like a rare commodity. But the simple act of putting a pen to paper, of committing my voice to a recording for the Voice of Democracy audio essay profoundly represents the many freedoms I take for granted every day.

---

PAYING TRIBUTE TO TIMOTHY  
BURRIS

**HON. JON C. PORTER**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Timothy Burris, who retired on January 3rd of this year, after 26 years of dedicated service to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, his last 8 years serving in the Laughlin Substation as Detective.

Tim began his career in 1979 as a patrol officer in Las Vegas, and started the Bicycle Patrol Unit there. He moved up to work in the Detective Bureau, an assignment he has maintained for the last 15 years. Tim also served on the International Outlaw Motorcycle Gang Investigators Association and before joining Metro, he served 3 tours in Vietnam in the U.S. Navy as a crewman on the U.S.S. *Kawishiji*, affectionately referred to as the "Special K" by the crew.

Demonstrating that his job is something he does, not who he is, Timothy's fondest memories are not necessarily the ones from being on the force, but rather memories of his family. The detective has 3 sons that he is very proud of; Timothy, 30, a high school art and theater teacher; Matthew, 27, a member of Metro's Mounted Patrol Unit; and James, 12, a middle school student and promising young bow-hunter.

Tim has spent much of his career downplaying his efforts while serving on the force. When approached with a recommendation for an award or medal, with his typical humble demeanor he will tell you that he doesn't see the need for medals or honors. He feels that he is just doing his job. That unassuming attitude is exactly what makes Tim so loved and respected.

His fellow police officers describe him as a real professional and a long-time solid police officer of the highest caliber. His outstanding record shows that he is the go-to-guy on any difficult case. His knowledge and experience will be greatly missed in southern Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Timothy Burris on the floor of the House today. I congratulate him on a great career and wish him the best in retirement.

IN HONOR OF NOT THIS TIME  
VETS

**HON. SAM FARR**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Not This Time Vets, a Santa Cruz County organization dedicated to ensuring the well being of veterans, both from previous and current conflicts. The organization was created in response to the indifference and hostility Vietnam soldiers faced as part of the Nation's criticism of the war. A non-profit organization, Not This Time Vets is committed to honoring the service and sacrifices of veterans in Santa Cruz County as well as show appreciation for citizens currently serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other parts of the world.

Not This Time Vets has demonstrated its appreciation to our veterans by drawing attention to their honorable service as well as advocating on their behalf in regard to preserving veterans' benefits and programs. For the estimated 18,000 veterans in Santa Cruz County, Not This Time Vets works to pay tribute to military service through organizing celebrations, informational events and advocating for effective veterans' support policies. On May 21, 2005, Not This Time Vets sponsored a parade in Santa Cruz, which drew an estimated crowd of 2,000 people. Those in attendance enthusiastically showed their support for veterans of all eras. While Americans may differ in their view of current and previous conflicts, we all need to honor the young men and woman serving this country, past and present. This is a universal point of agreement that Not This Time Vets keeps front and center.

Mr. Speaker, we know military service is a valuable and difficult sacrifice. Organizations like Not This Time Vets provide important services to our communities and veterans by providing a forum through which recognition, respect and appreciation can be demonstrated to those who have served our country. While no gesture could ever remove the scars inflicted by war, Not This Time Vets hopes to heal those physical and emotional wounds by publicly recognizing their service and bringing to light the tribulations they still endure. I applaud Not This Time Vets for the services they have provided to veterans in our community and their intentions to spread their message of healing and appreciation throughout the country.

---

CELEBRATING THE 80TH  
BIRTHDAY OF RICH DeVOS

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Richard (Rich) DeVos, a great American business leader, on the special occasion of his 80th birthday. Rich co-founded Amway Corporation, a direct selling company, based on the principle of helping people live better lives. By providing individ-

uals around the world the opportunity to be entrepreneurs, Amway has become an industry leader, and is now a subsidiary of Alticor, Inc.—a Michigan-based company with international presence and annual sales of \$6.4 billion.

Now retired from the company, Rich serves as Chairman of the Orlando Magic, which he and his family acquired in 1991. Rich continues to be a source of inspiration and motivation to others by sharing accounts of his personal challenges and achievements through speaking engagements and writings. Remarkably, Rich did not stop upon reaching his American Dream, but rather continues to encourage others to believe in themselves and pursue their own dreams. Rich DeVos was born in Grand Rapids, Michigan on March 4, 1926. He and his wife, Helen DeVos, have four children and fifteen grandchildren.

---

PAYING TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT  
GARY HOOD

**HON. JON C. PORTER**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Sergeant Gary Hood who retired on January 3, 2006, after 24 years of service on the force.

Sgt. Hood began his career with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) in 1976, after serving in the Air Force for 8 years. He was a crew member of the USAF Thunderbirds before leaving the service. At Metro, Sgt. Hood started as patrol officer and remained so by choice for 15 years. He also served in the Special Investigations and Concealed Weapons units for about 2 years and 6 years respectively. Sgt. Hood has been a sergeant for 14 years.

He and his wife, Sue, are the parents of two beautiful daughters, Christina, 26, and Erin, 21. They also have one granddaughter, Rhianna, 5. All are residents of Henderson, NV.

The more notorious cases that he was involved with during his career include the shooting of rapper Tupac Shakur and the violent fight between the rival Hells Angels and Mongol outlaw biker gangs during the Laughlin River Run in 2002. Three people were killed and 13 others were shot or stabbed in the confrontation.

Sgt. Hood received the 2002 Medal of Valor for his efforts in the shoot-out, the highest honor issued by the department. He also gives of himself by being a member of the Laughlin Town Advisory Board, a volunteer position. He can be described as a dedicated man, dedicated to the community, the police department and his family.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to honor Sgt. Gary Hood on the floor of the House today. I congratulate him on his retirement. He has been an honorable and valuable public servant and he will be missed.

RECOGNIZING KATELYN SELOFF  
OF CARROLLTON, TEXAS

**HON. KENNY MARCHANT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Katelyn Seloff of Carrollton, Texas. Katelyn has been named one of the top youth volunteers in Texas for 2006 in the 11th annual Prudential Spirit of Community Awards.

Katelyn Seloff, age 13, is an eighth-grader at DeWitt Perry Middle School in Carrollton, Texas. She created a peer tutoring program to provide students with academic help without the pressures of being tutored by a teacher. Katelyn recruited 21 students to volunteer as tutors. Together they provided regular tutoring sessions for 15 students in need of assistance. Her efforts led to her selection as a Distinguished Finalist in this year's Prudential Spirit of Community awards program.

Today I salute Katelyn for her impressive community service activities. It is encouraging to see outstanding young adults like her making significant contributions to their communities. I thank Katelyn for her dedication to volunteering; she is a great example of the high quality of the young people in our North Texas schools. I am proud to represent her in the U.S. House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE COMMUNITY OF  
PALCO, KANSAS

**HON. JERRY MORAN**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the citizens of Palco, Kansas for long-term efforts to sustain and revitalize their community.

Mayor Leo VonFeldt is proud to call this town of 235 people home. "Palco continues to grow," VonFeldt said. "The community has done a lot to keep going forward."

Over the last ten years, the citizens of Palco have taken action to ensure that their community continues to be home to another generation of Kansans.

In 1996, a USDA Rural Development grant was supplemented by \$125,000 of local dollars in order to complete an expansion of Kyser Machine Products. This effort provided six jobs to the local economy.

The development of Keller Motors/Petro Plus & Quality Collision Repair was completed in 1998. This half a million dollar project included a \$250,000 owner investment, \$200,000 in local contributions and Federal funding of \$50,000. The result of this shared investment is that 6 employees now provide area residents a full service gas station, 24 hour fuel access and auto collision service. The business has made a positive contribution to the community. The significance of that contribution was highlighted when owner Myron Keller was recognized as the 2004 National Young Entrepreneur of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration. Keller said he was humbled by the award, which in his opinion belongs to the entire community.

"Our community recognizes that we can't just sit back. We must be pro-active and keep working hard for a better future," Keller said. "Nothing just happens in rural America. You have to make it happen."

In 2002, a dedicated effort was made to enhance local government services through construction of a new city building. The facility was funded by \$120,000 in local donations and includes a city office, ambulance service and fire department.

The following year, community food service availability was greatly improved when the Palco Community Development Corporation purchased and completely remodeled a local restaurant. The \$45,000 project has resulted in 6 day a week restaurant service. In addition, new ownership took over Palco's grocery store which preserved access to grocery service for local residents.

In 2004, an investment of \$132,000 from local and Federal sources resulted in the renovation and opening of the Palco Medical Clinic. The clinic provides residents with needed health care service. Also, Midwest Community Bank opened a facility in Palco which preserved local access to lending and investment opportunities. That same year, the city completed a two year community enhancement initiative. The \$2.2 million project established a home improvement program, a new sewer plant and construction of a new city street near the downtown area.

In the last decade, the citizens of Palco have leveraged more than \$3,250,000 of private, local and Federal investment into their community. Most recently, the town has taken on the task of developing a local day care facility. Community leaders hope to have the facility open by the fall of this year. According to Mayor VonFeldt this is just one more example of the community coming together to achieve a goal. "Citizens are willing to give of their time, energy and resources," VonFeldt said. "This is what makes Palco great."

For rural communities to survive and prosper into the future, citizens must be willing to create their own opportunities for success. Ongoing efforts to revitalize Palco are an example of how hard work, vision and community support can create just such an opportunity. Citizens throughout Kansas are working together to enhance the quality of life in their communities. Palco is a success story that demonstrates how teamwork and creative thinking can make a positive difference in rural America.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONSTABLE  
PATRICK KETTERER

**HON. JON C. PORTER**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Laughlin Town Constable Patrick Ketterer for his outstanding service to the community of Laughlin and his dedication to making that community a safer and more pleasant place in which to live and visit.

Patrick Ketterer has been a Laughlin resident since 1988, moving there from Rochester, Michigan. He serves in one of two elected positions in the Laughlin Township. He was initially appointed to the position to fill a va-

cancy and has since been reelected to the position four times. He is the longest serving elected official in Laughlin.

Along with serving as the town Constable, Patrick Ketterer has given countless hours of service to the community through volunteer work. Some of his activities include serving with the Metro Volunteer Police (MVPs), volunteering as a Homeland Security reserve officer and working for the local Community Emergency Response Team as Team Trainer. He is also a member of the Kiwanis and Lions clubs, as well as the American Legion Post 60. On January 10, 2006, He received the Citizen of the Year award for 2005 from the Laughlin Town Advisory Board.

To the children of Laughlin Patrick Ketterer is known simply as "Santa." Usually arriving at holiday events by police car, fire truck, or even a horse and buggy, he has thrilled the children of the community for years by playing the role of Santa Claus.

Mr. Speaker, It is a privilege to honor Patrick Ketterer for his community service in the great state of Nevada.

CONGRATULATING THE ASIAN PACIFIC  
AMERICAN TIMES ON ITS  
10TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

**HON. MARK UDALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Asian Pacific American Times on its upcoming 10th Anniversary celebration and to honor the important contributions this paper has made over the last decade. On March 25, 2006, the APA Times will celebrate a record of substantial achievement and growth among its readership.

The Asian Pacific American Times began with a narrower mission and title than it has today as the "Philippine American Times," focusing on issues relevant to Filipino-Americans living and working in Colorado. Over time the paper realized even greater potential to reach more Asian-American communities and it broadened its coverage and objectives accordingly. In March 2003, the Asian Pacific American Times became "The Voice of Asian Pacific Americans in the Rockies."

Reading the Asian Pacific American Times today, it is not uncommon to see datelines from locations as varied as Denver, Washington D.C., South Korea, Mongolia, China, and the Philippines. This breadth demonstrates the APA Times' dedication to reporting on a wide range of issues important to emerging Asian communities. In addition to substantive reporting and editing, it is important to recognize the APA Times' devotion to community involvement. Having won the Asian Chamber of Commerce Small Business of the Year Award in 2003 and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Business Social Responsibility Award in 2005, the APA Times shows a clear commitment beyond routine journalism to greater support of Asian-American communities and cultural awareness. From volunteering in programs to participating in commissions to organizing special events, the APA Times and its employees go above and beyond their laudable work as a press outlet to become public servants and community leaders.

For their accomplishments, service, and hard work, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the employees of the Asian Pacific American Times on their 10th Anniversary and their many journalistic achievements over the last decade. I look forward to reading their work and witnessing their accomplishments for another ten years and beyond.

TRIBUTE TO PEACE CORPS  
VOLUNTEERS

**HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Peace Corps as it reached its 45th anniversary on March 1, 2006. The Peace Corps is an outstanding organization that promotes peace through helping countless individuals who want to help build a better life for the community in which they serve.

Since the Peace Corps' inception in 1961, more than 182,000 Peace Corps Volunteers have been invited by 138 host countries to work in areas such as HIV/AIDS prevention, information technology, business development, education, and environmental preservation. The Peace Corps also works to empower people in various communities to take charge of their futures.

In addition to serving overseas, the Peace Corps' Crisis Corps Volunteers have helped their fellow Americans. In response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the Peace Corps deployed approximately 272 Crisis Corps Volunteers to the Gulf Coast region to assist with hurricane response efforts, through an agreement with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). This deployment of volunteers within the U.S. was an historic first for the Peace Corps.

I would like to take some time now to honor current Volunteers from my District who are working on the front lines of humanity: Christina M. Burke serving in Nicaragua, Lisa M. Droege serving in Honduras, Cibeles Garcia serving in Ghana, Jesse S. Lovegren serving in Cameroon, Timothy A. Markin serving in Thailand. By engaging in this meaningful work, these volunteers are making significant contributions to individuals and communities throughout the world. Their family and loved ones should be justifiably proud of their service to the Peace Corps and the extraordinary way they have changed and improved people's lives.

Today, I ask that my colleagues join me in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Peace Corps and its global mission towards world peace and humanitarian aid. The thousands of Volunteers serving overseas truly are representative of the honorable cause that defines the Peace Corps.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CHIEF  
WILLIAM TURK

**HON. JON C. PORTER**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief William Turk of the Boulder City

Police Department, who has retired after twenty years of dedicated service.

Bill began working for the Boulder City Police Department in 1986. He started as patrol officer and worked his way through the ranks as a Detective, Sergeant, Lieutenant, and finally, as Chief of Police. Even though he was Chief of Police, he was always ready to serve as backup if needed. He learned this philosophy from the much larger Oklahoma City Police department where he served for ten years prior to coming to Boulder City. One night, he was responding to a call and requested another officer to assist him. When the dispatch said no units were available, he was stunned when the city's police chief himself showed up minutes later. The Chief had been listening to the radio traffic from his scanner at home.

Bill left Oklahoma City seeking a department where he could actually have time to solve problems he was called out to. Boulder City, with its low crime rate, fit the bill. Many officers have the belief they need to make as many arrests and citations as possible, but not Bill Turk. He believed in Community Policing. Boulder City residents would often notice pink slips on their cars, warning them of a parking violation, instead of tickets. Cars also received courtesy reminders if their doors were left unlocked. Once, several businesses were repeatedly complaining about kids leaving their bikes all over the sidewalk by a pizza parlor they frequented. The problem was the kids had no other place to put their bikes. Sitting behind the police station was a bike rack that never got used. The department donated the rack to the pizza parlor. Problem solved. These are just a few examples of how Bill worked hard not only to make the town safe but also to make it a better community.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Turk is a well-respected model of honesty and integrity. His career will stand as an example to all those who set forth to protect and serve. It is an honor to recognize him on the floor of the House and I wish him the best with retirement.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE,  
CAREER AND RETIREMENT OF  
LARRY BLEVINS

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mrs. TAUSCHER and I, rise to pay tribute to Donald Lawrence Blevins who is retiring from Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 342 after a distinguished career including fifty years as a Steamfitter, four years as an Instructor, ten years as Director of Training, nine years as Business Representative and another eight years as Business Manager/Financial Secretary.

