United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 2006 No. 46

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 25, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THELMA D. DRAKE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Renewed in spirit by religious observances and the fresh breath of spring, Members of Congress return today to offer You, Lord God, praise and thanks. Strengthened by family ties, conversations with neighbors, and meetings with constituents back home, they are again grounded by the human relationships that make them one with the people they represent and whom they serve.

May the hopes, concerns, and heartfelt needs they carry back to Federal Government find full expression in their committee work and public policy and the just laws they formulate. In all their endeavors may they listen, Lord, and learn from one another, and together reach a new depth of corporate civility.

May they become aware that in serving your people, they serve You, Lord God; for You alone are Father of all and the source of love and justice, both 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 her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

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, April 7, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 7, 2006, at 3:30 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3351.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 366.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 382.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

SENIORS ARE PLEASED WITH MEDICARE PART D

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, last week House Republicans hosted over 200 Medicare part D events across the country to educate seniors on this new prescription drug plan and to help them enroll. I hosted two successful Medicare part D enrollment workshops in North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District and was pleased to help many of my constituents sign up to get coverage and save money on their prescriptions.

This is a program that is working for most seniors, and early problems are quickly being corrected. Recently the Washington Post and ABC News reported that of the 30 million-plus seniors who have already enrolled, three-quarters said that the paperwork was easy to complete, and nearly two-thirds say that Medicare part D saved them money.

It is important for seniors interested in this program to enroll by May 15. Seniors do not have to be experts on Medicare to enroll. They can simply call 1–800–MEDICARE or visit medicare.gov for information and personalized assistance. These resources are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. If Medicare part D can help you or your loved ones, don't miss this opportunity.

GAS PRICES

(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. Madam Speaker, nothing was more talked about during the work recess than the outrageous gasoline prices as they go up and up and up. None were more harmed than seniors, others on fixed income, and, of course, America's families who are struggling. We also in Texas had a rolling blackout.

So we must act now; not the Republican agenda, not the agenda that does

Printed on recycled paper.

not work, but Democrats and Republicans must work together to act and pass solutions. We must have, if you will, a conservation day, 1 day that you are on public transportation or bicycles; taxes on the excessive CEO salaries, how much can they spend? We must have, of course, a tax on the outrageous profits of the energy companies, but, more importantly, that tax can be used as a rebate, a one-time $10 rebate to those families who are at a certain income; review of the release of barrels from the petroleum reserve; Congressional hearings on the allegation of price gouging; the FTC, the Federal Trade Commission, must be out in the field doing a national survey on gas prices, an assessment of the market, analyzing the exploiting of political issues like Iraq and Iran.

The President must take leadership. Government incentives for domestic production of ethanol and town hall meetings will be held in my district, and also we must do exploration in the gulf. Outrageous gas prices require us to act.

A TRIBUTE TO SPECIALIST MARK W. MELCHER

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

Mr. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, I rise with a somber mood to recognize a citizen, a patriot, a soldier who gave his life for a cause he believed in serving his country as a soldier in Iraq.

Mark Melcher lived in Pittsburgh his entire life. He grew up on the north side watching the Steelers, Pirates and Penguins play, and graduated the from North Catholic High School in 1989. Soon afterwards, he joined the Army. He served in Operation Desert Storm in Kuwait.

Following the 1991 conflict to liberate Kuwait, Mark returned home to begin working at the Mellon Financial Corporation. He then served in the National Guard's lst Battalion, 103rd Armored Division located in Friedens, in Somerset County, Pennsylvania.

Mark departed for military training on the morning of Sunday, February 5th. Sadly, on April 15, 2006, just a month after arriving in theater, Mark was killed when his tank he manned came under fire outside of Baghdad. He was 34 years old. He is survived by his parents, Kathy and John Melcher, Sr., of Ross, Pennsylvania. I commend the deepest sympathies of all Members of this House to the Melcher family.

Also I offer the gratitude of every American. We should never forget his devotion of duty, his love of country. Today and every day let us give thanks to Mark Melcher, his family, and indeed all of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and the marines.

John Melcher, Sr., Mark's father, said of Mark, my son believed in the cause, he loved his country, gave his life for his country. You don't get any better than that. Yes, sir, Mr. Melcher, you do not get any better than that.

ESCALATING GAS PRICES

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, as every other Member, I have just returned from my congressional district, which includes a major part of the Dallas metropolitan area, and they have some of the highest gas prices in the Nation.

Recent reports revealed that gas prices have shot up nearly 25 cents per gallon over the past 2 weeks. In December of 2003, gas averaged $1.50 a gallon. Now gas is reaching $3 a gallon. While I agree that supply-and-demand forces are part of the reason behind the escalating gas prices, I also believe that price gouging is a fundamental problem.

Congress must act and enact innovative policies such as windfall profit tax on the gas companies and greater investments in alternative fuels, fuel efficiency, even public transportation.

Madam Speaker, I urge the Republican leadership to stop the rhetoric and start thinking about the real change.

SALUTING THE LEADERSHIP OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DONALD RUMSFELD

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as a 31-year veteran of the Army National Guard and the father of three serving in the military today, I greatly appreciate the military successes that have been achieved under the leadership of Secretary Donald Rumsfeld.

Secretary Rumsfeld has worked tirelessly in the global war on terrorism and led our troops to liberate 25 million people in Afghanistan, defeat Saddam Hussein's enormous Army in 18 days, train over 250,000 Iraqi security forces, capture countless terrorists, and further the greatest spread of freedom in the history of the world.

House and Senate Democrats promised a substantive national security policy over a month ago, but they continue to practice the strategy of retreat and defeat, which does not protect our country.

Fortunately, Secretary Rumsfeld and the U.S. military remain committed to fighting terrorists in Iraq, Afghanistan and worldwide so that we do not have to face them on the streets of America.

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

BUSH PRESCRIPTION DRUG TAX—TWENTY DAYS LEFT UNTIL TAX TAKES PLACE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, the countdown continues. If neither the Bush administration nor this Congress act within the next 20 days, seniors who have yet to sign up for the new prescription drug plan will be penalized with a Bush prescription drug tax that will stay with them for the rest of their lives.

It is bad enough that the new prescription drug plan is so confusing and complicated that a vast majority of seniors have yet to sign up, but now, if seniors choose a drug plan after May 15, they will be penalized with a tax that will only make their prescription drug costs higher.

The Bush administration refuses to extend the deadline, even though they have heard recent reports of seniors waiting on the phone as long as 30 minutes to get more information on these private drug plans.

If House Republicans do not join us in extending this unfair deadline, seniors will encounter at least a 7 percent Bush prescription drug tax that they will be forced to pay every month for the rest of their lives.

As we check off another day on the calendar, House Republicans now only have another 20 more days to stand up and support America's seniors. It is time Republicans do the right thing.

GASOLINE PRICES—SOBER ACTION DEMANDED

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, talk is cheap, and gas prices aren't. With summertime right around the corner, Americans are making plans to pack up their car and hit the road for a summer vacation. However, this year gas prices are putting a damper on those summer plans.

The President and most Members of Congress appreciate something the American people know well, America has an addiction to oil. But higher gas prices today are the product of many different factors, including governmental regulation and heightened worldwide demand. Here at home we are best able to adapt by using tools at our disposal.

In the weeks ahead, Congress must continue to act on behalf of the American people by providing incentives for energy conservation and the development of alternative energy sources. We should expand our domestic oil production, including building new refineries and expanding current ones. Above all, Members of Congress cannot talk about the rise in energy prices and then say ''no'' to reforms when it comes time to vote.

Right now, talk, not oil, is cheap. Shortsighted solutions will not be effective. I urge my colleagues to work together on behalf of all Americans. Our Nation certainly has the will to evolve our actions and the capability to meet these challenges.

HONORING THE CAREER OF DAN PIERCECCHI

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the career of a gentleman I have known for almost 20 years, Mr. Dan Piercecchi, who will be receiving a lifetime achievement award.

Dan has dedicated his life to public service throughout Michigan, having served on the Inkster Parks and Recreation Commission and then being elected to the Inkster City Council. He has also served on the Livonia Planning Commission and is currently a proponent and a champion of municipal government throughout America.

He is also a very dedicated activist to our own Grand Old Party, and he was one of the first people I ever met when I became involved in politics. He has the wisdom, sagacity, and tenacity of an old bull, and this young bull would like to thank him very much for the example he set of what one of man of integrity can do to move mountains.

□ 1415

FREE ACT

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, crude oil prices have exceeded previous records set after Hurricane Katrina, reaching over $75 a barrel. This summer, Americans are expected to pay significantly more at the pump than last summer. In the meantime, oil companies continue to rake in record profits.

During five town hall meetings I held in Michigan in the past 2 weeks, the price of gasoline was the most troubling for my constituents. There are currently no Federal laws against price gouging. The only way the Federal Trade Commission can even attempt to prosecute unfair pricing is through antitrust and antimonopoly laws. To date, the FTC has never brought a gas price gouging case to court.

Recently, President Bush ordered an investigation into gas prices. However, because the Federal Government does not have a clear definition of what price gouging is, the FTC can do little more than study the issues. But we have had enough studies. Last September, I introduced a bill to increase the Federal Government's ability to prosecute price gougers. My bill, the Federal Response to Energy Emergencies Act, FREE Act, will provide the FTC and the Department of Justice with the authority to investigate and to prosecute those who engage in predatory pricing, from oil companies down to distributors, with an emphasis on those who profit most.

The FREE Act will also allow State attorneys general to investigate unfair pricing practices. This includes the gouging of gasoline, home heating oil, and natural gas. The Federal Government has a responsibility to act responsibly and prevent price gouging, and I urge a vote on my legislation.

PRESIDENT SHOULD VETO SUPPLEMENTAL SPENDING BILL

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, with a record deficit and national debt, now is the time for Congress to practice fiscal discipline, even where funding the war on terror is concerned.

While I have supported our troops and funding the rebuilding and reconstruction efforts along the gulf coast, I could not bring myself to support recent emergency funding legislation that left this House of Representatives at some $92 billion, including many elements that the President of the United States thought were unnecessary.

Well, if things were bad before, they just got worse. Madam Speaker, the Senate is working on the emergency supplemental bill, and it is now at $106.5 billion and rising, including such unrelated measures as $3 million for southern and eastern Kentucky tourism and $900,000 for Dartmouth College, to name two.

Let us support funding the war on terror and support the families and communities affected by the hurricanes that hit the gulf coast, but let us do it in a fiscally responsible way. This legislation has become a fruit basket of spending unrelated to our war efforts and Katrina; and I say plainly, Mr. President, veto this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Members should direct remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

REACH OUT TO MODERATE PEOPLE OF IRAN

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, anyone following the news knows that tension is growing in our relations with Iran. But as we consider our response to this situation, let us be clear about where the problem lies.

The problem is with the radical new leadership of Iran, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, and his extremist regime. It is not with the good people of Iran, who have shown openness to freedom and moderation.

Historically, Iran has been a center of culture and civilization. Millions of Iranians still value these things and seek a future with greater freedom and individual liberty. We must be reaching out to these people through diplomacy, person-to-person diplomacy and other ways to encourage their desire for freedom.

The idea of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of a leader who calls the Holocaust a myth and openly says Israel should be wiped off the map is unthinkable and must be addressed. But the best way to do that is through reaching out to the moderate people of Iran who want better for their country than the current regime, not through military action.

MEDICARE SUCCESS STORY

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share yet another success story from a senior who is saving money with Medicare prescription drug coverage. These stories are plentiful, and it is important we share them with the American people so seniors will know the truth. They could be saving thousands of dollars a year with Medicare part D.

Mrs. Cornelia Kinnebrew lives in Rome, Georgia, in my district. Like many seniors, Ms. Kinnebrew's medication costs were astronomical. She was paying more than $700 a month for her drugs, a huge portion of her monthly budget.

Well, after contacting my office, Ms. Kinnebrew is signed up for a Medicare prescription drug plan. We discovered that she qualified for the additional help available to our low-income seniors, and I am incredibly pleased to report that now, with Medicare part D, Cornelia Kinnebrew pays only $37 a month for her prescription drugs. That is a savings of nearly $700 every month.

Madam Speaker, the initial enrollment deadline for Medicare part D is May 15. With 3 weeks left to sign up, it is extremely important we put people over politics and help ensure all seniors have the opportunity to enroll.

My message to seniors is this: with Medicare part D, the D stands for delivers. The President and this Republican-led Congress have done just that. Take advantage of it.

GAS PRICES

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, gas prices are the topic right now, so

let us talk about energy, because we have heard some of our liberal colleagues take great delight in talking about the gas prices, and probably they should. It is their policies that have led us to this point.

The Democrat Party in this country is very tightly tied to environmental extremist organizations; and since the 1970s, they have been working day and night to halt domestic exploration for oil.

We cannot search for oil on the Outer Continental Shelf, meanwhile Cuba and Venezuela are. We cannot explore for oil in ANWR because it might hurt the caribou. We haven't built a refinery since 1976 because environmentalists use their influence over liberal policymakers to create a regulatory and permitting scheme that makes it virtually impossible to get approval. That is why we have fewer refineries today.

Madam Speaker, the House passed a bill last year to make price gouging a Federal crime and to streamline the process for building a refinery. Not a single Democrat in this body voted for that, and now it is languishing in the Senate.

It is time for action. That is the reality of the situation.

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, April 7, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 7, 2006, at 9:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4979.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 360.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 371.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 85.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, Speaker pro tempore WOLF signed the following enrolled bill on Tuesday, April 11, 2006:

H.R. 4979, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify the preference for local firms in the award of certain contracts for disaster relief activities.