Larry Blevins was born April 10, 1937, in Arbuckle, California; two years later, his family relocated to the city of Tormey near the Union 76 oil refinery. It was here in December of 1954 that Larry first embarked on his career as a Steamfitter working as a permit hand for Fluor Maintenance on a two-week turnaround. Realizing his potential, Larry joined the Steamfitters Local 342 Apprentice Program in January of 1956 and four years later graduated from the Laney Tech Trade School in Oakland, California.

Upon graduation, Larry's first General Foremen's position came while working Travel Card out of the Chico Local in 1961 and 1962 at a Titan missile base. Larry's elevation to a supervisory position was a rare feat for a Travel Card worker and came as a direct result of his outstanding skill level and ability to learn quickly. Larry was further rewarded for his commitment to Local 342 and elected to the Apprentice Committee in the General Election of Officers on December 10, 1967.

In the early 1970's, Larry was encouraged by Brother Vern Gosney to start regularly attending Membership Meetings and become more involved with the organization and operation of the Local. Brothers Les Reed and Tom Irvin also worked closely with Larry and were the first to recommend that he begin teaching. He took all of this advice to heart and began regularly attending meetings and started taking night school classes to learn supervisory techniques and engineering skills. It wasn't long before Larry began instructing the Local 342 Apprenticeship Training Program and subsequently earned a Life Time Services Teaching Credential through the State of California.

Starting in 1977, Larry embarked on another career path and undertook the task of running the Training Center as Director of Training. It was during his ten years as Director that the school was expanded to accommodate larger classes of apprentices to help complete the many projects within the Local's jurisdiction. As the need for apprentices grew, Larry also oversaw the expansion of the Journeyman Training classes. These classes were designed to upgrade the skill levels of the Local's journeymen and keep them current with the industry's expanding technological advancements. Larry understood the need to stay on top of the changing industry and worked diligently to keep pace.

On December 11, 1988 in the General Election of Officers, Larry won a three-way race for Business Representative over Contra Costa County with more than 53% of the vote. While overseeing Contra Costa County, the Local worked major projects such as: the TKC Rebuild at Chevron in Richmond, the CoGeneration Power Plants throughout the area's refineries, major expansions throughout Chevron, and Clean Fuels projects at Chevron, Shell, Tosco and Unocal. Almost overnight Larry's jurisdiction went from just a couple hundred UA members to more than 2,000. Larry's skills helped ensure that the work was manned with qualified craftsmen and the jurisdiction of the Local was protected.

After three terms as Business Representative, Larry put in his bid for nomination to the Local's top position, Business Manager/Financial Secretary. On December 14, 1997, with the largest turnout for any election in Local's history, Larry was elected with 88% of the votes cast. The Membership's confidence in him was high enough in the General Election of Officers in 2000 and again in 2003 that he was reelected unopposed.

With Larry's leadership and the assistance of many dedicated members, Local 342 has one of the finest and most progressive training centers in the country. Larry also worked tirelessly as a Board of Trust member to stabilize the Health and Welfare Plan and amend the Master Labor Agreement to improve the conditions on the work site. Larry negotiated an increase in the Total Package that provides

funds for the Pension, the Health and Welfare plan. These advancements have not only helped to significantly improve working conditions; the language and monetary conditions were also greatly increased.

Larry has represented Local 342 countless times at conventions of the California State Pipe Trades Council, the United Association, the Western States Pipe Trades Council and the Western States Pipeline Conference. He's also served on the Executive Boards of these associations as well as the Contra Costa and Alameda County Building and Construction Trades Councils. In 2001, Larry was appointed by the UA General President to the prestigious Laws Committee at the UA Convention in Miami Beach, Florida. On October 26, 2001, Larry was honored as Labor Leader of the Year and recognized by the Contra Costa Central Labor Council, the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council and the California State Senate and Assembly for his service to the community and to working men and women.

Larry not only worked tirelessly for his brothers and sisters of organized labor, he also cultivated friendships within the community. Some of the community projects he has been a part of include, Camp Okizu, the building of the Shepard's Gate home for battered women, the Mother Wright Foundation and the Northern California Special Olympics.

Upon retirement Larry will now have more time to devote to his wife, Debbie, sons Donald and Keith, daughter Dorothy, stepchildren Derrick and Andrea, as well as grandchildren Stephanie, Marshall, Amber and Curtis.

As we wish Larry a fond farewell, we can rest assured that he has left Local 342 financially strong, cultivated a strong symbiotic relationship with the Local's contractors, and helped strengthen the ties with Sister Locals and other branches. Larry's honorable toil has helped cement a positive place within the community for the brothers and sisters of Local 342. We are all beneficiaries of his hard work and we salute his efforts. Cheers to a happy and healthy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO THE BRADY KOHN  
FOUNDATION

**HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to the Brady Kohn Foundation and its founders, Carolyn and Andy Kohn. The Kohns began their foundation to honor a wonderful little boy, their son Brady, whose life on this earth was all too short. The work of this Foundation centers around the use of umbilical cord blood, a safe and painless way to retrieve valuable stem cells, which can be used to save the lives of many Americans. I welcome the initiative taken by the partnership of Christiana Care Hospital, the The Elie Katz Umbilical Cord Blood Program at Community Blood Services, and the Brady Kohn Foundation to publicly bank cord blood. This is the first step into truly cutting edge medical research.

I am very familiar with the dedication of The Brady Kohn Foundation's founding members. Carolyn and Andy have worked tirelessly to

achieve a partnership that would enable expectant mothers to have their umbilical cord blood publicly banked at no cost. The Brady Kohn Foundation will be the leader in education, awareness, and promotion of this project, inspiring expectant mothers to bank their cord blood in hopes of saving the lives of others. Christiana Care is an excellent choice for this project as they are home to approximately 7,000 deliveries per year. Of the cord blood collected, roughly 60 percent will be banked and used for medical procedures such as bone marrow transplants, while the other 40 percent will be used for research that has the potential to heal countless diseases in the future.

I recognize the struggle that the Kohns have gone through to reach their goal of providing a public umbilical cord banking system. I would like to thank Carolyn, Andy, and all those involved with this valuable project. I am certain the new public cord blood banking system will have a tremendous impact on many lives in my home state of Delaware and around the United States.

TRIBUTE TO MEDICALERT

**HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize MedicAlert, a company founded by Dr. Marion and Chrissie Colling of Turlock, California in 1956. The MedicAlert system provides identification and medical information in emergencies, alerting emergency medical professionals to preexisting medical conditions such as diabetes, heart conditions, implanted devices, and allergies to medications.

MedicAlert utilizes identification bracelets and the E-Health Key, both of which are to be carried at all times in case of emergency. A 24-hour Emergency Response Center can be reached by calling a phone number on MedicAlert bracelets, allowing direct dialogue with nurses who have access to patients' Electronic Health Record. The emergency contact information available in those records helps make sure that patients' families are contacted in an emergency. MedicAlert provides free training pertaining to the use of MedicAlert bracelets and E-Health Keys for emergency response personnel and the public safety community.

Now in its 50th year, MedicAlert is endorsed by the American Red Cross, the National Institute of Health, the American College of Emergency Physicians and the American Pharmaceutical Association. Over 100,000 medical professionals recommend MedicAlert to their patients. MedicAlert currently receives 3,500 emergency calls a year. MedicAlert has grown to have affiliates in nine countries: Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Cyprus, Malaysia, Iceland, South Africa and Zimbabwe.

I am very proud to congratulate MedicAlert on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary. Over 80,000 people credit MedicAlert with having helped saved their lives in an emergency, and I wish this amazing organization many more years of growth, increased awareness, and success. Four million members worldwide un-

derstand the great importance of this organization and the immeasurable service it provides.

“WHITHER THE SIX PARTY  
PROCESS?”

**HON. JAMES A. LEACH**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 2005, China, Japan, North Korea, Russia, South Korea, and the U.S. signed a Joint Statement of principles under which North Korea committed to abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs. In contrast to the hopes surrounding that pledge, the intervening 6 months have brought no substantive progress toward that end, and the Six Party process is beginning to appear moribund.

This circumstance is particularly regrettable because time is on no one's side. Every day of the status quo is another day for the North Korean regime to produce additional fissile material, and another day that the people of North Korea fall further behind the remarkable economic and social march of the rest of Asia. At the same time that the malfeasance of the North Korean government has brought us to this impasse, it remains in the interest of the U.S. to initiate additional dialogue, even if prospects for its success are uncertain.

Alternatively, to continue to maintain a reactive approach—such as placing unrealistic conditions on high-level contacts and other forms of meaningful engagement with the DPRK—cedes too much control to hard-liners in a regime that does not yet feel sufficient pressure or incentive to denuclearize.

We must continually test the intent of North Korea and not miss any opportunity for progress, however improbable. We are also obligated to consistently demonstrate to the other parties in the region that the intransigence impeding progress is not ours. Both of these priorities presuppose dialogue.

Because we control what we say, we ought not fear additional discussions or supplementary avenues of discussion. Conversation is never concession if one is speaking the truth, advancing the national interest.

At all levels of human interaction, including the international strategic level, there exists a significant psychological dimension: Between nations, as between people, the stronger party has greater strategic confidence and thus capacity to take the first conciliatory steps when intransigent differences arise. Given the enormity of the stakes at issue, it behooves the U.S. to take advantage of the greater flexibility we possess to creatively explore possibilities for resolving the challenges posed by North Korea.

One has the sense that due to understandable frustrations relative to past North Korean actions, including cheating on international commitments, the White House has given exceedingly constrained options to our negotiators. But clear-headedness about the nature of the North Korean regime should not cloud the mind about devising techniques and processes to overcome differences.

We have many assets, not the least of which is our professional diplomatic corps.

American professionalism is exemplified by Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill, who has developed a constructive relationship with all of the parties to the Six Party Talks, including North Korea. The case for sending him to Pyongyang to test the boundaries—and push the implementation—of the Joint Statement is compelling.

In particular, we should not be hesitant to begin considering the utility of negotiat[ing] a permanent peace regime on the Korean Peninsula at an appropriate separate forum, as envisioned by the Joint Statement and the recent U.S.-ROK strategic dialogue. Taking the initiative to formally end the Korean War would underscore our peaceful intent in an unparalleled fashion, and remind the Korean people that the U.S. singularly and unequivocally supports the peaceful reunification of the Peninsula. There may be sequencing concerns but forging ahead on this aspect of the statement of principles may increase the willingness of the other parties to exert greater pressure to enforce its critical core—the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula—and provide North Korea greater psychological as well as strategic comfort to accede to concerns of the outside world.

While we speak directly to the North Korean delegation in Beijing at the Six Party Talks and have certain contacts with the North Korean ambassador to the United Nations, there is clearly a problem of communication between our two governments. Accordingly, it is time, perhaps with appropriate *quid pro quo*s, that we explore the feasibility of establishing liaison offices in our two capitals.

For the U.S. to continue to stand pat is to transfer initiative to others, indebting us to the diplomacy of countries that may have different interests, or simply ensconcing the status quo.

It's time for the U.S. to lead.

#### TRIBUTE TO FAITH MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

### HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the Faith Missionary Baptist Church of Capitol Heights, Maryland and Reverend Dr. Michael C. Turner, Sr. for their outstanding commitment to the community over the last fifteen years.

Their church home was purchased in May of 2000, and the dedication and cornerstone laying service was held on November 11, 2000. Since its inception the Church has baptized hundreds of new converts, provided structured Bible classes, established a strong and viable Youth Ministry, established mentoring and tutorial programs, and established a 10-week Summer Youth Enrichment Program.

I submit for the record the celebration of the Church's 15th Anniversary with the theme of "Remembering the Past, Celebrating the Present, and Stepping into the Future."

#### RECOGNIZING U.S. SPEED SKATING CHAMPION, JOEY CHEEK

### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to recognize U.S. speed skating champion, Joey Cheek, who won Olympic gold on February 13 in the men's 500-meter speed skating event at the winter games in Torino, Italy. Mr. Cheek decided to donate \$25,000 in prize money to "Right to Play," an organization that will use the money to benefit refugees from the Darfur region of western Sudan by using sports to advance development, health, and peace.

Not only is Mr. Cheek an incredibly gifted athlete, he has shown tremendous generosity using his own glory to shed light on the atrocities being carried out by the Government of Sudan against its own people. As co-chair of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus and having traveled to Sudan five times, I have no doubt that Mr. Cheek's donation will make a difference in the humanitarian crisis unfolding in Darfur.

I insert for the RECORD a State Department news release from February 16. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Joey Cheek for his remarkable accomplishments, on and off the ice.

#### AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO AWARD A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE TUSKEGEE AIR- MEN

SPEECH OF

### HON. DANIEL E. LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 28, 2006*

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Tuskegee airmen. They sacrificed for a Nation they loved even when that love was not totally reciprocated. In 1941, the Army Air Force began a program to train African Americans as military pilots.

This was an era of segregation, when popular opinion was against training African Americans to become aviators, but the individuals of the Tuskegee experience showed the Nation and the world that they were equals. By overcoming many hardships, they cast aside the myths that had allowed segregation, inequity and injustice to prevail in society.

To break barriers, there is often one individual who will pave the way. The catalyst for African American aviation was Charles Alfred "Chief" Anderson. When first lady Eleanor Roosevelt, climbed into the back of Anderson's plane in 1941, a new chapter had begun for military aviation in America. His love for flying airplanes began at a young age and throughout his life gave wings to countless African American pilots.

In 1943, the Tuskegee airmen tasted combat for the first time. By World War II's end, the German Luftwaffe would know them as the "Red tailed Devils" and the American bombing crews would refer to them as the "Red Tail Angels." During the war, the four African

American fighter squadrons that made up the 332nd fighter group established their legitimacy with countless victories in the air. They also solidified a legacy of being highly disciplined and capable fighters by flying over 200 escort missions over Germany without ever losing a bomber to enemy fire.

For their service they were awarded high honors, including Distinguished Flying Crosses, Legions of Merit, Silver Stars, Purple Hearts, the Croix de Guerre, and the red star of Yugoslavia. A Distinguished Unit Citation was awarded to the 332nd fighter group for "outstanding performance and extraordinary heroism" in 1945.

The Tuskegee Airmen fought the Axis powers in Europe and racism at home. Their accomplishments spoke louder than words and provided evidence that led to the integration of our Nation's armed forces. It is important that we continue to acknowledge the sacrifices and service of these Americans who performed so admirably. The accomplishments of the brave Tuskegee Airmen will never be forgotten, and may they always remind us of the unlimited power of the human spirit.

#### HONORING LORRIE GRAVES, RE- BECCA McDUFF, AND JENNIFER PRATHER

### HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the early 1990s the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards began a voluntary certification process for teachers who excel in the classroom and demonstrate an exceptional knowledge of their subject field. Nationwide, only 1.5 percent of teachers have been awarded this certificate. It's clearly quite an achievement to attain this level of mastery.

Today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the three Seventh Congressional District teachers who have earned this distinction.

It is my privilege to congratulate and thank Lorrie Graves of Moore Elementary in Franklin, Rebecca McDuff of Grassland Elementary in Brentwood, and Jennifer Prather of Crosswind Elementary in Collierville for their hard work.

Each of these teachers has shown an incredible aptitude not only for teaching but for the specific area of study in which they specialize. They are improving the lives of their students, and we all thank them for their hard work.

#### RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2006 VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

### HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in Northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Several

members of the Fairfax County Police Department have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that are awarded to a public safety officer: the Lifesaving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that I enter into the record the names of the recipients of the 2006 Valor Awards in the Fairfax County Police Department. Receiving the Lifesaving Award: Master Police Officer James J. Greeves; Police Officer First Class Chris R. Musser; Officer Travis L. Tate; the Certificate of Valor: Officer Robert M. Bauer; Officer Connie E. Gerten; Police Officer First Class Timothy A. Judd; Officer Ryan A. Kaspar; Police Officer First Class Michael S. Lamper; Police Officer First Class Gregory McNiff; Officer Thomas E. Wilbert; the Bronze Medal: Police Officer First Class Keith J. Baker; Police Officer First Class Raymond E. Betts; Police Officer First Class Jonathan J. Bobel; Master Police Officer John D. Brocco; Police Officer First Class Sean M. Brodrick; Second Lieutenant Michael L. Connor; Master Police Officer Paul G. DeHaven; Officer Ryan L. Fisher; Police Officer First Class Edward F. Hanko; Officer Louis J. Marino; Officer Brandon C. McAleese; Master Police Officer Michael L. Mountjoy; Police Officer First Class Michael S. O'Brein; Master Police Officer John F. Pennington; Officer Anthony N. Taormina; Sergeant Paul Thompson; the Silver Medal: Police Officer First Class Anthony D. Erway; Police Officer First Class Lance T. Guckenberger; Officer Paul A. Meler.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Fairfax County Police Department. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

CONGRATULATING JOEL B. BULLARD, JR. FOR RECEIVING TIME MAGAZINE'S 2006 QUALITY DEALER AWARD

### HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to honor Mr. Joel B. Bullard, Jr., President of Joe Bullard Cadillac-Hummer on the occasion of receiving the 2006 Time Magazine Quality Dealer Award.

Joe has been a vital member of the Mobile, Alabama, community all of his life. He began his career at his family's car dealership, Joe Bullard Oldsmobile, in 1972 and rose through the ranks to become dealer in 1980. Under his leadership, the dealership has expanded, and he recently opened a 6.5 acre Cadillac and Hummer business.

In addition to his professional successes, Joe has long been a supporter of community organizations. He serves as a trustee of the United Way of Southwest Alabama, and he is past chairman of the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce. He has also served as a director for the Mobile Kiwanis Club, the Federal Reserve Board of New Orleans, the Mobile Air-

port Authority, Mobile Economic Development Council, and the Mobile Community Foundation.

Joe's long-standing commitment to the community combined with his business successes led to this well-deserved nomination. He was one of only 66 automobile dealers, from more than 19,500 nationwide, nominated for the 37th annual award. The Time Magazine Quality Dealer Award is the most prestigious and highly coveted award for car dealers, and the recipients are among the nation's most successful auto dealers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to Joe for being named Time Magazine's 2006 Quality Dealer Award recipient and for his many professional achievements. I know his wife, Foncie, his two children, and his many friends join with me in praising his accomplishments.

### TRIBUTE TO HELPING THE HURTING, INC.

### HON. NATHAN DEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, not-for-profit charitable organizations provide an essential service in meeting the needs of the down-trodden and forgotten of our nation. Today I rise to recognize the honorable service of one such organization from my district that supports many who have fallen through the cracks. This group, Helping the Hurting, Inc., is dedicated to providing free counseling to single mothers as well as abused women and children, many of whom do not have Medicare, Medicaid, or any other kind of insurance. This guidance has assisted thousands during their time of deepest need in circumstances ranging from substance abuse to marital hardships to managing personal finances. Helping the Hurting's aid goes beyond counseling services to offering a food bank, clothes closet, and even helping low-income individuals find ways to get their prescriptions at a lower cost through Patient Assistance Programs. The organization's founder Daniel Staats has helped many through his 17 years of service who felt forgotten by all those around them, and I salute his admirable sacrifice and dedication to those in need.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATIONS "GO RED FOR WOMEN" EFFORT IN FRANKLIN, TENNESSEE

### HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, heart disease is the number one killer of women in the United States. The numbers are staggering. Each year heart disease claims the lives of more than 475,000 women and yet less than 15 percent of women know that this disease is a major threat to their health. Clearly education is critical to fighting this disease.

The American Heart Association's "Go Red for Women" effort is a movement committed

to wiping out heart disease by educating women on steps they can do to reduce their risk.

On May 4, 2006 hundreds of women will be gathering in Franklin, Tennessee to show their support for the "Go Red for Women" campaign. I want to join them in speaking out on this issue and thank our community for focusing on this issue.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2006 VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

### HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in Northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Several members of the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that are awarded to a public safety officer: the Lifesaving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that I enter into the record the names of the recipients of the 2006 Valor Awards in the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department. Receiving the Lifesaving Award: Apparatus Technician Cliff E. Sweeney; the Certificate of Valor: Lieutenant David P. Conrad; Firefighter Lawrence L. Ellison; Firefighter Kimberly A. Schoppa; Technician Jeffrey S. Seabright; Captain II Clayton Thompson; Lieutenant Chester E. Waters; the Bronze Medal: Firefighter Justin D. Childs; Lieutenant Gary C. Dize; Firefighter James P. Hobgood; Captain IVEMS Supervisor Lorenzo M. Thrower.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of the Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

CONGRATULATING DR. SAMUEL EICHOLO ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

### HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to honor Dr. Samuel Eichold on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

As a Marine, internist, University of South Alabama medical school professor, founder of Camp Seale Harris for diabetic children, and creator of the Mobile Medical Museum, Sam Eichold has dedicated his 90 years to helping others.

Dr. Sam has been active in Mobile's medical community throughout his life. It was at the age of 59 when he left his private practice to become a medical professor at the University of South Alabama, where he still keeps an office.

In 1989, Dr. Sam was named Mobilian of the Year. He has also devoted much of his time to Mobile's art community. He has even served as a board member of the Mobile Symphony Orchestra, the Chamber Music Society, and the Mobile Opera Guild, among others. He was given a Greater Mobile Arts Award by the Mobile Arts Council in October, and an art gallery at Spring Hill College bears his name.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating a dedicated community leader and friend to many throughout south Alabama. I know Dr. Sam's colleagues, his family, and his many friends join with me in praising his accomplishments and extending thanks for his many efforts over the years on behalf of Mobile and the First Congressional District.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR  
ENTERPRISE OPPORTUNITY

**HON. NATHAN DEAL**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the thousands of small businesses across the United States which, by definitional size, are classified as micro enterprises. More than one-half of the nation's economic engine is fueled by small businesses.

Micro enterprise embraces strategic economic development relative to the smallest of the businesses, generally with five employees or less. Once called "mom and pop" businesses, they no longer equate to the folksy moniker. In many cases across rural America, the micro enterprises become capital for human development and poverty alleviation. It is documented and recognized that micro enterprises create jobs, generate income, build assets and enhance interpersonal skills among its owners and their employees.

Micro enterprises utilize a valued conduit for financial training, business development and loans. Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) earn this designation through rigorous Department of Treasury standards. The CDFIs interface with the men and women who have a dream of owning and growing a small business; it is they who extend credit and become de facto partners in entrepreneurial enterprises throughout the land.

Micro enterprises and CDFIs also partner with foundations, community banks, regional banks, state economic development agencies, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank and other like-missioned federal agencies such as the Appalachian Regional Commission. As traditional working capital is beyond the financial reach of many, a unique collaboration steers these business entities toward success and self-sufficiency.

The Association for Enterprise Opportunity strives to assist underserved entrepreneurs in starting, stabilizing and expanding businesses. As its national conference is held in May in Atlanta, the economic capital of the southeastern United States, I welcome them to my state.

The host of the national conference is the Georgia Micro Enterprise Network, a nonprofit organization dedicated to making a difference in the economic lives of Georgians. The conference will celebrate the vision of micro enterprise success, and we, as Members of Congress applaud that success and commend the myriad venturous fibers which make our nation's great economic quilt as strong as ever.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HONORING LISA ROTEN

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor one of Tennessee's exceptional teachers. Lisa Roten of Adamsville received the Wal-Mart Teacher of the Year Award for our state in 2005. Her award is accompanied by a \$10,000 education grant for her school. I know that everyone at Adamsville Elementary School is thrilled for Lisa and proud of her achievement.

She has shown herself to be an enthusiastic and dedicated teacher while working with our sixth grade students. As a mom, I know the importance of a good teacher. Lisa clearly knows that nurturing the unique gifts in each of our kids is critical to education.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Lisa for her exceptional work.

RECOGNIZING THE FAIRFAX COUNTY  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 2006  
VALOR AWARD RECIPIENTS

**HON. TOM DAVIS**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of men and women in Northern Virginia. The Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes individuals who have demonstrated superior dedication to public safety with the prestigious Valor Award. Several members of the Fairfax County Sheriff's Office have earned this highest honor that Fairfax County bestows upon its public safety officials.

There are several types of Valor Awards that are awarded to a public safety officer: the Lifesaving Award, the Certificate of Valor, or the Gold, Silver, or Bronze Medal of Valor.

It is with great pride that I enter into the RECORD the names of the recipients of the 2006 Valor Awards in the Fairfax County Sheriff's Office. Receiving the Lifesaving Award: Private First Class Nicole L. Arnett; Private First Class Laval L. Collins; Private First Class Clifton Cooley; Private First Class Michael D. Ford; Master Deputy Sheriff Marvin S. Johnston; Private First Class Thomas V. Kyle; Private/Deputy John J. Roth; Second Lieutenant Gregory E. Schossler; Deputy Ryan E. Tasse; the Certificate of Valor Award: Second Lieutenant Brian Johnston; Private First Class Teena M. Putman.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the men and women who serve in the Fairfax County Sher-

iff's Office. Their efforts, made on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, are selfless acts of heroism and truly merit our highest praise. I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding this group of remarkable citizens.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ST. PAUL'S  
EPISCOPAL SCHOOL ON THEIR  
2006 5A GIRLS' STATE INDOOR  
TRACK AND FIELD CHAMPIONSHIP

**HON. JO BONNER**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to honor St. Paul's Episcopal School on their 2006 5A Girls' State Indoor Track and Field Championship.

Head Coach Jim Tate has led St. Paul's to 32 state championships. Since 1983, Coach Tate's teams have claimed 74 separate state team championships in track and cross-country. Twenty-five of his former athletes have gone on to compete at the collegiate level in either track or cross-country. In 1999, Coach Tate was selected as the national cross-country coach of the year.

The St. Paul's girls' cross-country team holds the national record for the longest consecutive state championship streak in the nation, winning the state championship for 16 consecutive years (1983-1998). This year's girls' team proved to be champions in their victory on February 4, 2006, at Celebration Arena in Priceville.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating St. Paul's Episcopal School on a great season and their state championship. This school deserves public recognition for this great honor, and I extend my congratulations to each member of the team and coaching staff.

St. Paul's Girls' Varsity Indoor Track Roster, Emily Bender 9th, Eleanor Brown 9th, Malise Collins 8th, Emily Collins 11th, Paige Cunningham 12th, Maggie DeLaney 12th, Sophie Eldred 8th, Norah Gufstason 8th, Margaret Harkness 7th, Angelica Howard 11th, Kayleigh Hudson 7th, Mary Carleton Johnston 10th, Hannah Jones 7th, Allison Kneip 11th, Allison Lerner 11th, Taylor Luckey 8th, Mary Win McCarthy 10th, Molly McGee 11th, Brenna McGee 10th, Jordan McMullan 11th, Coco Montgomery 7th, Kelsey Outlaw 7th, Hannah Samman 7th, Jeannie Schottgen 7th, Katelyn Simpson 12th, Mae Stimpson 10th, Ellie Stimpson 8th, Victoria Strange 8th, Nancy Taylor 9th, Summer Thomas 7th, Neal Tisher 9th, Sydneyjane Varmer 10th, Angel Watson 9th, Katherine White 7th, and Morgan Yeager 10th.

Coaching Staff: Head Coach: Jim Tate, Assistant Coaches: Kelli Etheredge, Lyndell Farmer, Erin Moore, and Bill Quina.

HONORING RHONDA KENNEDY

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Rhonda

Kennedy. Rhonda was named Tennessee Principal of the Year in 2005.

We all know how important principals are to our communities. Anyone with children can tell you it's the principal who sets the tone for a school and the huge impact that has on the quality of education our kids receive. Rhonda has shown that she is innovative, energetic, and dedicated to our kids and we can't thank her enough for that.

Among her achievements is the successful implementation of a program to assist special needs students. Rhonda also created a "Learning Lab" to improve literacy skills at her school.

Principal Kennedy's work has helped improve achievement at her school and brought parents, students, and our teachers together.

HONORING DEWBERRY'S 50TH  
ANNIVERSARY

**HON. TOM DAVIS**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the Dewberry Companies' 50th anniversary.

Dewberry was established as a small land design and survey practice on Friday, April 13, 1965, in Arlington, Virginia. Currently, Dewberry has more than 1,800 employees in 30 offices nationwide. The company has expanded from a small business to a nationwide company with over 1,800 employees and 30 offices. Dewberry provides an array of services, including civil engineering, surveying, design-build, environmental sciences, land development, security and homeland defense.

The company has assisted in major projects in the Northern Virginia area including the full planning and engineering of services for Kings Park (a residential community in Fairfax County), Tysons II, the Dulles Toll Road, and assisted with work for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. Moreover, Dewberry has consulted for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development during presidential-declared disasters.

Dewberry has been a strong member of the community through various charitable and scholarship programs. An example would be the Dean Meyers Scholarship fund, named for a Dewberry engineer who tragically lost his life in the DC sniper attacks of 2002. This scholarship which is awarded annually to a civil engineering student from a rural Pennsylvania high school has grown to \$100,000. Dean Meyers was a civil engineer who worked for Dewberry until his tragic death in October of 2002 when he became a victim of the Washington, DC area sniper attacks. Dewberry has also donated \$20,000 to the victims of the tsunami and another \$20,000 to the victims of the 2005 Gulf Coast hurricanes.

The founder of Dewberry, Sidney O. Dewberry, has not only propelled the success of Dewberry, but has served in numerous positions within the community including the Blue Ribbon Commission on Higher Education, and the Commission on Transportation. Additionally, he has served as member of the Commission on Fiscal and Spending Priorities in Fairfax County, as chairman of the Arlington

County, Virginia Planning Commission, and as chairman of the Fairfax County, Virginia Engineering Standards Review Committee. Currently, Mr. Dewberry is the Rector of George Mason University Board of Visitors and part of the George Mason University Foundation Board of Trustees.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend and congratulate Dewberry on all of its contributions and accomplishments. They have served their community well, truly meriting recognition. I call upon my colleagues to join me in the applauding Dewberry's past accomplishments and in wishing the company continued success in the years to come.

HONORING RETIRED NEW YORK  
STATE ASSEMBLYMAN RICHARD  
J. KEANE

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a tremendous sense of pleasure to honor the personal accomplishments and the long career in public service of a great elected leader and wonderful friend, former New York State Assemblyman Richard J. Keane.

Dick Keane is, as I said, a close friend of long standing. In point of fact, I succeeded Dick Keane as a member of the New York State Assembly in the 145th District. In all truthfulness I can say that no new member had a better mentor than I did.

Like me, Dick Keane is a lifelong—and tremendously proud—resident of South Buffalo, New York. A product of a large and politically prominent family in South Buffalo, Dick's career began protecting the public as a Buffalo Firefighter. From there, Dick went on to serve on the Erie County Board of Supervisors and was the first Democrat to serve as Chairman of its successor body, the Erie County Legislature. Dick was elected to a vacant seat in the State Assembly in 1976, and served in that seat proudly for 22 years.

But in Albany, Dick had two official duties that brought him great joy—his management of the Assembly's baseball team, and the Presidency of the American Irish Legislators Society of New York State, the latter being an organization in which I would later serve as Historian.

Each year, the American Irish Legislators Society of New York State honors one of its own, a former member of the State Legislature who made a significant contribution both to public service and, usually, to the Society itself. On Monday, March 13th, in Albany, NY, Dick Keane will be the Society's 2006 honoree. That that event, it will be my distinct honor to present Dick with a commemorative copy of these remarks and to join with my successor in the State Assembly, Assemblyman Mark Schroeder, in honoring Dick Keane's service to New York State and to his community.