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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 2006

Mr. RENZI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April 26, 2006, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, April 27.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 2006, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. RENZI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, April 27, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

TO MEMORIALIZE AND HONOR THE CONTRIBUTION OF CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

Mr. RENZI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) to memorialize and honor the contribution of Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 83

Whereas President Richard M. Nixon nominated William H. Rehnquist to replace Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan on the Supreme Court on October 21, 1971, he was confirmed by the United States Senate on December 10, 1971, and served as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States from January 1972 through September 1986;

Whereas President Ronald W. Reagan nominated Associate Justice William H. Rehnquist to replace Chief Justice Warren E. Burger as the Sixteenth Chief Justice of the United States on June 20, 1986, and he was confirmed by the United States Senate on September 17, 1986;

Whereas William Rehnquist presided as Chief Justice from September 1986 until September 2005 for a total of 19 years, making him the fourth-longest-serving Chief Justice after Melville W. Fuller, Roger B. Taney, and John Marshall, and the longest-serving Chief Justice who had previously served as an Associate Justice;

Whereas Chief Justice Rehnquist ably presided as chief administrator of the United States courts to insure the due administration of justice during times of rising caseloads and fiscal constraints;

Whereas Chief Justice Rehnquist was respected for his intellect, fairness, and humor by his fellow Justices and by members of the other branches of government; and

Whereas despite the debilitating effects of thyroid cancer, Chief Justice Rehnquist continued his service to the court and the country, and administered the oath of office to President George W. Bush at his second inauguration on January 20, 2005: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND HONOR

SECTION 1. The United States, acting through Congress, authorizes and directs the Curator of the Supreme Court, subject to the direction and approval of the Chief Justice of the United States, to procure a marble bust, including pedestal, of the late Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, and to cause them to be placed in the Supreme Court building to honor his memory and legacy to the Supreme Court of the United States.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated $50,000 to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

House Joint Resolution 83, introduced by Congressman RICHARD POMBO, chairman of the House Resources Committee, is offered to honor the contributions of former Chief Justice William Rehnquist by authorizing and directing the Curator of the Supreme Court to produce a marble bust, including a pedestal, of the late Chief Justice and have it placed in the Supreme Court Building.

Madam Speaker, Chief Justice Rehnquist served the people of this country and the court that he loved for 33 years. He was, in fact, the fourth longest serving Chief Justice. I believe a bust in the Supreme Court is but a small token of our deep appreciation for his dedication to this country and the rule of law.

Similar honors have been authorized by Congress for 13 other Chief Justices, and I believe Chief Justice Rehnquist is equally deserving. I encourage adoption of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, the majority has already explained the purpose of House Joint Resolution 83, which was introduced by Resources Committee Chairman RICHARD POMBO.

All former Chief Justices of the Supreme Court are currently memorialized with their busts placed in the Great Hall of the Supreme Court Building. House Joint Resolution 83 will extend this honor to former Chief Justice Rehnquist as well, and we support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 83.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVING LOCATION OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. RENZI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) approving the location of the commemorative work in the District of Columbia honoring former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 28

Whereas section 8908(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code provides that the location of a commemorative work in the area described as Area I shall be deemed authorized only if approved by law not later than 150 days after notification to Congress and others that the commemorative work may be located in Area I;

Whereas section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note) authorizes the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor Dwight D. Eisenhower; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has notified Congress of her determination that the memorial should be located in Area I: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the location of the commemorative work to honor Dwight D. Eisenhower, authorized by section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note), within Area I as depicted on the map referred to in section 8908(a) of title 40, United States Code, is approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 28 approves the location of the Dwight D. Eisenhower commemorative work in the District of Columbia. Congressman JERRY MORAN is the author of the companion bill in the House, and he should be commended for his efforts to have this legislation enacted in such a timely manner.

□ 1430

Congress authorized the establishment of a Washington, D.C., memorial to former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 2002. Under the Commemorative Works Act, Congress must formally approve the placement of memorials located in ''Area 1'' of the District of Columbia within 150 days of notification by the Secretary of the Interior. Area 1 comprises the central monument core along the National Mall.

The Secretary of the Interior notified Congress on January 31, 2006, that the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission should be granted the authority to consider sites within Area 1 for the Eisenhower Memorial after concluding that former President Eisenhower is of ''preeminent historical and lasting significance to this Nation.'' Congress must approve this recommendation by July 2, 2006, for the planning and approval process to proceed. Senate Joint Resolution 28 does just that. I urge adoption of the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, President Dwight D. Eisenhower is a towering figure in American military and political history. We are pleased that the process for memorializing him is moving along rapidly and join our colleagues in offering our support for this resolution.

I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) for his steadfast advocacy of this legislation. Mr. MOORE is a member of the Executive Committee of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, and in his letter to Ranking Member RAHALL noted, ''President Eisenhower deserves a memorial location that speaks to his life and legacy.'' We are pleased to support this resolution.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that today the House is taking up S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution approving the location of the commemorative work in the District of Columbia honoring former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This measure, which was approved by the Senate earlier this month; it is identical to H.J. Res. 78, which was introduced by Representative JERRY MORAN of Kansas, with my original cosponsorship. With House approval of this measure today, this legislation will be sent to the President for his signature, marking an important milestone in the construction of a national memorial to President Eisenhower.

As a member of the Executive Committee of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, established under Public Law 106–79 and Public Law 107–117, I have been working with my Commission colleagues to fulfill the laws' mandate that ''an appropriate permanent memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower should be created to perpetuate his memory and his contributions to the United States,'' and that the ''Commission shall consider and formulate plans for such a permanent memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower, including its nature, construction and location.'' I want to take this opportunity to thank my fellow Commissioners for their dedicated work on this project, and to take particular note of the contributions of Commission Chairman Rocco C. Siciliano and Commission Executive Director Brig. General Carl W. Reddel, USAF (Ret). Working in particular with my fellow Executive Committee members Senators TED STEVENS and DANIEL INOUYE, their tireless dedication to this project has been the primary reason we have moved so far so fast with this legislation. Their outstanding work is exemplified in the Commission's biographical essay about Dwight D. Eisenhower, which I include below:

THE NATIONAL MEMORIALIZATION OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Dwight D. Eisenhower (October 14, 1890–March 28, 1969) served as the 34th President of the United States and ranks as one of the preeminent figures in the global history of the twentieth century. Eisenhower was a central leader in the victorious resolution of World War II but his lasting significance in history lies in his deep commitment to freedom, the Constitution and democracy, and his contributions to defining and sustaining an international peace for which many Americans died.

A serving officer in World War I, Eisenhower's unusual abilities led to accelerated promotions at the outset of World War II and his selection in December 1943 as Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces. For this position he was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and endorsed by General George C. Marshall. He commanded the largest and most complex amphibious assault in world history. In this historic role, although he asked many Americans to sacrifice their lives, he became one of the most popular political figures in America and one of the most beloved military leaders in American history.

Toward the end of World War II, Eisenhower was nominated by President Roosevelt and approved by Congress for the rank of five-star General. Upon retiring from military service, he actively served as President of Columbia University from October 1948 to January 1951. While in that position, President Truman regularly sought his advice and counsel and then recalled him to active duty, appointing him in December 1950 as the first

commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) military forces in Europe.

As the second presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, replacing General Marshall in December 1945, he oversaw the peacetime demobilization of American military forces, recommended the continuation of universal military training and strongly advocated the unification of the armed forces.

As Eisenhower's two-term presidency began, American democratic values and national security were threatened by powerful adversaries. Passionately devoted to national security through alliances with other nations, President Eisenhower began his first administration when the Cold War's global challenges had gone beyond Europe. Convinced that a long-term strategy would be necessary to win this war, President Eisenhower sought to contain the Soviet Union militarily while building a prosperous economy. He understood the political economy of warfare better than most of his contemporaries and realized that excessive military expenditures could undermine the nation itself. Knowing that nuclear war was un-winnable and a threat to civilization, President Eisenhower promoted the peaceful uses of atomic energy, while skillfully and willingly deploying the most advanced electronic and photographic technologies to ensure American security. Simultaneously, he sustained strategic nuclear deterrence. President Eisenhower inaugurated the national security policies that guided the nation for the next three decades, leading to the peaceful end of the Cold War in 1989.