Mr. Speaker, owing to my past service as Historian, I want to close with a bit of history. Ireland provided to the United States a number of wonderful gifts, but none more valuable than its people. Since the first days of landing on American soil, the Irish people have demonstrated a commitment to public service that

is unrivalled by any other ethnic group. From police and fire service to elective office, Irish Americans represent what is best about America—that if you work hard, play by the rules, love your family and your community and give as much as you can back to that community, the vaunted American Dream can be yours.

Dick Keane is a public official and a private citizen utterly worthy of that description and of the respect of those whose lives he made better for that service. It is my distinct honor to recognize him here today.

HONORING NANCY SANDERS  
PETERSON

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege for me to rise and acknowledge outstanding Tennesseans. Today I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Nancy Sanders Peterson, the president and CEO of Peterson Tool Co. Inc., for her contribution to our community in Tennessee.

Nancy has been recognized many times for her business success and she was recently inducted into the YWCA's Academy for Women of Achievement. This distinction honors women for their community leadership and Nancy is a wonderful addition.

She is a dedicated volunteer who has contributed her time and talents as a mentor for young women. Whether teaching money-management skills to Girl Scouts or speaking on university campuses, Peterson is a wonderful role model. And Nancy has counseled fellow female entrepreneurs on how to expand their businesses.

Congratulations and many thanks to Nancy Peterson for her unlimited energy and enthusiasm and her service to so many young women.

THE RETIREMENT OF U.S. MARINE  
CORPS GUNNERY SERGEANT  
LORENZO V. CHANCE

**HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gunnery Sergeant Lorenzo V. Chance, who is retiring after more than 22 years of service in the United States Marine Corps.

Gunnery Sergeant Chance was raised in Fayetteville, North Carolina where he graduated from Cape Fear High School in 1983. He began his military career at Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island, South Carolina, where he attended basic training in 1984. His assignments included the MOS's of Rifleman, Administrative Chief, Drill Instructor, and Marksmanship Instructor.

Throughout his distinguished career, Gunnery Sergeant Chance has served in a wide variety of assignments in the Marine Corps including:

September 1984–1986—Administrative Clerk, HQMC Manpower Branch;

November 1986–December 1987—Embarkation NCO Marine Wing Headquarter Squadron—1 Okinawa, Japan;

January 1988–December 1991—HQMC Programs and Resources Division, Assistant Security Manager ensuring the personnel, physical, and information security of a division of 60 persons, hundreds of highly-sensitive documents, and equipment;

January 1992–June 1995—Military Entrance Processing Station Montgomery, AL, Processing Specialist, interviewing and processing thousands of applicants into the U.S. Armed Forces;

July 1995–November 1997—Paris Island, SC, Senior Drill Instructor Third RTBN, K Company and, Operations Chief/Acting First Sergeant, Support BN, Special Training Company, a direct impact in the “Making of Marines”;

December 1997–April 2002—HQMC PP&O, Current Operations Branch, Marine Corps Command Center where he served as an Assistant Watch; Team Chief, SNCOIC Marine Corps Exercises Employment Program, and Post 9/11 Crisis Action Team Operations Chief. During this period he was also assigned various other duties, including service as a Member of the Headquarters Marine Corps, Inspector General’s Readiness Assessment Team, responsibility for globally inspecting Marine Corps units for deployment capability and, in the 2000 Presidential Inaugural Committee, SNCOIC of the Street Cordon.

Finally, from May 2002 through November 2005, Gunnery Sergeant Chance served the 435 Members of both the 108th and 109th Congress as SNCOIC Marine Corps Congressional Liaison Office. He was also the Senior Enlisted service member to the U.S. House of Representatives during this period. During this period, Gunnery Sergeant Chance was responsible for directing, and organizing numerous congressional and staff delegations around the world. His attention to detail in making these very important trips logistically successful is noteworthy.

Gunnery Sergeant Chance has been very effective in carrying the Marine’s message to the halls of Congress. By his exemplary professional competence, sound judgment, and total dedication to duty, Gunnery Sergeant Chance has reflected great credit upon himself and has always upheld the highest traditions of the United States Marine Corps. He has made a lasting contribution to the capability of today’s Marine Corps and has helped shape the future of tomorrow’s Corps.

His superior performance of his duties highlights more than 22 years of honorable and dedicated Marine Corps service. I know that my many colleagues who have come to know and rely on Gunnery Sergeant Chance extend to him our warmest thanks for his service and our best wishes for happiness and success in his future endeavors.

HONORING A GREAT AMERICAN—  
THOMAS WADSWORTH LITTLEFIELD

**HON. HENRY E. BROWN, JR.**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a constituent and respected businessman,

T. Jeffrey Littlefield, vice president of TRICARE North Region Operations for PGBA, LLC, will soon be joined by many members of his family in recognizing their patriarch, Thomas Wadsworth Littlefield, on the occasion of his 87th birthday, April 8.

The quote that his son Jeff recalls hearing his father say often is “this too shall pass.” In living by these words, Mr. Littlefield sought to give strength to his family when faced with challenges that seemed too great to bear. Like many of his generation, he knew firsthand the frequency and degree to which life could present great challenges.

It is the sad horror of human existence that there will always be evil leaders who would deprive others of life and liberty to satisfy their own zealous quest for corrupt power. Never was this more evident than during World War II.

Men such as Thomas Wadsworth Littlefield represent the very backbone of America—having sacrificed so much for the good of family, nation, and religious freedom—their collective actions singularly define them as our “Great-est Generation.”

When he joined battle and fought bravely in the last offensive against Japan while serving as a Private First Class in the U.S. Army’s 105th Infantry, H Company, at Okinawa, Japan, Mr. Littlefield faced threats and fears that most of us will, thankfully, never come to know. Like many American soldiers, his military service did not end there as he fought to defend liberty in numerous locations in and around Japan throughout World War II.

In living commemoration of the great Victory over Japan, known commonly as “VJ Day,” he named his second daughter, Vicki Jane Littlefield (“V.J.”) born in August of 1945, soon after Japan surrendered.

Not long after winning the peace, Mr. Littlefield returned to civilian life and worked to win the hearts and minds of faculty, parents and children as elementary school principal in the Weber County school district of Ogden, Utah. There, he labored for 30 years, laying the foundation for a new generation of American leaders; eventually retiring at age 65.

Before the war, Mr. Littlefield attended Weber State College (now Weber State University) in Ogden, where he led them to numerous victories as their football quarterback. Later, he attended Utah State University in Logan, Utah, where he received his educator’s degree.

An avid sports fan, he always enjoyed snow skiing, tennis and exploring the trails of Mount Ogden on his dirt bike several times a year.

Raised on a turkey farm in Morgan, Utah along with eight brothers and sisters, his mother, Kate Wadsworth Littlefield, helped to nurture leadership in their family by serving as an active Republican event organizer and as the first female United States Postmaster in Morgan County, Utah.

A faithful follower of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, Mr. Littlefield was always active in church events and, together with his wife of 65 years this coming June, raised their family as Mormons. Thomas Wadsworth Littlefield and Myrtle Carrigan Littlefield have been blessed with nine grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren. In August of this year, T. Jeffrey Littlefield and Tommy Starling will share another blessing, as this loving family will welcome grandchild number 10 into the world.

Throughout his life, Mr. Littlefield’s philosophy and outlook on life was to make sure that his children were raised with love and to instill in them the confidence, drive and an ambition to succeed. In so doing, it was his fervent hope to see his descendants achieve more than he could ever experience in his own life. A testament to his service, sacrifice and values, Mr. Littlefield will be joined by family members in presence and in spirit on April 8 to herald the celebration of his 87th birthday.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize, individually, the names of those so dear to this great American: Thomas Wadsworth Littlefield, Father; Myrtle Carrigan Littlefield, Mother; Joseph Littlefield, Paternal Grandfather; Kathryn Wadsworth Littlefield, Paternal Grandmother; Irvin Carrigan, Maternal Grandfather; Catherine Jones Carrigan, Maternal Grandmother; Patti Ann Fowers, Daughter; Norman George Fowers, Son-In-Law; Holly Fowers, Granddaughter; Heather Fowers Smedley, Granddaughter; Daren Smedley, Heather’s husband; Jonah Smedley, Great Grandson; Annabelle Smedley, Great Grandson; Nate Fowers, Grandson; Kaleb Fowers, Great Grandson; Mitch Fowers, Grandson; Vicki Jane Olson, Daughter; Brook Clyde Olson, Son-In-Law; Marci Olson Kiehl, Granddaughter; Sam Kiehl, Marci’s husband; Jake Kiehl, Great Grandson; Spencer Kiehl, Great Grandson; Alli Kiehl, Great Granddaughter; Kami Olson Howe, Granddaughter; Chad Howe, Kami’s husband; Conner Howe, Great Grandson; Hunter Howe, Great Grandson; Rylie Jo Howe, Great Granddaughter; Audri Ann Olson, Granddaughter; Jenni Olson, Granddaughter; Thomas Jeffrey Littlefield, Son; Thomas Brent Starling, Partner and future Son-In-Law; and Carrigan Shea Starling-Littlefield, if the latest addition to their family is a Granddaughter, or Hayden Thomas Starling-Littlefield, if the newborn is a Grandson.

War veteran, educator, father and grandfather, athlete, and loving husband, his life and service to our nation helped to forge a nation and spread Democracy the world over.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mr. Thomas Wadsworth Littlefield and his extended family on the occasion of his 87th birthday.

HONORING MIKE WALKER

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, all too often our local, State and Federal governments turn to tax increases rather than responsible budgeting in order to balance the bottom line.

In 1990, Mike Walker became city manager for Brentwood, TN, just after a property tax increase had been implemented. This was the last property tax increase in Brentwood. Mike has refused to use tax increases to balance the budget, instead he’s been a responsible steward of our tax dollars. It’s no wonder he was named City Manager of the Year by the Tennessee City Management Association. He’s done a great job.

With clear vision and detailed planning, Mike has increased the parkland in Brentwood

from 50 acres to 575 acres and he helped shepherd the construction of a new 43,500 square foot library.

Mike is a consummate professional and a talented leader. We all thank him for his work.

#### AMERICAN RED CROSS MONTH

### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the month of March is a time for us to officially recognize the essential role the American Red Cross plays in our communities. 2006 is a special year for the Red Cross, as we commemorate its 125th year of making our country safer, healthier and more secure. In honoring the national organization of the Red Cross, we must also recognize the local chapters that work tirelessly to achieve these goals, such as the Red Cross of Southern Maryland, now in its 80th year of service.

The Southern Maryland Red Cross, and the Nation, faced new challenges in 2005. The deadly tsunami in late 2004 tested the character and will of the international community, and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita uprooted families and communities. Throughout every trial we faced, the Red Cross was there to help ease suffering and aid recovery. These dedicated people were first in line to help families and individuals, friends and strangers.

The Southern Maryland Red Cross faced not only the national disasters of 2005, but ones that hit closer to home. The response they provided is a testament to the kindness of any American touched by tragedy. The citizens of Southern Maryland rolled up their sleeves to donate over 7,000 units of blood and gave donations to aid the victims of 200 house fires. They learned CPR, lifesaving skills, and first aid techniques. They volunteered their time, money and hearts to anyone who needed help. And they did not just aid their neighbors at home, but also those abroad, allowing over 200 military personnel to communicate with their families in Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Southern Maryland Red Cross are no different from you or me. They have full time jobs, families, and responsibilities at home. What makes these Americans so extraordinary is that they have selflessly taken time out of their lives to help schools, workplaces, families, and any person who needs a hand. The Southern Maryland Chapter consists of 200 volunteers and donors, but it responds to the needs of a nation.

The Southern Maryland Red Cross brings aid and recovery, gives hope and comfort, and inspires Americans to reach out when help is needed. I feel assured knowing that the Southern Maryland Chapter is working every day to better the lives of my fellow Maryland residents. We must all do our part to recognize the vitality of the Red Cross and ensure that they are ready to help us respond to the challenges that lie ahead.

In honor of the Southern Maryland Chapter of the Red Cross, I would like to take this time to officially recognize March as American Red Cross Month. Whether it is a donation of time, money or courage, the American Red Cross is there for us. This March is a time to stand up and recognize their continued service.

I encourage all Americans to show their commitment to the Red Cross by donating money or volunteering their time at one of the many local chapters across the country.

#### RECOGNIZING THE FIRST U.S.-KOREA STRATEGIC CONSULTATION FOR ALLIED PARTNERSHIP

### HON. VITO FOSSELLA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, when President George Bush traveled to South Korea late last year to attend the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, APEC, Summit in Busan, he and President Moo-Hyun Roh agreed that while the strategic partnership and evolving security alliance between our two nations were "mutually beneficial," increased and more efficient communication were still required.

Against this backdrop, Presidents Bush and Roh agreed to launch a strategic dialogue called Strategic Consultation for Allied Partnership, SCAP, at the ministerial level for consultations on bilateral, regional and global issues of mutual interest. Currently, the U.S. only holds such consultations with Australia, Saudi Arabia and Japan.

The first of these meetings took place in Washington on January 19, 2006, when South Korea's Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Ki-Moon Ban, met with U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. According to the State Department, among the key initiatives Secretary Rice and Foreign Minister Ban laid out as topics for continued discussion include: coordination of efforts to promote freedom, democratic institutions and human rights worldwide; strengthened cooperation on fighting terrorism and exerting common efforts for the observance and implementation of international security cooperation regimes for the prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; coordination of efforts to develop comprehensive international strategies to fight transnational pandemic disease; maintaining a strong U.S.-ROK alliance to contribute to peace and stability in Northeast Asia; and developing common approaches to reinforcing peace and stability through multilateral peacekeeping and improved collaboration on crisis response and disaster management.

It is clearly evident that the shared agenda of the United States and South Korea is both broad and comprehensive. South Korea is one of our country's principal trading partners, with over \$72 billion in trade volume each year and the fifth-largest purchaser of U.S. agricultural products. In fact, on Thursday, February 2, 2006, the U.S. and Korea announced the launching of negotiations on a Free Trade Agreement, FTA, which would represent, according to U.S. Trade Representative Rob Portman, the "most commercially significant" free trade pact since NAFTA.

Moreover, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, during the 2004 calendar year, 627,000 South Koreans visited the United States for tourism and business travel, making Korea the fifth largest overseas market of tourists coming to our shores. As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Korea, I am also well aware that Korea has made great progress in working to meet all the statutory

requirements for entry into the Visa Waiver Program, VWP.

The United States and South Korea also share a deep concern about regional stability and continued peace on the Korean Peninsula. At the same time, South Korea has been an important and indispensable ally in the global war on terror and in bringing peace, stability and democracy to Iraq. In fact, South Korea has deployed more troops in Iraq than any other country besides the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, the first Strategic Consultation for Allied Partnership was an important contribution to strengthen the U.S.-Korea bilateral relationship and expand the horizon of the alliance. I also commend Secretary Rice and Foreign Minister Ban on their pledge to continue sustaining the formative discussions as their joint efforts deserve our full recognition and support.

#### HONORING SERGEANT DENNIS KRAMER AND SPECIALIST JOSEPH DELAPP

### HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, America has always relied on the men and women of our Armed Services to keep us free. Quite simply, without them the greatest bastion of freedom on this planet would not exist. We can never thank them enough.

Today I ask my colleagues to honor two men who have served America with distinction.

Sergeant Dennis Kramer received the distinguished honor of Noncommissioned Officer of the Year for 2004.

Specialist Joseph Delapp was awarded the esteemed Soldier of the Year for 2004.