While undertaking strategic Cold War measures, President Eisenhower assiduously pursued balanced budgets with remarkable fiscal responsibility and without sacrificing necessary public works. He introduced lasting innovations to the institution of the presidency, creating the first White House chief of staff, the first congressional relations office, the first presidential assistant for national security affairs and the first presidential science advisor. He dramatically improved the transportation infrastructure of the country with construction of the interstate highway system and the St. Lawrence Seaway. The territory of the United States was expanded with the addition of the new states of Alaska (January 3, 1959) and Hawaii (August 21, 1959).

To address the increasing complexity of citizens' social needs, President Eisenhower created the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1953, improved Social Security by increasing benefits and placing an additional ten million Americans in the Social Security system, and dispensed free polio vaccines. In 1957, he signed the first civil rights legislation since Reconstruction.

The extraordinary accomplishments of Dwight D. Eisenhower as president and military leader are enhanced in a series of memorable addresses and speeches including—Guildhall Address (London, 1945), Chance for Peace (Washington, 1953), Atoms for Peace (United Nations, 1953), Open Skies (Geneva Summit, 1956) and the Farewell Address (1961). Similar to Washington, Eisenhower became president and commander in chief after leading his country and its allies to military victory in Europe. His preeminent historical and national significance is assured. The challenge in our national memorialization of Dwight D. Eisenhower will be to honor all facets of his extraordinary career of life-long public service in a distinct, unique and enduring manner.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Kansas' most famous sons, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. His remarkable career in public service and his legacy of protecting our country and the American people is most deserving of a memorial here in our Nation's Capital.

President Eisenhower spent his childhood in Abilene, Kansas, which is located in my district. Upon graduation from Abilene High School in 1909, he enrolled at West Point. Eisenhower soon became an esteemed figure and one of the most beloved military leaders in American history. After leading the U.S. and its allies to victory in World War II, he rose to the eminent rank of five-star general and went on to become the first commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's military forces in Europe. In 1953, Eisenhower became the 34th President of the United States.

Initial site approval must be granted by Congress in order for monument design plans to proceed. The Eisenhower Commission was responsible for initially selecting the four-acre location near the Department of Education that has now been designated for the memorial. I was joined by the entire Kansas delegation in supporting H.J. Res. 78, the House companion bill to S.J. Res. 28. I recognize that the designation of the memorial site is an instrumental first step in making this tribute a reality.

Eisenhower himself once said that "this world has always set a high value on leadership." Eisenhower's valiant leadership qualities, innumerable successes, and staunch defender of American liberties make him worthy of a monument attributing to such. I stand here today offering my support for this important resolution.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 28.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RENZI. 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.

GLENDO UNIT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT CONTRACT EXTENSION ACT OF 2005

Mr. RENZI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 592) to amend the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998 to extend certain contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and certain irrigation water contractors in the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 592

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 "Glendo Unit of the Missouri River Basin Project Contract Extension Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. GLENDO UNIT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN CONTRACT EXTENSION.

Section 2 of the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2816, 117 Stat. 1854) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "December 31, 2005" and inserting "December 31, 2007"; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "beyond December 31, 2005" and inserting "beyond December 31, 2007"; and

(B) by striking "before December 31, 2005" and inserting "before December 31, 2007".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

S. 592, introduced by Senator CRAIG THOMAS, extends nine water contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and water customers depending on the Glendo Reservoir in Wyoming until December 31, 2007. Our distinguished House colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) has led the effort in this Chamber to bring this bill to the floor.

To meet Endangered Species Act compliance within the Platte River basin area, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Colorado have been negotiating with the Federal Government on a recovery plan for four threatened and endangered species. Although all parties are expected to finalize and sign the recovery plan late this year, area water users need access to Glendo Reservoir water deliveries into the spring irrigation season, and this legislation ensures that while allowing the recovery plan process to go forward. I urge my colleagues to support this time-sensitive bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we support the passage of S. 592. This bill would allow delivery of irrigation water to continue while work is finished on the Recovery Implementation Program for four listed species that rely on Platte River habitat.

A carefully managed process is in place to implement the Platte River Cooperative Agreement and to achieve species recovery. S. 592 will allow this critical work to continue without creating hardship for farmers who depend on irrigation water.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 592.

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.

AMENDING THE RECLAMATION WASTEWATER AND GROUNDWATER STUDY AND FACILITIES ACT

Mr. RENZI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2341) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of a project to reclaim and reuse wastewater within and outside of the service area of the City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility, Texas, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2341

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WASTEWATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT.

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

"SEC. 1636. AUSTIN, TEXAS, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT.

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

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

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

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

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of Public Law 102–575 (106 Stat. 4600) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to chapter XVI the following:

''Sec. 1636. Austin, Texas, water reclamation and reuse project.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2341, introduced by Mr. DOGGETT, authorizes Federal participation in a water reuse project in Austin, Texas. Drought and increasing demands continue to stress existing water supplies. As a result, the city of Austin is being proactive and planning for its future water needs. This project is part of Austin's effort to create new water supplies. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we support the passage of H.R. 2341. Similar legislation was introduced in the 107th Congress, and we commend Mr. DOGGETT for his persistence and hard work to secure authorization for this important project.

The city of Austin is keenly aware that additional sources of water will be required to meet future water demands. The city has decided to meet the expected water supply shortfall by implementing aggressive water conservation and water recycling and reclamation programs.

The water recycling project identified in this bill will be eligible for limited financial assistance under the Bureau of Reclamation's title 16 water recycling program. Water recycling and desalination projects are proven technologies that can help stretch limited water supplies in areas such as Texas.

I want to express our full support for this legislation, and I offer my congratulations to Mr. DOGGETT for his leadership.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of both of my colleagues on the floor and the support of both the chairmen and the ranking members and staff of the Resources Committee and the subcommittee.

I rise in support of this legislation that I have offered on behalf of the City of Austin in addressing the growing water needs that we have in Central Texas in a fiscally and environmentally responsible way.

This particular project deals with the design, planning, and construction of a project to use wastewater and reclaim it in our community.

The Bureau of Reclamation was originally authorized to get involved with such projects in 1992, and this bill adds Austin to the list of eligible projects under what is known as Title 16. The bill will help the City with Federal funds to supplement what Austin is already doing locally to expand our water reclamation facilities.

Under Title 16, Federal participation is limited, and the City will remain responsible for at least three-fourths of the cost of the project.

Reclaimed water, or treated wastewater, is generally used when high-quality drinkable water is not required, such as for irrigation, industrial cooling towers, and for various manufacturing purposes.

For more than 20 years, the City of Austin has operated its own water reclamation project for irrigation and to supply the composting operations at the Hornsby Bend Plant on the Colorado River.

In Texas, although we have some mighty powerful rivers, we also have a mighty thirsty State. I believe that by conserving the many resources with which we have been blessed in Central Texas, we can ensure an ample water supply for the indefinite future.

This reclamation initiative will reduce the demand on Austin's existing water supply and conserve high-quality water from the Colorado River for human consumption.

Austin's existing reclaimed water system consists of 16 miles of pipe, 1.5 million gallons of storage in 2 tanks, 3 pump stations, and 2 pressure zones. We envision a much-expanded system under the master plan. We will reclaim water through 123 miles of pipe, 17 million gallons of storage, and multiple pump stations and pressure zones. For the system to grow from its existing limited capacity to its ultimate size will take about $200 million in additional infrastructure over the coming years. When completed, the expanded system authorized by this bill could eventually save as much as 9 billion gallons of water every year.

Austin is already a national leader in planning for a sustainable future that improves our quality of life, boosts economic development, and protects the environment. Water conservation is a key part of that plan and a critical issue for a growing economy in an environmentally-minded city. Even with active water conservation programs, the maximum daily demand for water in Austin increased by 43 percent during the 1990s. Austin recognizes that aggressive conservation efforts can meet about half of our future shortfall, but expanding our reclamation capabilities can get us the rest of the way there.

Ben Franklin once said, ''When the well is dry, we know the worth of water.'' Well, this bill demonstrates that Austinites know the worth of water before our source of water goes

dry, and we are taking steps to ensure water for our future.

The City and the Bureau of Reclamation have already advanced the project by completing a favorable Appraisal Report and beginning a Feasibility Study. The Appraisal Report concluded that the city's projected water ''shortage can be eliminated by more aggressive water reclamation'' and that ''there is a Federal interest in pursuing water reclamation and reuse investigations in Austin.''

In 1907, Theodore Roosevelt said, ''The conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem, it will avail us little to solve all others.'' With your help, the capital of the Lone Star State can make even more significant strides in managing its water resources. I urge approval of this legislation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RENZI. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Texas, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2341, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEPHONE RECORDS AND PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 2006

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4709) to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen protections for law enforcement officers and the public by providing criminal penalties for the fraudulent acquisition or unauthorized disclosure of phone records, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4709

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 ''Telephone Records and Privacy Protection Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) telephone records can be of great use to criminals because the information contained in call logs may include a wealth of personal data;

(2) call logs may reveal the names of telephone users' doctors, public and private relationships, business associates, and more;

(3) call logs are typically maintained for the exclusive use of phone companies, their authorized agents, and authorized consumers;

(4) telephone records have been obtained without the knowledge or consent of consumers through the use of a number of fraudulent methods and devices that include—

(A) telephone company employees selling data to unauthorized data brokers;

(B) ''pretexting'', whereby a data broker or other person represents that they are an authorized consumer and convinces an agent of the telephone company to release the data; or

(C) gaining unauthorized Internet access to account data by improperly activating a consumer's account management features on a phone company's webpage or contracting with an Internet-based data broker who trafficks in such records; and

(5) the unauthorized disclosure of telephone records not only assaults individual privacy but, in some instances, may further acts of domestic violence or stalking, compromise the personal safety of law enforcement officers, their families, victims of crime, witnesses, or confidential informants, and undermine the integrity of law enforcement investigations.

SEC. 3. FRAUD AND RELATED ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH OBTAINING CONFIDENTIAL PHONE RECORDS INFORMATION OF A COVERED ENTITY.

(a) OFFENSE.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1038 the following:

''§ 1039. Fraud and related activity in connection with obtaining confidential phone records information of a covered entity

''(a) CRIMINAL VIOLATION.—Whoever, in interstate or foreign commerce, knowingly and intentionally obtains, or attempts to obtain, confidential phone records information of a covered entity, by—

''(1) making false or fraudulent statements or representations to an employee of a covered entity;

''(2) making such false or fraudulent statements or representations to a customer of a covered entity;

''(3) providing a document to a covered entity knowing that such document is false or fraudulent; or

''(4) accessing customer accounts of a covered entity via the Internet, or by means of conduct that violates section 1030 of this title, without prior authorization from the customer to whom such confidential phone records information relates;

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON SALE OR TRANSFER OF CONFIDENTIAL PHONE RECORDS INFORMATION.—

''(1) Except as otherwise permitted by applicable law, whoever, in interstate or foreign commerce, knowingly and intentionally sells or transfers, or attempts to sell or transfer, confidential phone records information of a covered entity, without prior authorization from the customer to whom such confidential phone records information relates, or knowing or having reason to know such information was obtained fraudulently, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, the exceptions specified in section 222(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 shall apply for the use of confidential phone records information by any covered entity, as defined in subsection (h).

''(c) PROHIBITION ON PURCHASE OR RECEIPT OF CONFIDENTIAL PHONE RECORDS INFORMATION.—

''(1) Except as otherwise permitted by applicable law, whoever, in interstate or foreign commerce, knowingly and intentionally purchases or receives, or attempts to purchase or receive, confidential phone records information of a covered entity, without prior authorization from the customer to whom such confidential phone records information relates, or knowing or having reason to know such information was obtained fraudulently, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, the exceptions specified in section 222(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 shall apply for the use of confidential phone records information by any covered entity, as defined in subsection (h).

''(d) ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR AGGRAVATED CASES.—Whoever violates, or attempts to violate, subsection (a), (b), or (c) while violating another law of the United States or as part of a pattern of any illegal activity involving more than $100,000, or more than 50 customers of a covered entity, in a 12-month period shall, in addition to the penalties provided for in such subsection, be fined twice the amount provided in subsection (b)(3) or (c)(3) (as the case may be) of section 3571 of this title, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(e) ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR USE OF INFORMATION IN FURTHERANCE OF CERTAIN CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—

''(1) Whoever, violates, or attempts to violate, subsection (a), (b), or (c) knowing that such information may be used in furtherance of, or with the intent to commit, an offense described in section 2261, 2261A, 2262, or any other crime of violence shall, in addition to the penalties provided for in such subsection, be fined under this title and imprisoned not more than 5 years.

''(2) Whoever, violates, or attempts to violate, subsection (a), (b), or (c) knowing that such information may be used in furtherance of, or with the intent to commit, an offense under section 111, 115, 1114, 1503, 1512, 1513, or to intimidate, threaten, harass, injure, or kill any Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer shall, in addition to the penalties provided for in such subsection, be fined under this title and imprisoned not more than 5 years.

''(f) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—There is extraterritorial jurisdiction over an offense under this section.

''(g) NONAPPLICABILITY TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—This section does not prohibit any lawfully authorized investigative, protective, or intelligence activity of a law enforcement agency of the United States, a State, or political subdivision of a State, or of an intelligence agency of the United States.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONFIDENTIAL PHONE RECORDS INFORMATION.—The term 'confidential phone records information' means information that—

''(A) relates to the quantity, technical configuration, type, destination, location, or amount of use of a service offered by a covered entity, subscribed to by any customer of that covered entity, and kept by or on behalf of that covered entity solely by virtue of the relationship between that covered entity and the customer;

''(B) is made available to a covered entity by a customer solely by virtue of the relationship between that covered entity and the customer; or

''(C) is contained in any bill, itemization, or account statement provided to a customer by or on behalf of a covered entity solely by virtue of the relationship between that covered entity and the customer.

''(2) COVERED ENTITY.—The term 'covered entity'—

''(A) has the same meaning given the term 'telecommunications carrier' in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153); and

''(B) includes any provider of IP-enabled voice service.

''(3) CUSTOMER.—The term 'customer' means, with respect to a covered entity, any individual, partnership, association, joint stock company, trust, or corporation, or authorized representative of such customer, to whom the covered entity provides a product or service.