Sergeant Dennis Kramer of Baudette, Minnesota enlisted in May 2001 and is serving in the 1/187th Infantry Regiment at Fort Campbell as a reconnaissance squad leader. During Operation Enduring Freedom, he served as a rifleman in A Company of the 1/187 and upon redeployment he volunteered for the scout platoon where he served as a sniper and sniper section squad leader during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Specialist Joseph Delapp of Mayfield, Kentucky was awarded Battalion Soldier of the month in August 2004 and Brigade Soldier of the Year 2004. Formerly in D Company 2/327 Infantry, Delapp is now the Commanding General's Driver, and a Noncommissioned Officer. Delapp entered the Army on January 31, 2002 and was deployed in March 2003 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom where he served as a driver and a gunner.

Mr. Speaker, now we owe a debt of gratitude to these men and to their families. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these outstanding members of our military and thank them for their dedication to defending our country. God Bless the U.S. Armed Forces.

ACT COMMEMORATING THE LIFE:  
OR LIFETIME INNOVATIONS OF  
THOMAS EDISON

SPEECH OF

**HON. CANDICE S. MILLER**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 28, 2006*

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1096, which commemorates the lifetime innovations of Thomas Edison.

This legislation will ensure the preservation of Thomas Edison's laboratory in New Jersey. Edison set a tremendous example for all Americans to follow, and, through this legislation, Americans of future generations will be able to learn from the lessons he taught us.

Before Thomas Edison opened his lab in New Jersey, he called Port Huron, Michigan, his hometown. That town has done a fine job in its own right to preserve the memory of Thomas Edison, and I am proud to represent it in the House.

In 2004, Port Huron rededicated the Edison Rock as part of the 125th Anniversary of the invention of the light bulb. The event featured the actor Mickey Rooney who starred in the 1940 movie "Young Tom Edison", which chronicled Tom's formative years.

I think the Edison Rock is a fitting tribute—not only because it is very big and very heavy—something like 62 tons—but because, like most rocks, it is very old.

That's significant.

In order to rank the importance of Thomas Edison's achievement of the first, practical light bulb you have to go back a long, long way—

In fact, you have to go back to the very beginning—to the Bible and the Book of Genesis, where it says: "And God said, let there be light—and there was light."

Of course, God meant there was sunlight—and don't get me wrong—that was a great start.

But the only problem with sunlight is that it lasts only when the sun is out.

It wasn't until thousands of years later when Thomas Edison said,—"Let there be light"—and finally we had light during the other half of the day.

The significance of this invention can never be exaggerated.

Electric light was the spark that ignited the Industrial Revolution and all the technological breakthroughs that followed.

America's work ethic is also part of Edison's extraordinary legacy. Although Edison was undoubtedly a genius, he never thought of himself as one. In fact, he always claimed that his inventions were the product of hard work. "Genius is one percent inspiration, 99 percent perspiration" was one of his most famous quotes.

Thomas Edison actually struggled for years and built more than 6,000 prototypes before he came up with the successful design for the light bulb.

He made us believe that through hard work, anything can be accomplished.

Edison gave us many gifts—the light bulb—the phonograph—the motion picture camera—as well as hundreds of other inventions that have shaped our modern world.

The phrase—"Good old American ingenuity" describes the "can-do" spirit of our nation—

our ability to take on any problem and come up with a solution.

Edison was the personification of American opportunity. He didn't grow up as a member of the privileged class.

He was just an average American, who through a lot of hard work and a little inspiration became one of the most famous and influential people in history.

And so he gave us many gifts—the light bulb, the phonograph, the motion picture camera as well as hundreds of other inventions that have shaped our modern world.

But possibly his greatest gift to us was his representation of the American spirit.

For when we think of Thomas Edison, we believe that anything is possible.

Edison's ability to take on the most difficult problems of mankind—and come up with an invention that could make everyone's life better is a source of American pride.

We believe that American know-how and American ingenuity are among the characteristics that make our nation great.

That's why I'm confident in our nation.

I'm confident in our ability to do whatever it takes to assure the safety of our nation and the success of liberty.

And it's our nation that continues to bring the light of liberty to the world.

And finally, we believe that you can grow up in Port Huron, Michigan—or thousands of other communities across America—and in everyone of them you have the opportunity to reach for greatness.

IN FAVOR OF THE SOLOMON  
AMENDMENT SUPREME COURT  
DECISION

**HON. STEVE BUYER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the March 6 Supreme Court Decision in favor of the Solomon Amendment. This decision brings resolution to a period of time in which students seeking military careers have been denied equal access to their career of choice due to the political climates and cultures of the institutions in which they receive their education.

My commendation goes to the United States Supreme Court's prudent action in siding with Congress to uphold this vital legislation. Even in this time of great sacrifice when our men and women in uniform are engaged in defeating the forces of tyranny and terror, some have neither masked nor disguised their loathing of the American military. A blatant disregard and violation of the basic principles of free speech and right to association has been demonstrated by these institutions. I feel it pertinent to add that Congress never asked for anything other than equal access for military recruiters. We simply ask the same access as that given to any other employer.

It has been argued that the less fortunate carry the burden of military service.

This decision of the Supreme Court in fact levels the playing field. It guarantees students at higher educational institutions have equal access to military service for our great nation. This decision could not have come at a more important time. Today's cultural tone places so much emphasis on receiving benefits rather

than on service to our country. A lack of military recruiters on campus would only continue to erode the consciousness of the people about the pride of military service and our obligation in defense of America. I would be remiss not to mention that such access to military recruiters is a cornerstone of our successful all-volunteer force.

Colleagues, our Constitutional obligation was clearly laid out. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution states, "that Congress shall have the power to . . . raise and support Armies, . . . to provide and maintain a Navy, . . . and to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the Militia." I once again commend the Supreme Court in helping us uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

REMEMBERING CALVIN RITCHIE  
OF FAUQUIER COUNTY, VIRGINIA

**HON. FRANK R. WOLF**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and me to remember Calvin L. "Boots" Ritchie, a farmer and activist deeply committed to agriculture and his fellow farmers in Fauquier County, Virginia, who passed away on February 26.

Selected by the Fauquier Times-Democrat as "Citizen of the Year" in 1994, Boots will be remembered for his countless accomplishments, including co-founding People Helping People of Fauquier County, Inc., a local charity offering immediate help to residents of Fauquier struggling against natural disaster, illness, or sudden financial hardship.

We insert for the RECORD a Fauquier Times-Democrat obituary from February 28. A Fauquier native, Boots will be deeply missed by the people of the county, and at home by his family.

[From the Fauquier Times-Democrat, Feb. 28, 2006]

"BOOTS" SUCCUMBS TO CANCER

SOUTHERN FAUQUIER FARMER WAS OUTSPOKEN  
ADVOCATE FOR AGRICULTURE, EDUCATION

Calvin L. "Boots" Ritchie, of Bealeton, one of Fauquier County's leading citizens for the past two decades and an active force behind a home-grown charitable organization, died at home on Feb. 27 after a long and valiant fight against cancer. He was 78.

A native son of Fauquier, Mr. Ritchie was born June 17, 1927 at Inglewood Farm, where he died.

He earned his unique nickname as a child, when he did his chores around the farm "wearing an adult-sized pair of gumboots that reached to his hips," recalled his sister, Hazel Bell, in a 1994 interview. "He was about 5 or 6 years old, and the name stuck."

He spent his entire life working in agriculture, first on the family farm and later, while engaged in custom farming. In the mid-1970s, he founded the Fauquier Grain Company.

Mr. Ritchie came to the general public's attention in 1978, when he was involved in the American Agriculture Movement.

The AAM sought 100 percent parity for farm products, and made their point by staging a memorable "Tractorcade" demonstration that passed through Fauquier into Washington, D.C.

"Our main agricultural export is grain, which is priced lower now than it was five

years ago," wrote Mr. Ritchie in a 1979 column in the Democrat. "No other industry could stay in business under these circumstances, and farmers cannot be expected to, either."

In later years, Mr. Ritchie became a driving force behind Fauquier County's purchase of development rights program.

However, it was a different crisis, far from Fauquier, that put Mr. Ritchie on a new path that would make a lasting difference for hundreds of people.

In the wake of the disaster in South Carolina caused by Hurricane Hugo in 1989, Mr. Ritchie and several of his friends founded People Helping People of Fauquier County, Inc., a nonprofit corporation for the sole purpose of helping people struggling against natural disasters, illness or sudden financial hardship.

#### EDUCATION ADVOCATE

In the early 1990s—after a school bond referendum held to provide funding for a second high school failed—Mr. Ritchie became active in yet another arena.

Determined to see a second high school in southern Fauquier, Mr. Ritchie persistently lobbied the School Board and pushed for the needed school bond referendum. When Liberty High School at Bealeton opened in 1994—without the funding for a football stadium—he was at the forefront of the campaign, soliciting donations and selling raffle tickets to raise the money to get the stadium built.

After Mr. Ritchie and his friends on the Principal's Advisory Committee at Liberty raised \$100,000 for the stadium lights, the Board of Supervisors, then under the late Dave Mangum (Lee District), came up with the remaining \$250,000 to build it.

Due to Mr. Ritchie's efforts and his growing, positive influence in Fauquier County, he was recognized as the Fauquier Times-Democrat's Citizen of the Year for 1994.

His influence continued throughout his final years, and he often spoke out on issues that were important to him. A frequent contributor to the Democrat's opinion pages, Mr. Ritchie's last letter was published here on Jan. 25, 2006.

In it, he urged the Board of Supervisors to consider giving tax money to parents who wished to opt-out of the public schools and send their children to private or Christian schools.

"The movement would be so great that I doubt that we would have to build any more new public schools," he said. "The good news is that everyone wins."

Mr. Ritchie was a longtime, active member of Mount Carmel Baptist Church near Morrisville, where he served on the Building and Grounds Committee, as well as videographer for worship services.

According to his family, one of the highlights of Boots' life was being chosen to carry the Olympic Torch.

Mr. Ritchie is survived by his wife, Gail R. Ritchie; his sons, and Glenn C. Ritchie, all of Bealeton; and his daughters, Jennifer R. Krick of Bealeton and Helen R. Ritchie of Strasburg.

Also surviving are his step-sons, Edward C. Lynskey of Annandale and William E. Lynskey of Midland; and his stepdaughters, Linda L. Ashby and Karen L. Hughes, both of Bealeton; and his sisters, Hazel R. Bell of Drayden, Md., Jennalee R. McNally, Marie R. Lee and Peggy R. Dahany, all of Fredericksburg; 11 grandchildren and four great-grandchildren.

He was preceded in death by his parents, Wilbur Early Ritchie and Ethel Barker Ritchie; a son, Jeff A. Ritchie; and his brothers, C. Hunter Ritchie, Claude Ritchie, and Charles Dwight Ritchie.

Funeral services and interment will be private. A public memorial service will be held on Saturday, March 4 at 2 p.m. at the Liberty High School auditorium.

Memorial contributions may be made to the American Cancer Society, Relay for Life, P.O. Box 1095, Warrenton, VA 20188; People Helping People, P.O. Box 3108, Warrenton, VA 20188; or to Mount Carmel Baptist Church, 12714 Elk Run Road, Midland, VA 22728.

Online condolences may be made at <http://www.moserfuneralhome.com>.

### HONORING JUSTICE CORNELIA CLARK

#### HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to take a moment to recognize and honor Justice Cornelia Clark.

Justice Clark has been selected for a seat on the Tennessee Supreme Court where she will be only the 4th woman ever to serve. Her wealth of experience and insight will serve her well in this important role and we honor her for such a wonderful achievement.

Justice Clark's professional accomplishments are proof of her dedication to the judiciary. Since her graduation from Vanderbilt Law School in 1979, Justice Clark devoted herself to the law as a litigation attorney and later as an attorney for the city of Franklin. For 10 years, Justice Clark served as a Circuit Court Judge and most recently as the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Cornelia has shown a remarkable inquisitiveness and dedication to lifelong learning throughout her career. Prior to law school she earned her Master of Arts in Teaching from Harvard University and worked as an educator. She served 10 years as an adjunct professor at the Vanderbilt University School of Law. Countless women have been inspired by her example and we all thank her for her work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Justice Clark and welcoming her to the bench of the Tennessee Supreme Court.

### BEMIDJI, MINNESOTA OLYMPIANS

#### HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the nation watched with pride and admiration as the United States Men's and Women's Olympic Curling teams competed at the XX Olympic Winter Games in Turin, Italy. I am proud to point out that both teams hail from Bemidji, Minnesota in the 7th Congressional District.

The city of Bemidji sent more athletes per capita to the 2006 Winter Olympics than any other town in America. The athletes on both Olympic Curling teams call the Bemidji Curling Club their home. One of the premier curling clubs in the United States, the Bemidji Curling Club has captured more than 50 state and na-

tional titles in its outstanding 71-year history. The Club will also host the U.S. World Team Trials from March 4th through 12th. For curlers and curling fans Bemidji is the place to be.

The sport of curling dates to 16th century Scotland where games were played during winter on frozen ponds, lochs and marshes. Curling's popularity spread during the 19th century to many nations in Europe, as well as to the United States, New Zealand, and Canada. It is now played in over 35 countries throughout the world.

Both of the U.S. Olympic Curling teams from Bemidji faced tough competition from the very best teams the world has to offer. With the world watching they demonstrated their skills on one of sport's grandest stages and brought honor and praise to themselves and Members of the Women's team were Cassie Johnson, Jamie Johnson, Jessica Schultz, Maureen Brunt, Courtney George and Coach Neil Doese. The Men's team consisted of Pete Fenson, Shawn Rojeski, Joe Polo, John Shuster, Scott Baird and Coach Bob Fenson.

Both teams exhibited their skill, their mastery of strategic play and the ability to precisely execute when the pressure was on. This combination of skill and determination helped the Men's team to bring home the Bronze Medal for the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the great achievement of all these fine athletes. The commitment to excellence, sportsmanship and honor that they displayed while representing the United States will long be a source of pride for all Minnesotans, especially those who call Bemidji, Minnesota their home.

### HONORING DIXON GROVE BAPTIST CHURCH

#### HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dixon Grove Baptist Church on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. Dixon Grove Baptist Church has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to its surrounding community and the state of Georgia.

The late Reverend John Arthur Dixon founded Dixon Grove Baptist Church in 1956 and declared that the church would be built by faith. Reverend James E. Harris assumed leadership of the church in 1979. As a result of their combined leadership and vision the church rose from its humble beginnings in a schoolhouse with a congregation of fewer than 50 members to a multi-acre facility that accommodates the 600 members that attend the church today.

Reverend James E. Harris continues to uphold the vision and mission set by Reverend John Arthur Dixon of adhering to Biblical principles while improving the lives of people in the community. Reverend James E. Harris demonstrated his leadership through community, civic, and religious involvement by accepting my request to represent the 13th congressional district at the White House Conference on Aging in December of 2005.

Through faith in God and commitment to service, church ministries expanded under

Reverend James E. Harris to include: Family Counseling and a Youth Christian Basketball League to reach the youth of the Clayton County community. After the most devastating natural disaster in the history of the United States struck in 2005, Dixon Grove Baptist Church responded to the needs of evacuees by providing assistance through its Community Food and Clothing Co-operative.

Please join me in honoring Dixon Grove Baptist Church and Reverend James E. Harris for their commitment to Jesus Christ's example of faith and giving. It is my sincere hope that the ministry and work of Dixon Grove Baptist Church prospers for another 50 years.

#### CAPUANO PROVIDES LEADERSHIP ON DARFUR

### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, no crisis confronting the world is as grave as that in Darfur, Sudan, where genocide is a tragic fact. America's failure to act more vigorously in this regard is a grave error. It is true that there are other nations, including many in Africa—which bear some of the blame. But we must not let the inaction of others become a justification for our own failure to take steps that we know to be morally necessary to save lives. My colleague from Massachusetts, (Mr. CAPUANO), on his return from a trip to Darfur led by the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic Leader, wrote a forceful article in the Boston Herald for March 7th making the case for much firmer action by the U.S. and others in Darfur.