''(4) IP-ENABLED VOICE SERVICE.—The term 'IP-enabled voice service' means the provision of real-time voice communications offered to the public, or such class of users as to be effectively available to the public, transmitted through customer premises equipment using TCP/IP protocol, or a successor protocol, (whether part of a bundle of services or separately) with interconnection capability such that the service can originate traffic to, or terminate traffic from, the public switched telephone network, or a successor network.''.

(b) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1038 the following:

''1039. Fraud related activity in connection with obtaining confidential phone records information of a covered entity.''.

SEC. 4. SENTENCING GUIDELINES.

(a) 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 section, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and policy statements applicable to persons convicted of any offense under section 1039 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) 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.

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. 4709 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. 4709, the Law Enforcement and Phone Privacy Protection Act of 2006. This legislation will protect the privacy of consumers' cell phone records and create new criminal penalties for the unauthorized purchase, sale or disclosure of such records.

Certain unscrupulous companies operating on the Internet use deception to acquire an individual's phone records and then sell this personal information. Typically these companies employ a tactic known as ''pretexting'' to deceive the phone companies.

□ 1445

By impersonating the actual cell phone account holder, these companies are often able to obtain significant private information about the individuals.

This practice not only presents a threat to the privacy of the average consumer; the Judiciary Committee has also learned that criminals have employed these services to determine the identity of undercover law enforcement officers as well as suspected confidential informants and witnesses. Additionally, stalkers and domestic users can use such information to track a victim's location and associates.

Amazingly, none of this is clearly illegal under Federal law. H.R. 4709 targets pretexting and other deceptive practices not adequately addressed by the current law and provides express protection in the criminal code for the privacy of confidential phone records information. These important new consumer protections cover the records and calling logs of cellular, land line, Voice-Over-Internet-Protocol users, and accomplish this goal on a technology neutral basis. The bill also establishes specific criminal penalties for the fraudulent acquisition or disclosure of such records without the consent of the consumer.

More specifically, the bill prohibits third parties from purchasing or receiving confidential phone records information without the prior authorization of the consumer, or knowing or having reason to know that the information was obtained fraudulently. It exempts use of information by any covered entity if such use would be permissible under existing laws governing the handling of such information by telecommunications carriers. This exception includes any uses by agents, contractors, or joint venture partners to receive the confidential phone records acting on behalf of the covered entity to perform any of the functions permitted under existing law.

The bill also provides enhanced criminal penalties for anyone who engages in large scale operations to violate the law, or who discloses or uses fraudulently obtained confidential phone records information in furtherance of crimes of violence, including domestic violence and stalking, or to kill, injure or intimidate a witness, juror, confidential informant, or law enforcement officer.

The bill under consideration today incorporates several technical and conforming changes to the text that was reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee on March 2 this year. This bipartisan legislation is supported by the U.S. Department of Justice, the National Center For Victims of Crime, the Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association, and all of the major land line and mobile telephone companies.

I commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, Lamar Smith, for introducing this important measure. I also want to thank Judiciary Committee Ranking Member CONYERS, Congressman GOODLATTE, and Congressman SCOTT for their contributions to this legislation.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4709 provides consumers with important new protections for the confidentiality of their calling records without compromising the legitimate lawful interests of law enforcement, emergency services and cellular telephone service providers. I urge my colleagues to support this sensible piece of legislation and hope that the Members of the other body will consider and pass this bill expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Without objection, the 20 minutes will be controlled by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise with great pleasure and enthusiasm as one of the supporters of this legislation, Telephone Records and Privacy Protection Act of 2006, H.R. 4709; and I am pleased to acknowledge Mr. LAMAR SMITH and JOHN CONYERS as the original sponsors of this legislation.

I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I add my applause to legislation that makes several important and noteworthy changes to current law.

First and foremost, it establishes a new criminal offense against anyone who knowingly and intentionally obtains or attempts to obtain the confidential phone records of a third party through any one of the bill's several enumerated schemes or devices to defraud. Penalties for violating this prohibition include a fine or a term of imprisonment of not more than 20 years, or both.

Second, the bill establishes a new set of criminal penalties for anyone who knowingly and intentionally sells or purchases the confidential phone records of a third party without proper authorization or knowing that such records were obtained through fraud. Violators of either of these two provisions are subjected to a maximum term of imprisonment of up to 5 years.

Finally, in an effort to offer increased protection to the likely victims of such activities, this legislation includes a series of enhanced criminal penalties against any individual who engages in any one of the aforementioned crimes knowing that such information was sought in furtherance of or with the intent to commit any one of the bill's dozen or so enumerated offenses. Individuals specifically protected under this provision include potential victims of domestic-violence-related offenses, jurors, criminal witnesses, confidential informants, and law enforcement officers.

Recent investigations undertaken by State and Federal law enforcement officials have demonstrated the ease with which an individual can obtain the confidential calling records of a third party. By simply contacting one of the

many on-line data brokers that currently exist, the private records of anyone sitting in this room could be filtered into the public domain within a matter of minutes.

And if put into the wrong hands, such information could be used to commit countless crimes of violence, including acts of domestic violence, retaliatory acts against law enforcement officers, or acts aimed at undermining our current criminal justice system.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to note that as we fight the crime of identity theft, this new and innovative legislation puts a dagger in some aspects of that. For example, the records of high-ranking officials dealing with government business could be secured, whether it is local, State or Federal, and put various actions of the government in jeopardy.

And, yes, a law enforcement officer that may be undercover, those records can be secured and immediately put that law enforcement officer in great jeopardy of his or her life.

And, finally, for those of us who are parents, we understand what it means to be able to communicate with a young person through a cell phone. Just imagine a stalker or a child predator securing those records of your teenage son or daughter. What a horrific thought to think.

And so it is important that this legislation be passed for the protection of Americans all over this country and as well for the integrity of our technology system.

The bill before us seeks to stop these potential abuses from becoming a reality, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile measure.

I am pleased to acknowledge LAMAR SMITH and JOHN CONYERS as the original sponsors of this bill. This legislation makes several important and noteworthy changes to current law.

First and foremost, it establishes a new criminal offense against anyone who knowingly and intentionally obtains, or attempts to obtain, the confidential phone records of a third party through any one of the bill's several enumerated schemes or devices to defraud. Penalties for violating this prohibition include a fine or a term of imprisonment of not more than 20 years, or both.

Second, the bill establishes a new set of criminal penalties for anyone who knowingly and intentionally sells or purchases the confidential phone records of a third party, without proper authorization or knowing that such records were obtained through fraud. Violators of either of these two provisions are subjected to a maximum term of imprisonment of up to 5 years.

Finally, in an effort to offer increased protection to the likely victims of such activities, the legislation includes a series of enhanced criminal penalties against any individual who engages in any one of the aforementioned crimes knowing that such information was sought in furtherance of, or with the intent to commit any one of the bill's dozen or so enumerated offenses. Individuals specifically protected under this provision include potential victims of domestic-violence related offenses, jurors, criminal witnesses, confidential informants and law enforcement officers.

Recent investigations that have been undertaken by State and Federal law enforcement officials have demonstrated the ease with which an individual can obtain the confidential calling records of a third party. By simply contacting one of the many online data brokers that currently exist, the private records of anyone sitting in this room could be filtered into the public domain within a matter of minutes.