Mr. Speaker, given the moral imperative of action, I hope all of our colleagues will agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts who writes that "I urge the President to fully support the U.N. peacekeeping mission and put the full weight of the U.S. military behind it. More troops, with a mandate to protect civilians, are desperately needed. . . . If the U.N. cannot meet this timetable, we must strengthen the AU force and provide additional civilian support."

Mr. Speaker, at a time when people compete with each other to stress the importance of the moral element in politics, our colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) has struck a clear note on one of the overriding moral issues of our time, and I join him in calling on the President and the rest of us to take prompt action.

U.S. MUST WORK TO HALT DARFUR GENOCIDE  
(By Michael Capuano)

We look back on the Holocaust and wonder how the world stood by while 6 million Jews were slaughtered. Never again, we pledged. Yet in 1994, 1 million Rwandans were massacred. Afterward, we declared it genocide and pledged never again. Many leaders later expressed deep regret over our inaction.

In 2003, our attention was drawn to Darfur, Sudan, where innocent civilians were being murdered, enslaved, raped and driven from their homes. We declared it genocide, but failed to act, again.

Since 2003, more than 400,000 people have been murdered in Darfur and 2 million more displaced. I just returned from Sudan, on a trip led by House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi.

In Al Fashir, Darfur, we met with relief workers, traveled to Internally Displaced Persons camps and spoke with African Union (AU) personnel. This reinforced my conviction that genocide is still occurring, the government of Sudan is responsible and not enough is being done.

We also met with Sudanese government officials who claimed the suffering in Darfur was exaggerated. There were skirmishes over water and grazing rights, they said, but nothing to concern outsiders. They admitted funding the Janjaweed, the militias who attack civilians, yet vehemently denied genocide is occurring. Everyone else we spoke with, AU personnel and relief workers, recognize they are witnessing genocide.

There are 7,700 AU personnel on the ground. However, they don't have a mandate to protect civilians and lack sufficient resources. Without a drastic troop increase and outside logistical assistance, the AU will continue struggling. AU officials told us they need more support and are planning for the involvement of a United Nations force. But the government of Sudan, the perpetrators of the genocide, rejects U.N. involvement.

I have persistently called for the protection of civilians and an end to the violence. Attempts to address this crisis legislatively have faced resistance. I have tried to introduce amendments to a State Department bill and a Foreign Operations bill, authorizing the president to use all necessary means to stop the genocide. These amendments were blocked.

President Bush and U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan recently discussed a U.N. peacekeeping force for Darfur. The president has publicly called for the doubling of peacekeepers. I urge the president to fully support a U.N. peacekeeping mission and put the full weight of the U.S. military behind it. More troops, with a mandate to protect civilians, are desperately needed and must arrive in the next couple of months. If the U.N. cannot meet this timetable, we must strengthen the AU force and provide additional civilian support.

President Bush recently said America was first to recognize the genocide in Darfur. He said, "Our country was the first country to call what was taking place a genocide, which matters—words matter."

Actions matter more. It's time to back our words up with action. Time is running out.

HONORING JOHN ROSS, DR. JENNIFER STEWART-WRIGHT, AND RAY BELL

### HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor today to acknowledge the achievements of Tennesseans who have made a tremendous contribution to our community.

Savannah resident John Ross has committed a great deal of energy to the conservation of our state's wildlife and natural resources. In recognition of this work, he has been named 2004 Land Conservationist of the Year. John's passionate advocacy work and his effort to educate others on this issue are a great example to the community, and I want to thank him for his involvement.

Dr. Jennifer Stewart-Wright of Fairview was honored by the Harpeth River Watershed with the River Steward Award for her active work

on multiple restoration projects and her efforts as a professor at Tennessee State University. Dr. Stewart-Wright has made this a family affair with the assistance of her children, Selah and Jesse, who share their mom's passion for revitalizing and protecting our waterways.

Mr. Ray Bell of Franklin has been awarded the Lane W. Adams Quality of Life Award for his years of service to helping those diagnosed with cancer. A cancer survivor himself, Ray has dedicated countless hours not only to cancer patients but to their families as well. Ray's compassion and commitment are incredibly inspiring and a blessing for those facing this disease. We all thank him for his work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring, thanking and congratulating these outstanding Tennesseans for making a difference in their communities.

WOMEN'S BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER'S CELEBRATING 20 YEARS CREATING SUCCESSFUL WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES 1986-2006 CELEBRATING THE PAST CHALLENGING THE FUTURE

### HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Women's Business Development Center (WBDC) is a nationally recognized nonprofit women's business assistance organization, devoted to providing services and programs that support and accelerate women's business ownership and strengthen the impact of women on the economy.

The year 2006 marks the beginning of the third decade of the WBDC's successful commitment to meeting the needs of women entrepreneurs for greater opportunities in business ownership. Founded in 1986 by S. Carol Dougal and Hedy M. Ratner, more than 50,000 women in Illinois have benefited from its programs and services including counseling, entrepreneurial training, child care business development, strengthening of emerging businesses, Latina Initiative providing business development programs in Spanish in economically disadvantaged communities, certification and business opportunities for women's business enterprises and financial assistance and loan packaging.

The WBDC has worked for 20 years to economically empower women and their families, striving to influence the larger political and economic environment in a way that encourages and supports women's economic empowerment and minority business development.

The WBDC has affected the national women's business landscape helping to establish women's business assistance centers in six states. Now there are over 10.6 million women-owned businesses in the U.S., employing over 19.1 million workers, and over 350,000 of those businesses are in Illinois. Minority-owned businesses are growing faster than all firms, and 1 in 5 women-owned firms in the U.S. is owned by a woman of color. Women-owned businesses nationally generate over \$2.46 trillion in sales.

In 2006 the Women's Business Development Center celebrates its 20th anniversary.

As the Center moves into its third decade of service to women business owners and outstanding advocacy for the strengthening and support of minority and women owned businesses, I am proud to recognize its impressive achievements.

HONORING THE 2005 FOOTBALL SEASON OF THE LIVINGSTON ACADEMY WILDCATS

**HON. BART GORDON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the championship season of the Livingston Academy Wildcats. The Wildcats won their first state football championship at the Class 3A Blue Cross Bowl in December.

Residents of Overton County, Tennessee, can be proud of their Wildcats. The team fought against the odds as they went into the playoffs as the Number 4 seed in Region 2-3A with a 5-5 record. They impressively defeated four region champions on their way to the state football championship.

Early in the championship game, the Wildcats held a 21-0 lead over David Lipscomb. Showing great skill and determination, the Wildcats left MTSU's Floyd Stadium as victors with a 28-13 win over their competitor.

This group of Wildcats was the first football team in the school's history to advance past the quarterfinals. In addition, they became only the second team from the Upper Cumberland to win the state title.

I commend the Wildcats and their head coach, Matt Eldridge, for a wonderful season and an outstanding championship win. Danny McCoin, Bobby Gore, Bruce Lamb, Grant Swallows, David Clouse and Dale Flatt serve as the team's assistant coaches. Gary Ledbetter is Livingston Academy's principal.

I congratulate all the talented members of the 2005 3A State Champion Wildcats: Jake Peterman, Jonathan Sullivan, Clint Cooper, Jamie Cravens, Levi Holt, Josh Simpson, Joe Reynolds, Wilson Cates, Mike Jones-Larue, Cody Waddey, Dustin Looper, Josh Carwile, John Michael Stephens, Jonathan McGill, John Cody Brown, Vincent Woodruff, Drew Cannon, Steven Morgan, Jamey Vaughn, Josh Huit, Colton Hummel, Seth Melton, Kevin Scott, Jordan Bailey, Jake Reeder, Gary Massengille, Josh Coffee, Kiefer Smith, Tyler Livingston, Sam Nelson, Jeremiah Jackson, Terrance Melton, David Petry, Cody Shokoui, Blake Moon, Beau Massengille, Curtis Beaty, Levi Cobble, Volby Loftis, Brad Pendergraft, Ryan Bowman, Jesse Cole, Wade Ford, Josh Looper, Bobby Perdue, Jacob Coffee, Ethan Livingston, John Willeford, Robert Holt, David Ledbetter, Justin Gore, Ryan Duke, Jonathan Preece and Jacob Collins.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUNSHINE IN MONETARY POLICY ACT

**HON. RON PAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Sunshine in Monetary Policy Act, which re-

quires the Federal Reserve to resume reporting the monetary measure known as M3. M3 consists of M1 (M1 is currency in circulation plus travelers' checks, demand deposits, Negotiable Order of Withdrawal (NOW) accounts, and similar interest-earning checking account balances) plus M2 (M2 is M1 plus household holdings of savings deposits, small time deposits, and retail money market mutual funds balances except for balances held in IRA and Keogh accounts) plus institutional money market mutual fund balances and managed liabilities of deposits consisting of large time deposits, repurchase agreements, and Eurodollars.

The Federal Reserve Board has recently announced it will stop reporting M3, thus depriving Congress and the American people of the most comprehensive measure of the money supply. The cessation of Federal Reserve's weekly M3 report will make it more difficult for policymakers, economists, investors, and the general public to learn the true rate of inflation. As Nobel laureate Milton Friedman famously said, "inflation is always and everywhere a monetary phenomenon." Therefore, having access to a comprehensive measure of the money supply like M3 is a vital tool for those seeking to track inflation. Thorsten Polleit, honorary professor at HFB-Business School of Finance and Management, in his article "Why Money Supply Matters" posted on the Ludwig von Mises Institute's website mises.org, examined the relationship between changes in the money supply and inflation and concluded that "money supply signals might actually be far more important for inflation—even in the short-term—than current central bank practice suggests," thus demonstrating the importance of the M3 aggregate.

The Federal Reserve Board has claimed neither policymakers nor the Federal Reserve staff closely track M3. Even if M3 is not used by Federal Reserve Board economists or legislators, many financial services professionals whose livelihoods depend on their ability to obtain accurate information about the money supply rely on M3. For example, my office has been contacted by a professional money manager complaining that the Federal Reserve Board's discontinuing M3 reports will make it difficult for him to do his job.

Whatever lack of interest policymakers are currently displaying in M3 is no doubt related to the mistaken perception that the Federal Reserve Board has finally figured out how to effectively manage a fiat currency. This illusion exists largely because the effects of the Fed's inflationary policies are concentrated in malinvestments in specific sectors of the economy, leading to "bubbles" such as the one that occurred in the stock market in the late nineties and the bubble that many believe is occurring in the current real estate market. When monetary inflation is reflected in sector-specific bubbles, it is easier to pretend that the bubbles are caused by problems specific to those sectors, instead of reflecting the problems inherent in a fiat currency system. Once the damage to our economy done by our reliance on fiat currency becomes clear, I am certain that policymakers will once again take more interest in M3.

Economists and others who are following M3 have become increasingly concerned

about inflation because last year the rate of M3 rose almost twice as fast as other monetary aggregates. This suggests that the inflation picture is not as rosy as the Federal Reserve would like Congress and the American people to believe. Discontinuing reporting the monetary aggregate that provides the best evidence that the Federal Reserve Board has not conquered inflation suggests to many people that the government is trying to conceal information about the true state of the economy from the American people. Brad Conrad, a professor of investing who has also worked with IBM, CDC, and Amdahl, spoke for many when he said, "It [the discontinuance of M3] is unsettling. It detracts from the transparency the Fed preaches and adds to the suspicion that the Fed wants to hide anything showing money growth high enough to fuel inflation..."

Discontinuing reporting M3 will only save 0.00000699% of the Federal Reserve Board's yearly budget. This savings hardly seems to justify depriving the American people of an important measurement of money supply, especially since Congress has tasked the Federal Reserve Board with reporting on monetary aggregates. Discontinuing reporting M3 may not be a violation of the letter of the Federal Reserve Board's statutory duty, but it is a violation of the spirit of the congressional command that the Federal Reserve Board ensure the American public is fully informed about the effects of monetary policy.

Mr. Speaker, knowledge of the money supply is one of the keys to understanding the state of the economy. The least the American people should expect from the Federal Reserve Board is complete and accurate information regarding the money supply. I urge my colleagues to ensure that the American people can obtain that information by cosponsoring the Sunshine in Monetary Policy Act.

HONORING McDONALD AND ROSETTA CRAIG

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to honor McDonald Craig, the owner of a Tennessee Century Farm in Linden, Tennessee. On Christmas Day in 1871, Craig's great-grandparents, Tapp and Amy, purchased the 110 acre farm. Tapp and Amy Craig, freed from slavery after the Civil War, were the first African-Americans to buy property in Perry County.

The Craig family has owned and farmed this land in Perry County for more than 130 years. As a farmer and musician, Craig has not only maintained his family's legacy, but he has also made a name for himself as a country musician performing at local festivals and fairs.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing McDonald, his wife Rosetta, and their family for contributing so much to our community.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBIN KELLY  
SHEARES

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Robin Kelly Sheares, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn community. Robin Sheares was born in Harlem to the late Gloria and Herman Sheares. At the tender age of 6, her family moved to Bedford-Stuyvesant and ever since she has been a member of the Brooklyn community.

A proud graduate of the public school system, Robin has been an attorney for nearly 20 years. She is experienced in housing, criminal and civil law. In her nearly 20 years as an attorney, she has been an administrative law judge, an instructor, and an arbitrator. She is active in Brooklyn, working with community-based organizations, religious institutions, and youth mentoring groups.

Robin Kelly Sheares is an active member of the Wayside Baptist Church and her Block Association. At Wayside, she works closely with the Sunday School and Youth Ministry. Robin's other memberships include, but are not limited to, the Metropolitan Black Bar Association, the Brooklyn Women's Bar Association and the Brownstoners of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Inc.

Robin has been dedicated to the Noel Pointer Foundation and the New York Road Runner's Club. Robin is often called upon as a guest lecturer and Career Day speaker. She has even addressed students at her alma maters, Public School 309 and Junior High School 57. Although, Robin has no biological children, she has nurtured a number of youth and is a strong advocate for children and parents rights as evident by her work with the Brownstoners's Education Task Force and her alma maters: Brooklyn Technical High School and Ithaca College.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Robin Kelly Sheares, as she offers her talents and community services for the good of our local communities.

Mr. Speaker, Robin Kelly Sheares's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes her most worthy of our recognition today.

A TRIBUTE TO MARY ANN  
HAWTHORNE

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mary Ann Hawthorne, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Born, raised and entirely educated in the State of New York, Mary Ann Hawthorne has found a unique way to give back to her State's education system. Ms. Hawthorne earned her bachelors in education from Bernard Baruch

College in New York City in 1972. During her first 2 years as a teacher, Ms. Hawthorne simultaneously worked her way through graduate school and earned a masters in business education from Long Island University. Four years later Ms. Hawthorne received her professional diploma and masters of science in administration and supervision of education.

Deeply committed to the education of New York's youth, Ms. Hawthorne worked as a teacher, an assistant principal, and a principal. Today Ms. Hawthorne is the community superintendent for District 11 as well as local instructional superintendent for Region 2.

Ms. Hawthorne has acted as a wonderful role model to children and fellow educators alike. Ms. Hawthorne's achievements in education are endless. In September 2001 Ms. Hawthorne was selected by the National Association of Secondary School Principals to serve as an assessor for new principals. In January 2003, President Bush and Secretary of Education Rod Paige at the White House honored her when she was picked to be part of a panel of the top eight principals in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Hawthorne is a product of the New York education system and a true inspiration to the community around her. She continues to work to improve education in New York and for that I ask that we recognize and give thanks to Mary Ann Hawthorne for her wonderful contribution to our community.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY  
MUST PROMOTE DEMOCRACY IN  
HAITI

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to articulate how crucial it is for the international community to reach out to Haiti and help President-elect Rene Preval achieve his many goals for the impoverished Nation that is Haiti and to enter into the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York CaribNews appealing for greater international involvement in the country.

Preval's election represents what could be a potential turning point in the history of Haiti which has been marred by corruption, military intervention, violence and a stifling of the will of the people. Having served as president in the 1990s, Preval is the only elected president to have served out a full four-year term without being overthrown. In the elections held last month, Preval was clearly the choice of the masses with more than half of votes cast in his favor—leading his nearest rival, Leslie Manigat, a former president, who received only 12 percent of votes.

So far, the international community has acted on behalf of the Haitian people—urging the country's Electoral Council to declare Preval the winner and preventing further violence from spilling out through the entire country. By doing so, the will of the Haitian electorate was respected and protected.

Now it up to the United States to step in and assist Preval in establishing his government. The government of the United States must act fast to secure the results and also begin providing humanitarian, economic and

other forms of aid that President-elect Preval will need to build and sustain a viable government. I also urge that the transitional government of Haiti to actively engage in the transfer of power to Preval.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in calling on all the great nations of the international community to actively assist Haiti during its momentous transition to a democratically elected government.

[From the New York CaribNews, Feb. 28, 2006]

HAITI HAS A CHANCE TO MOVE FORWARD  
(Editorial)

“The international community must show the Haitian people that it is sincere about ending their suffering.”

U.S. Congressman Charles Rangel, one of the strongest and most consistent voices on Capitol Hill when it comes to articulating Caribbean causes was right on the money as he summarized the Haitian situation. His call on the world's leading nations and many developing states to move swiftly to improve the economic and social conditions in what is the Western Hemisphere's poorest nations couldn't have come at a better time.

His plea to the United Nations, Washington, Paris, Ottawa, Berlin, Brasilia, Santiago and other capitals which say they have a keen interest in what happens in the French-speaking Republic that's next door to the Dominican Republic was voiced a few days after Rene' Preval had been declared the winner in the February 7th presidential elections.

If the same international community had previously shown the resolve to end the Haitian nightmare that it demonstrated last week to end the election stalemate, the world's oldest Black Republic would have been spared the pain and trauma it has endured for decades.

By stepping in and forcing the incompetent and politically bias Electoral Council to declare Preval the winner, the countries with the resources and the influence to halt the slide into anarchy avoided more spilling of blood and paved the way for the will of 2.2 million Haitian voters to be recognized.

That it took eight days after the election to count the votes and announce a winner was clear evidence of an attempt by a handful of people, backed by the powerful business and political elite to stop Preval, a former protégé of ousted President Jean Bertrand Aristide, from taking office after the people had made a clear choice.

Some 33 candidates had faced the electorate but Preval was the only one with widespread national support, especially in the urban slums of Port-au-Prince. That was seen in the fact that his nearest rival, Leslie Manigat, a former President, had received only 12 percent of the votes cast.

Early in the count, Preval had secured a resounding 61 percent but mysteriously, his share of the votes cast began to decline, so much so that by the time 90 percent of the ballots had been tabulated he had only 48.7 percent, less than two percent short of the 50 per cent plus one vote needed to escape a run-off.

Obviously, the Council and Preval opponents were manipulating the process by invalidating almost 150,000 votes, many of them from the poorest areas of the country. They claimed that the spoilt or blank votes which represented about seven percent of the total had to be counted, never mind that it was difficult to understand how so many Haitians who had waited in line for hours, traveled long distances or who had endured all kinds of hardship in order to select their president would then turn around and turn

in blank ballots. It just didn't make sense. Several people believed most of the blank votes were simply stuffed into the ballot boxes to defraud Preval.

Added to such election woes, almost 10 per cent of the tally sheets disappeared and several supporters found thousands of burned ballots smoldering in a garbage dump in Port-au-Prince.

The suspicions of fraud and the delay in announcing a winner triggered pro-Preval demonstrations that virtually shut down the capital and raised the real fair that riots would turn deadly.

The problem in the Caribbean country is that it doesn't have a tradition of electoral politics and its fledgling democratic institutions are weak. The judiciary is far from being independent and the security forces are untrained and often heavy-handed. To add to such woes, the powerful elite isn't concerned about the widespread poverty and illiteracy. Instead, it is committed to furthering its nest at the expense of progress and peace.

What the country needs the most is a government committed to economic and social progress. Such an administration would need all of the help it can get from both inside and outside of the country. Now that Preval has demonstrated that he has the people's support through relatively free and fair elections, the international community must step forward and live up to its responsibility providing the much promised but never delivered massive financial and technical support.

At the same time Preval, who is the only elected President to have served out a full four-year term without being overthrown, must reach out to his opponents in a meaningful fashion in order to be able to deliver on his election promises.

Just as important, the Haitian Diaspora in North America must back the government and help to keep it focused on its key task, and that is to lift the nation out of deep poverty and despair.

A TRIBUTE TO PRISCILLA A.  
WOOTEN

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, a community is only as great as those individuals who perform exemplary service on its behalf, whether through unique achievement in professional endeavors or simply through a lifetime of good citizenship. The Honorable Priscilla A. Wooten is one of the most distinguished members of our community and is most deserving of this tribute.

Priscilla Wooten, a devoted mother, grandmother, and community leader, has lived in the East New York community for over 50 years. Ms. Wooten was a dedicated employee of the New York City Board of Education for many years. From January 1982 through January 2002 she served on the New York City Council. She has also served as Chairperson of the Education Committee and as a member of the Finance, Health, and Elections Committees.

Additionally, she also found time to serve on such boards as the Commission on Students of African Descent, the New York Collaborative for Excellence, the NAACP and others too numerous to mention.

Ms. Wooten is a Deaconess of the Greater Bright Light Missionary Baptist Church and

has spent countless hours sheltering the homeless, clothing the naked, and being a friend to the friendless. She is a woman who dared to be different.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of her life-long commitment to the people of New York, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to bestow upon Priscilla A. Wooten this honor with the highest respect and esteem.

NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY

**HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the 16th annual National Sportsmanship Day, which is celebrated today around the world.

National Sportsmanship Day raises awareness about issues relating to sportsmanship and ethics in athletics as well as daily life. Athletic competition can teach students, coaches, and parents valuable lessons that can be applied on and off the field. With increased pressure to succeed placed upon today's athletes and students, the importance of ethics, honesty and fair play have never been more necessary.

Given the heightened demand for accomplishment in today's society, the idea of participation and fitness in many aspects of sport is often lost. Forgetting this important basis of athletic competition, students often are forced to maintain a 'win at all costs' mentality. Each year, the Institute for International Sport, based in my district in Kingston, Rhode Island, provides the opportunity to counter these notions through meaningful dialogue among school administrators, coaches, teachers, and students on the subject of ethics, fair play and sportsmanship.

The 16th annual National Sportsmanship Day strives to foster sportsmanship through the defeat of gamesmanship, the practice of ethically dubious methods to gain an objective. Through activities and discussions, more than 13,000 schools throughout the United States and around the world will participate in these events to spread honest athletics.

Each year, National Sportsmanship Day recognizes a number of athletes who offer a tribute to their respective sport and enhance their skills with their desire to play fairly. This year, the Institute for International Sport has selected their Sports Ethics Fellows from a number of players, coaches, and school administrators at the high school level. With both their simultaneous pursuit of academic and athletic excellence, they model and promote the virtues of the student-athlete in the truest sense.

I hope that my colleagues can join with me on this day in celebrating and promoting the continued success of National Sportsmanship Day. With its moral, ethical and fitness components, today's activities can promote a healthy and more active community amongst our nation's youth, and support a team oriented future for our country of sports enthusiasts.

A TRIBUTE TO EVELYN CRUZ

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Evelyn Cruz, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Evelyn Cruz was born and raised in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. One of four children and the only daughter, she attended Transfiguration School where she learned at an early age the value of community service. Her Puerto Rican working-class parents, Luis and Graciela, instilled in Evelyn the value of hard work, dedication, and respect for others. As the granddaughter of activist grandparents, she learned how to advocate and fight for fairness in housing, healthcare, education and community services.

Evelyn has dedicated most of her life toward the betterment of her community. During her high school years, she was vice-president of her sophomore class and a member of several school clubs. In 1977, she was elected one of the youngest representatives on the then NYC Area Policy Board, where she reviewed budget proposals, participated in public hearings and allocated community development funding to local community based organizations. At the age of 16, she was the youngest recording secretary elected to serve on the 90th Precinct Community Council where she served for several terms. Years later, she was elected and served as the President of the Precinct Council.

In the 1980s, during New York City's drugs and AIDS epidemics, Evelyn organized her community and led the fight to reclaim her neighborhood streets and parks from drug dealers. As the co-founder of the March Against Drugs, Inc., she organized annual anti-drug community marches and drug prevention fairs for more than 10 years.

While attending John Jay College part-time and working full-time at Merrill Lynch for a successful mother and daughter financial consultant team, Evelyn gained valuable experience in client-relations, the financial markets, and real estate.

Evelyn has been profiled in NY's Newsday, El Diario La Prensa, The New York Times, and Talk Radio. She enjoys sports and is a three-time MVP softball player, women's handball champ and a great paddleball player. Some her favorite books are Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, *100 Years of Solitude*, Ayn Rand's *Anthem*, and George Orwell's *1984*.

Evelyn is passionate about public service and her work in the community. In 1992, she left the private sector and joined the congressional staff of Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez.

Evelyn's work in the community has shaped her into a leader, an advocate, and an instrument for social change. She hopes to continue to share her knowledge and experience with her neighbors in the hopes of ongoing change and improvement—and looks forward to a bright future for the borough she calls home—Brooklyn.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Evelyn Cruz, as she offers her talents and community services for the good of our local communities.

Mr. Speaker, Evelyn Cruz's selfless service has continuously demonstrated a level of altruistic dedication that makes her most worthy of our recognition today.

---

DANA REEVE

**HON. SHERROD BROWN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dana Reeve, who lost her battle to cancer yesterday at the age of 44.

Like her husband, Christopher, Dana will be remembered for her resilience and courage in the face of adversity.

Dana stood by her husband as he fought for his life, working as a tireless advocate for increased funding to find the key to reversing paralysis.

Through the Christopher Reeve Foundation they created together, Chris and Dana moved the science forward and brought hope to 2 million paralyzed Americans and their families.

After Christopher's death in 2004, Dana skillfully led the foundation where she established Quality of Life initiatives to improve the day-to-day lives of paralyzed people. She founded the Christopher and Dana Reeve Paralysis Resource Center.

Though her life was much too short, Dana left an indelible mark on this world. Her grace and personal strength are an inspiration to us all.

---

A TRIBUTE TO ESTER E. WATERMAN

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Ester E. Waterman, a distin-

guished member of the Brooklyn community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Ester E. Waterman is the daughter of Joseph and Mavis Waterman. Ms. Waterman was born in Trinidad W.I. and spent her childhood in San Fernando, Trinidad. In 1970, Ms. Waterman migrated to the United States where she attended Erasmus High School. Upon high school graduation, Ms. Waterman was accepted to New York University. A tireless and devoted undergraduate, Ms. Waterman worked her way through college and graduated with a degree in Computer Science. Her professional experience includes American Express, Alexander & Alexander Benefit Services and AON Consulting Company.

Today Ester E. Waterman is an active community resident of Brooklyn, New York and an inspiration to those around her. She is deeply committed to her love for children and learning. In 1998 Ms. Waterman fulfilled her community's need for a childcare service when she established "Loving Arms Learning Day Care Center."

Community members and leaders alike have praised Ms. Waterman's work. The Caribbean American International Child Care Network Inc. & United Family Services Inc. recognized Ms. Waterman in 2002 for her work and dedication to children. In 2004 Council Member Leroy Comrie awarded Ms. Waterman with the New York City Council Citation for Child Care and in 2005 Senator Nick Perry presented her with the New York State Assembly Certificate of Merit.

Mr. Speaker. Ms. Waterman continues to dedicate her time to the people and children of Brooklyn. She has truly made a strong positive impact on the community and for that I ask that we recognize and give thanks to Ester E. Waterman for her wonderful contribution to our community.

---

A TRIBUTE TO JULIA L. JAMES

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 7, 2006*

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Julia L. James, a distinguished

member of the Brooklyn community. It behooves us to pay tribute to this outstanding leader and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her impressive accomplishments.

Julia L. James is an active community resident of Brooklyn, New York. Over the past several years, she has devoted her time and energies to improving the quality of life in her community. Ms. James is a member of New York City Community Board No. 17, where she serves as the chair of the Social Services Committee. She also serves on the boards of Beulah Community Housing Development Corporation and the Wyckoff Museum Advisory Board. Ms. James was also invited to serve on the board of Protestant Board of Guardians, Inc., a 40-year-old organization. For 8 years, Ms. James contributed her talents and abilities to the community as a member of Community School Board No. 18, including her tenure as a past president.

Julia L. James is the daughter of Rev. Henry R. and Ruth James and was born on the Island of the Commonwealth of Dominica. Ms. James is a Certified Public Accountant, licensed in the State of New York, and a Certified Management Accountant. She earned her undergraduate degree from Baruch College and her graduate degree from the Leonard Stern School of Business at New York University. Her professional experience includes Ernst & Young and Deloitte.

Ms. James is an active member of the Beulah Church of the Nazarene where she serves as a musician. She was instrumental in the creation of the Church's Housing Development Corporation, which seeks to encourage home ownership among members and community residents.

Ms. James has worked actively on the political campaigns of many individuals seeking to improve the quality of life for Brooklyn residents. With the help of God, Julia L. James strives to be a "woman who dares to be different."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is incumbent on this body to recognize the accomplishments of Julia L. James, as she offers her talents to our local communities.

# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 2320, LIHEAP Funding.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

#### Routine Proceedings, pages S1807–S1858

**Measures Introduced:** Nine bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2375–2383. **Pages S1833–34**

#### Measures Passed:

**LIHEAP Funding:** Senate passed S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1808–15, S1817–28**

#### Adopted:

By 68 yeas to 31 nays (Vote No. 34), Frist (for Snowe) Amendment No. 2913 (to Amendment No. 2899), to improve the distribution of funds to States under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. **Pages S1815, S1817–26**

Kyl/Ensign Amendment No. 2899, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for allotments to States for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006. **Page S1826**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 75 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. 33), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Page S1815**

Chair sustained a point of order that Inhofe Amendment No. 2898, to reduce energy prices, was not germane, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S1826**

#### Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act:

Senate continued consideration of S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process, taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S1850–52**

#### Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 2932, to provide additional transparency in the legislative process. **Pages S1850–52**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, March 8, 2006. **Page S1850**

#### Nominations Received:

Senate received the following nominations:

Michael E. Ranneberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya.

Robert F. Godec, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Tunisia.

Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2010.

Jon Wellingshoff, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2008.

Richard Capka, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

Jerry Gayle Bridges, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps. **Pages S1852–58**

#### Nominations Withdrawn:

Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

James Hardy Payne, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, which was sent to the Senate on September 29, 2005. **Page S1858**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S1832–33**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S1834–35**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** **Pages S1835–44**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S1831–32**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Pages S1844–49**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Pages S1849–50

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S1850

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today.  
(Total—34) Pages S1815, S1826

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 9:45 a.m., and adjourned at 7:13 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 8, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1850.)

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

### SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

*Committee on Appropriations:* Committee held a hearing to examine the proposed supplemental funding request for additional resources to assist the Gulf Coast region in its recovery from hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico in 2005, after receiving testimony from Alabama Governor Bob Riley, Montgomery; Louisiana Governor Kathleen Blanco, Baton Rouge; Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour, Jackson; and Texas Governor Rick Perry, Austin.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

### APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Defense, after receiving testimony from Tina W. Jonas, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller); and Vice Admiral

Evan M. Chanik, USN, Director, Force Structure, Resources and Assessments (J8).