And, if put into the wrong hands, such information could be used to commit countless crimes of violence, including acts of domestic violence, retaliatory attacks against law enforcement officers, or acts aimed at undermining our current criminal justice system.

The bill before us seeks to stop these potential abuses from becoming a reality. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the author of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, since I introduced this legislation, I rise in strong support of the Telephone Records and Privacy Protection Act of 2006, the TRAPP Act. And I want to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his leadership and continuing support of this bicameral and bipartisan bill.

Madam Speaker, few things are more personal and potentially more revealing than our telephone records. Who we call can reveal much about our business and personal lives, including intimate details about one's medical or financial condition. Calling records can even be used to identify a caller's location. In some cases the unauthorized release of personal information like a phone record can lead to a tragic result.

Unfortunately, existing Federal statutes that could be used to target data thieves are inadequate. These statutes have clearly not deterred data burglars from treating confidential phone record information as a commodity to be bought and sold over the Internet without the consent of consumers, sometimes for as little as $100.

The underlying bill targets companies and individuals who traffic in fraudulently obtained confidential phone records and provides new protections for the privacy of calling logs themselves. It establishes a new section, 1039, in title 18 of the United States Code, that will provide explicit penalties for those who use fraud to obtain confidential phone records.

Madam Speaker, the bill imposes a prison sentence of up to 10 years and a fine of up to $500,000 on any person who, in interstate commerce, sells, transfers, purchases or receives confidential phone records of a telephone company without the prior consent of the consumer.

The bill includes enhanced penalties for cases where the information is used in furtherance of crimes of domestic violence or a threat to law enforcement officials or their families.

We need to pass this bill to demonstrate that we take seriously the obligation to protect the confidentiality of consumer telephone records and to make clear to data thieves that their conduct will result in a felony conviction.

This legislation supports crime victims, prosecutors, and companies and individuals who have been the targets of this fraud. A companion measure is expected to be introduced soon in the Senate.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, at this time I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to yield back if the gentlewoman from Texas will yield back.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I include the following letters of support for this legislation:

CONSUMERS UNION,
Washington, DC., February 8, 2006.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. BILL NELSON
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS SCHUMER, SPECTER AND NELSON: Consumers Union, the publisher of Consumer Reports, supports the Consumer Telephone Records Protection Act of 2006, S. 2178, and applauds your leadership on this critical consumer issue.

The Consumer Telephone Records Protection Act would go far in protecting consumers' private telephone records. Consumers have a reasonable expectation that their calling records will not be released to anyone other than themselves. Congress must meet that expectation by preventing stalkers, identity thieves, and shady data-brokers from accessing consumers' personal telephone calling records. Subjecting to criminal penalties the selling of those records and the practice of pretexting to obtain them will serve as a strong deterrence.

Importantly, instead of simply reaffirming Federal Trade Commission authority to enforce penalties against unfair and deceptive trade practices, the Consumer Telephone Records Protection Act ensures that other federal entities are empowered to protect consumers' calling records. Additionally, the bill covers all wireline, wireless and VoIP services, protecting the rights of consumers to keep their phoning records private regardless of which platform they use.

We look forward to working with you toward adoption of S. 2178 as well as other complementary measures required to protect consumers phone records. These include stronger enforcement powers and penalties for FTC and the Federal Communications Commission; mandatory consumer notice when calling records have been requested or provided to any party; requirements that consumers affirmatively opt-in before any of their records are shared, even with affiliates of the phone company; and finally, provisions strengthening carrier internal processes for safeguarding consumer information under Section 222 of the 1934 Communications Act, with tough penalties for noncompliance.

We applaud your swift action and thank you for your leadership to protect consumers. We look forward to working with you toward effective, enforceable consumer phone record privacy legislation.

We look forward to working with you toward enactment of this important legislation.

Respectfully,

JEANNINE KENNEY,
Senior Policy Analyst.

VERIZON WIRELESS APPLAUDS CELL PHONE PRIVACY BILL

BEDMINSTER, NJ.—Senators Charles Schumer of New York, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and Bill Nelson of Florida proposed legislation in the U.S. Senate today to make it a crime for someone to obtain cell phone customer calling or billing information under false pretenses or for a wireless company employee to sell such customer information. Verizon Wireless issued the following statement from Steve Zipperstein, vice president of legal & external affairs, in response to the filing:

''As the first wireless company in the U.S. to take legal action to protect cell phone customers' private account information from so-called online data brokers, Verizon Wireless applauds the efforts of Senators Schumer, Specter and Nelson to protect our customers' privacy from the crooks and predators who we've been hauling into civil court. The criminal penalties in this bill will provide another powerful weapon in the legal arsenal that the private sector and the government can use to protect consumers. We believe this legislation will give federal prosecutors and others in law enforcement the tools they need to crack down on this despicable practice and help defend the privacy of U.S. cell phone customers.''

Verizon Wireless' record of aggressively protecting customer privacy has put the company at the forefront of the U.S. wireless industry.

On September 15, 2005, Verizon Wireless secured a permanent injunction against Source Resources Inc, a Tennessee-based company, to halt its illegal practice of obtaining and selling confidential customer telephone records. Verizon Wireless brought the lawsuit, believed to be the first of its kind, after one of its customers reported that his confidential wireless phone records had been secured without his permission by Source Resources. http://news.vzw.com/news/2005/09/pr2005-09-15.html

On November 9, 2005, Verizon Wireless obtained an immediate injunction against Global Information Group (GIG) of Temple Terrace, FL after the company made ''thousands of attempts'' to gather confidential information without proper authorization and used various fraudulent ''schemes'' to do so, including impersonating Verizon Wireless employees and posing as Verizon Wireless customers. The suit is pending. http://news.vzw.com/news/2005/11/pr2005-11-09a.html

In other actions to protect customer privacy: Verizon Wireless won permanent injunctions to stop two telemarketing firms—Intelligent Alternatives of San Diego, CA, and Resort Marketing Trends of Coral Springs, FL,—from making calls to Verizon Wireless customers by using auto-dialers and recorded messages. Federal consumer protection law prohibits use of auto-dialers or prerecorded messages in calls to cell phones—http://news.vzw.com/news/2005/12/pr2005-12-09.html

Verizon Wireless filed a lawsuit seeking an injunction against Passport Holidays of Ormond Beach, FL for violating federal and state laws after it sent more than 98,000 unsolicited short text messages to Verizon Wireless customers informing them they supposedly had won a cruise to the Bahamas and asking them to call to claim their prize—http://news.vzw.com/news/2005/11/pr2005-11-23.html

In August 2004, Verizon Wireless obtained an injunction against Rhode Island resident Jacob Brown, a known spammer who had been sending numerous text message solicitations to Verizon Wireless customers—http://news.vzw.com/news/2004/08/pr2004-08-30.html

In June 2004, Verizon Wireless broke with the wireless industry by becoming the first to announce it would protect customer privacy by refusing to participate in a national wireless phone directory—http://news.vzw.com/news/2004/06/pr2004-06-21.html

SPRINT NEXTEL SUES TO SHUT DOWN ONLINE SERVICES THAT ILLEGALLY OBTAIN AND SELL CONFIDENTIAL TELEPHONE RECORDS

RESTON, VA.—(Business Wire)—Jan. 27, 2006—Sprint Nextel Corp. (NYSE:S) announced today that it has filed a lawsuit against the parent company of four online data brokers that use illegal and deceptive practices to obtain and sell wireless customer call detail records. Sprint Nextel states within the Complaint that 1st Source Information Specialists Inc., parent company of www.locatecell.com, www.celltolls.com, www.datafind.org and www.peoplesearchamerica.com, employs fraudulent tactics, such as posing as customers seeking information about their own accounts, to access cell phone logs and phone numbers.