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee continued open and closed hearings to examine military strategy and operational requirements in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program, receiving testimony from Admiral William J. Fallon, USN, Commander, United States Pacific Command; General Burwell B. Bell, III, USA, Commander, United Nations Command and Republic of Korea-United States Combined Forces Command, Commander, United States Forces Korea; and General James L. Jones, USMC, Commander, United States European Command and Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded open and closed hearings to examine the nuclear weapons and defense environmental cleanup activities of the Department of Energy in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years nuclear security program, after receiving testimony from Linton F. Brooks, Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, and James A. Rispoli, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, both of the Department of Energy.

### CREDIT RATING AGENCIES

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the current oversight and operation of credit rating agencies, after receiving testimony from Paul Schott Stevens, Investment Company Institute, Damon A. Silvers, AFL-CIO, and Alex J. Pollock, American Enterprise Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; Colleen S. Cunningham, Financial Executives International, Florham Park, New Jersey; Glenn L. Reynolds, CreditSights, Inc., and Vickie A. Tillman, Standard and Poor's Credit Market Services, both of New York, New York; Frank Partnoy, University of San Diego School of Law, San Diego, California; and Jeffrey J. Diermeier, CFA Institute, Charlottesville, Virginia.

### RURAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine rural telecommunications, including telephony, data transmission, video transmission and mobility, after receiving testimony from Thomas Dorr, Under Secretary, and James M. Andrew, Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, both of the Department of Agriculture; Mark Goldstein, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; Mark K. Johnson, Regulatory Commission of Alaska, Anchorage; Ray Baum, Commissioner, Public Utility Commissioner of Oregon, Salem; William Squires, Blackfoot Telecommunications Group, Missoula, Montana; Larry Sarjeant, Qwest Communications, and Joe Garcia, National Congress of American Indians, both of Washington, D.C.; and Craig Mundie, Microsoft, Redmond, Washington.

### ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the goal of U.S. energy independence, focusing on how the United States can facilitate the advancement of technologies to create new sources of energy, how to make more

efficient use of existing energy resources, and how to increase access to domestic resources in an environmentally safe way, after receiving testimony from R. James Woolsey, Booz Allen Hamilton, McLean, Virginia, former Director of Central Intelligence Agency; Susan M. Cischke, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan; Frank A. Verrastro, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C.; and Amory B. Lovins, Rocky Mountain Institute, Snowmass, Colorado.

#### U.S.-OMAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

*Committee on Finance:* On Monday, March 6, Subcommittee on International Trade held a hearing to examine the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement, receiving testimony from Susan C. Schwab, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative; Edward S. Walker, Jr., Middle East Institute, David Hamod, National U.S. Arab Chamber of Commerce, and Thea M. Lee, AFL-CIO, all of Washington, D.C.; and Robert Hemphill, AES Corporation, Arlington, Virginia.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

#### NOMINATION

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Randall L. Tobias, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Bayh, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

#### 2005 GULF COAST HURRICANES RESPONSE

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* Committee met to discuss the response of community-based organizations to the 2005 Gulf Coast hurricanes, receiving testimony from Cynthia Fagnoni,

Managing Director, Education, Workforce and Income Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; Kay Wilkins, American Red Cross, Metairie, Louisiana; Jayne Wright, Louisiana State Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster and Food Bank of Central Louisiana, Alexandria; Todd Hawks, Salvation Army, Arlington, Virginia; Craig Nemitz, America's Second Harvest, and Heather Feltman, Lutheran Disaster Response, both of Chicago, Illinois; Mostafa Mahbood, Islamic Relief USA, Burbank, California; Almetra Franklin, St. Mary Community Action Agency, Franklin, Louisiana; Tanya Harris, Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, New Orleans, Louisiana; Lorna Bourg, Southern Mutual Help Association, New Iberia, Louisiana; Thomas E. Green, Office of Community Services, Little Rock, Arkansas; and Ande Miller, National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster, Tom Hazelwood, United Methodist Committee on Relief, William Daroff, United Jewish Communities, and Welton Gaddy, Interfaith Alliance, all of Washington, D.C.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

#### VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

*Committee on Veterans Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, after receiving testimony from James R. Mueller, Robert E. Wallace, and Dennis Cullinan, all of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C.

#### BUSINESS MEETING

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

---

## House of Representatives

### *Chamber Action*

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 17 public bills, H.R. 4881–4897; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 81–82; H. Con. Res. 352; and H. Res. 711–712 were introduced. **Pages H644–45**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H645–46**

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 645, requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense

relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States; adversely (H. Rept. 109–384);

H. Res. 641, requesting the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to electronic surveillance without search warrants on individuals in the United States, adversely (H. Rept. 109–385); and

H. Res. 710, providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements (H. Rept. 109–386). **Pages H575, H600, H644**

**Speaker:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Price of Georgia to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H573**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H575**

**Presidential Message:** Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted to Congress a legislative proposal entitled, the “Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006”, to give the President line item authority to reduce wasteful spending—referred to the Committee on Budget and the Committee on Rules and ordered printed (H. Doc. 109–94). **Page H577**

**Suspensions:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

*Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the “Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building”:* H.R. 3934, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the “Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building”; **Pages H577–78**

*Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the “Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office”:* H.R. 4054, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the “Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office”, by a yea-and-nay vote of 413 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 19; **Pages H578–79, H598–99**

*Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1271 North King Street in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, as the “Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building”:* S. 2089, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1271 North King Street in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, as the “Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building”—clearing the measure for the President; **Pages H579–81**

*USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006:* S. 2271, to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, by a yea-

and-nay vote of 280 yeas to 138 nays, Roll No. 20—clearing the measure for the President;

**Pages H581–93, H599**

*Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act:* H.R. 32, amended by the Senate, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in counterfeit marks; and **Pages H593–96**

*Supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week:* H. Res. 681, to support the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week. **Pages H596–98**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 4:02 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H598**

**Senate Message:** Messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H575 and H601.

**Senate Referral:** S. 2320 was referred to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and the Workforce. **Page H628**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H598–99 and H599. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HUD, THE JUDICIARY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies held a hearing on the Department of Transportation. Testimony was heard from Norman Y. Mineta, Secretary of Transportation.

### MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE, AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life, and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Air Force Budget. Testimony was heard from GEN T. Michael Moseley, USAF, Chief of Staff, Department of the Air Force.

**HUMAN CLONING/STEM CELL RESEARCH**

*Committee on Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources held a hearing entitled “Human Cloning and Embryonic Stem Cell Research After Seoul: Examining Exploitation, Fraud and Ethical Problems in the Research.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: James F. Battey, Jr., M.D., Chair, NIH Stem Cell Task Force, Director, National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders; Bernard Schwetz, Director, Office for Human Research Protections; and Chris B. Pascal, Director, Office of Research Integrity; and public witnesses.

**CRUISE SHIPS/INCIDENT INVESTIGATION**

*Committee on Government Reform:* Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations held a hearing entitled “International Maritime Security II: Law Enforcement, Passenger Security and Incident Investigation on Cruise Ships.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**BRIEFING—BIENNIAL BIOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT**

*Committee on Homeland Security:* Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack met in executive session to receive a briefing on the Biennial Biological Risk Assessment. The Subcommittee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

**OVERSIGHT—WHITE COLLAR ENFORCEMENT**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held an oversight hearing on White Collar Enforcement (Part 1): Attorney-Client Privilege and Corporate Waivers. Testimony was heard from Robert D. McCallum, Jr., Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue March 9.

**NATIONAL FOOD UNIFORMITY ACT**

*Committee on Rules:* Granted, by voice vote, a structured rule providing for further consideration of H.R. 4167, National Food Uniformity Act of 2005. The rule provides that no further general debate shall be in order. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the report. The rule provides that the amendments printed in the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be

subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

---

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY,  
MARCH 8, 2006**

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

**Senate**

*Committee on Appropriations:* to continue hearings to examine the proposed supplemental funding request for additional resources to assist the Gulf Coast region in its recovery from hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico in 2005, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

Subcommittee on District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine potential effects of a flat Federal income tax in the District of Columbia, 2 p.m., SD-124.

*Committee on Armed Services:* to hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense quadrennial defense review; to be followed by a closed session in SR-222, 2:30 p.m., SH-216.

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Subcommittee on International Trade and Finance, to hold hearings to examine the proposed reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 10 a.m., SD-538.

*Committee on the Budget:* business meeting to markup concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2007, 2 p.m., SD-608.

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Subcommittee on Trade, Tourism, and Economic Development, to hold hearings to examine impacts of piracy and counterfeiting of American goods and intellectual property in China, 2:30 p.m., SD-562.

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD-366.

*Committee on Finance:* to hold hearings to examine a prognosis of the nation's health care tax policy, 10 a.m., SD-215.

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Richard T. Miller, of Texas, to be U.S. Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an U.S. Alternate Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and John A. Simon, of Maryland, to be Executive Vice President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Narcotics Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the impact of the American Servicemembers' Protection Act on Latin America, 2:30 p.m., SD-419.

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* business meeting to consider S. 1955, to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Security Act of 1974 and the Public Health Service Act to expand health care access and reduce costs through the creation of small business health plans and through modernization of the health insurance marketplace, S. 1902, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize funding for the establishment of a program on children and the media within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to study the role and impact of electronic media in the development of children, and the nominations of Mitchell C. Clark, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Management, Department of Education, Jean B. Elshtain, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities, Edwin G. Foulke, Jr., of South Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, Allen C. Guelzo, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities, Arlene Holen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, George Perdue, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, Anne-Imelda Radice, of Vermont, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Craig T. Ramey, of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences, Sarah M. Singleton, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation, Richard Stickler, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Kent D. Talbert, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Education, Horace A. Thompson, of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, and certain nominations in the Public Health Service, 10 a.m., SD-430.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* to resume hearings to examine Hurricane Katrina, focusing on recommendations for reform, 9:30 a.m., SD-342.

Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine Crime Victims Fund rescission, 2:30 p.m., SD-342.

*Committee on Indian Affairs:* to hold hearings to examine S. 2078, to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to clarify the authority of the National Indian Gaming Commission to regulate class III gaming, to limit the lands eligible for gaming, 9:30 a.m., SR-485.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* business meeting to consider Steven G. Bradbury, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, John F. Clark, of Virginia, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service, Donald J. DeGabrielle, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Texas, John Charles Richter, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, Amul R. Thapar, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and Mauricio J. Tamargo, of Florida, to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, all of the Department of Justice, proposed legislation providing for comprehensive immigration reform, S. 1768, to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings, S.

829, to allow media coverage of court proceedings, S. 489, to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, to limit the duration of Federal consent decrees to which State and local governments are a party, S. 2039, to provide for loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders, S. 2292, to provide relief for the Federal judiciary from excessive rent charges, and S.J. Res. 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* to receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

## House

*Committee on Appropriations,* to mark up Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2006, 4 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Related Agencies, on Food and Safety Inspection Service, 9:30 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on Air Force Budget and Acquisition Overview, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, on Department of Health and Human Services, 10:15 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies, on DOE, 10 a.m., and on Bureau of Reclamation, 2 p.m., 2362B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, on Indian Health Services, 10 a.m., B-308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life, and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, on Navy/Marine Corps Budget, 10 a.m., and on Pacific Command, 1:30 p.m., H-143 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, on NOAA, 1 p.m., H-309 Capitol.

*Committee on Armed Services,* hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the European Command, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Projection Forces, hearing on the Evolving Missions of the U.S. Navy and the Role of Surface and Subsurface Combatants, 5 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on Department of Defense management of historic and historic-eligible facilities, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the Special Operations Command: Transforming for the Long War, 3 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* to consider a motion to authorize issuance of a service contract with Mr. Robert Douglas to support the ongoing investigation by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of "data brokers" who acquire and sell consumers' cell phone records and other confidential information; followed by a markup of the Prevention of Fraudulent Access to Phone Records Act, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Silicosis Story: Mass Tort Screening and the Public Health,” 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Government Reform*, Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs, hearing entitled “The Paperwork Reduction Act at 25: Opportunities To Strengthen and Improve the Law,” 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on Homeland Security*, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology, hearing entitled “Proposed Fiscal Year 2007 Budget: Enhancing Preparedness for First Responders,” 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight, hearing entitled “The 9/11 Reform Act: Examining the Implementation of the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center,” 2:30 p.m., 311 Cannon.

*Committee on International Relations*, to mark up H.R. 3127, Darfur Peace and Accountability Act of 2005; followed by a hearing on United States Policy Toward Iran—Next Steps, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing on East Asia in Transition: Opportunities and Challenges for the United States, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, hearing on The U.S.-European Relationship: Opportunities and Challenges, 1 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia, hearing on Palestinian Authority Elections: Implications for Peace, Regional Security, and U.S. Assistance, 2:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

*Committee on the Judiciary*, Subcommittee on the Constitution, oversight hearing entitled “The Voting Rights Act: Evidence of Continued Need,” 4 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing entitled “The Report on Orphan Works by the Copyright Office,” 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Water and Power, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 4545, To amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Los Angeles County Water Supply Augmentation Demonstration project; and S. 1338 Alaska Water Resources Act of 2005, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Committee on Rules*, to consider H.R. 2829, Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005, 4 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure*, Subcommittee on Aviation, oversight hearing on Reauthorization of the National Transportation Safety Board, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, to continue oversight hearings on Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY 2007 for the following Agencies: EPA, NOAA and TVA, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs*, oversight hearing on improving access to quality care for our nation's veterans through collaboration with affiliated medical institutions and the Department of Defense and the operation of integrated medical facilities, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Director of National Intelligence Fiscal Year 2007 Budget, 10 a.m., H-405 Capitol.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 8

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Wednesday:** After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 30 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of S. 2349, Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act.

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 8

## House Chamber

**Program for Wednesday:** Consideration of Suspensions: (1) H.R. 2383—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”; (2) H.R. 1190—San Diego Water Storage and Efficiency Act of 2005; (3) H.R. 4192—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the President William Jefferson Clinton Birthplace Home in Hope, Arkansas, as a National Historic Site and unit of the National Park System; (4) H.R. 4472—Children’s Safety and Violent Crime Reduction Act of 2005; (5) H.R. 3505—Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2005; (6) H.R. 1053—To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment; (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine; (7) H. Res. 673—Expressing support for the efforts of the people of the Republic of Belarus to establish a full democracy, the rule of law, and respect for human rights and urging the Government of Belarus to conduct a free and fair presidential election on March 19, 2006. Begin consideration of H.R. 4167—National Uniformity for Food Act of 2005.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## HOUSE

Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E289, E290, E291, E292, E293, E294, E296, E297, E298  
 Bonner, Jo, Ala., E290, E290, E291  
 Brown, Henry E., Jr., S.C., E293  
 Brown, Sherrod, Ohio, E301  
 Buyer, Steve, Ind., E295  
 Castle, Michael N., Del., E288  
 Davis, Danny K., Ill., E297  
 Davis, Tom, Va., E289, E290, E291, E292  
 Deal, Nathan, Ga., E290, E291  
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E283, E285

Fossella, Vito, N.Y., E294  
 Frank, Barney, Mass., E297  
 Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E298  
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E292  
 Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E294  
 Langevin, James R., R.I., E300  
 Leach, James A., Iowa, E288  
 Lungren, Daniel E., Calif., E289  
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E284, E286  
 Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E292  
 Miller, Candice S., Mich., E295  
 Miller, George, Calif., E287  
 Moran, Jerry, Kans., E284, E286

Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E287  
 Paul, Ron, Tex., E298  
 Peterson, Collin C., Minn., E296  
 Porter, Jon C., Nev., E283, E284, E285, E286, E287  
 Radanovich, George, Calif., E288  
 Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E299  
 Scott, David, Ga., E296  
 Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E299, E299, E300, E300, E301, E301  
 Udall, Mark, Colo., E286  
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E283, E285  
 Wolf, Frank R., Va., E289, E295  
 Wynn, Albert Russell, Md., E289



# Congressional Record

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](http://www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess). Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at [swais.access.gpo.gov](http://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](mailto: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](http://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.