In the suit filed today in Florida, Sprint Nextel states that the schemes conducted by these fraudulent online services invade the privacy of Sprint Nextel's customers. Sprint Nextel has requested both temporary and permanent injunctions against 1st Source Information Specialists Inc.

''Protection of confidential customer information is our number one priority and we are taking aggressive action to ensure that any threat to privacy is eliminated immediately,'' said Kent Nakamura, vice president for telecom management and chief privacy officer for Sprint Nextel. ''1st Source Information Specialists continues to display egregious disregard for privacy, and previous industry-driven actions do not appear to have deterred their illegal activities. We can assure our customers that we will make every effort to put these services out of business.''

To further demonstrate its commitment to protecting consumer privacy, Sprint Nextel is supporting federal legislation that seeks to increase criminal and/or civil penalties against third party companies that fraudulently seek to obtain, sell or distribute customer records. In particular, Sprint Nextel hails legislation crafted by senators Charles Schumer of New York, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and Bill Nelson of Florida for its provisions that make it illegal to obtain telephone customer records, and that stiffen prison sentences and fines for those companies fraudulently selling information. Sprint Nextel looks forward to working with these senators and other members of Congress to pass the legislation that best protects consumers and ends this fraudulent practice.

In addition to launching a legal assault on these illegal activities, Sprint Nextel's corporate security and customer care teams employ safeguards to protect confidential customer information from unauthorized access. Sprint Nextel customer service agents have been made aware of the fraudulent tactics used by online data brokers, and they are trained to follow detailed authentication procedures when responding to customer inquiries. Sprint Nextel's security practices were validated in 2005 when the company was awarded the ''Best Practice in Security for Governance'' by the Aberdeen Group.

Sprint Nextel strongly encourages its customers to take precautions to protect themselves. In particular, Sprint Nextel recommends that customers regularly change passwords used to access account information on the Sprint.com web site or when calling customer care, and select unique passwords to access voicemail messages on Sprint phones. For additional customer privacy tips, please go to www.sprint.com/privacy.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Monterey Park, CA, March 29, 2006.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

UNITED STATES SENATE BILL 2178—SUPPORT CONSUMER TELEPHONE RECORDS PROTECTION ACT OF 2006 AS INTRODUCED ON JANUARY 18, 2006

DEAR SENATOR SCHUMER: The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department is proud to support your United States Senate Bill 2178 (S. 2178). This Bill would prohibit the obtaining, by fraud or other unauthorized means, of confidential phone record information.

Recently, there has been a lot of media focus regarding the sale of another's cell phone records over the internet. Many companies, charging as little as $20, offer to research and provide a month's worth of cell phone call information, no questions asked.

With the above in mind, S. 2178 seeks to correct this serious situation by prohibiting another from obtaining this information under false pretense or selling such information by any person, including an employee of the provider.

As Sheriff of Los Angeles County, I support S. 2178. Should you need further assistance regarding this issue please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (323) 526–5000, or my Legislative Advocate, Sergeant Wayne Bilowit, at (323) 240–5696.

Sincerely,

LEROY D. BACA,
Sheriff

T-MOBILE SUES CELL RECORD BROKERS FOR CRIMINAL PROFITEERING

BELLEVUE, WA., January 23, 2006—In an effort to restrain the unlawful activities of entities that attempt to fraudulently obtain confidential customer information, T-Mobile USA, Inc. is bringing legal action against online data brokers the company believes are involved in illegitimately obtaining and selling call records. Acting under Washington State criminal profiteering laws, T-Mobile today filed suit in King County, Wash., Superior Court seeking an injunction to stop Locatecell.com, as well as related companies and individuals, from engaging in such illegal behavior. T-Mobile also is prepared to take similar legal action against other believed violators.

''To further safeguard the privacy of our customers, T-Mobile is taking action to prosecute these online data brokers to the fullest extent permitted by the law,'' said Dave Miller, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, T-Mobile USA. ''For the protection of all wireless customers, their illegal actions must be stopped.''

T-Mobile also endorses the need for federal legislation making it a crime for anyone to obtain, sell or distribute, through fraudulent means, the private calling records of mobile phone customers.

''T-Mobile supports adoption of federal legislation making it clear that fraudulent activities by third parties to obtain, sell, or distribute call records is a crime,'' said Tom Sugrue, T-Mobile's Vice President of Government Affairs. ''Legislation should address the deplorable and deceptive actions of these third-party brokers who illegitimately obtain and sell call records without the knowledge or consent of wireless customers. We

applaud the FCC's recent citations against brokers that have defied its subpoenas.''

Legislation introduced by Sens. Schumer, Specter and Nelson and co-sponsored by Sens. Burns and Reid, takes particular aim at these perpetrators, defined as anyone who sells or obtains confidential customer information through deception or unauthorized access to a telephone company's data. T-Mobile commends this bipartisan group of Senators for targeting privacy predators such as online brokers in an effort to bolster protections for consumers. T-Mobile looks forward to working with members of Congress to resolve this important privacy concern.

As a result of data uncovered during a continuing, thorough internal investigation, T-Mobile had issued numerous cease and desist letters against companies that were believed to have illegally obtained and sold phone-calling records of some of its customers.

T-Mobile reiterates that it is important for customers to continue to take steps to protect their accounts by utilizing passwords. T-Mobile urges all users of mobile phone services to take the following password protection steps:

Create separate passwords for voicemail, online access, and for use when calling customer care about your billing account.

Set complex passwords using both numbers and letters where appropriate.

Avoid common passwords such as birth dates, family or pet names and street addresses.

Change your passwords at least every 60 days.

Memorize your passwords.

Don't share passwords with anyone.

''T-Mobile takes customer privacy seriously. Customer protection is a primary concern. We have invested millions of dollars to help protect customer information, and we continue to further reinforce our systems. Our customer phone records are not for sale,'' said Sugrue. ''We encourage Congress and the FCC to act swiftly to bring the illegal activity of online data brokers to an end.''

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, since I introduced this legislation, I rise in strong support of the ''Telephone Records and Privacy Protection Act of 2006 (the TRAPP Act).''

And I want to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his leadership and continuing support of this bicameral and bipartisan bill.

Madam Speaker, few things are more personal and potentially more revealing than our phone records.

Who we call can reveal much about our business and personal lives, including intimate details about one's medical or financial condition.

Calling records can even be used to identify a caller's location.

In some cases, the unauthorized release of personal information like a phone record can lead to a tragic result.

Unfortunately, existing Federal statutes that could be used to target data thieves are inadequate.

These statutes have clearly not deterred data burglars from treating confidential phone records information as a commodity, to be bought and sold on the Internet, without the consent of consumers, for about $100.

The underlying bill targets companies and individuals who traffic in fraudulently obtained confidential phone records and provides new protections for the privacy of calling logs.

It establishes a new section 1039 in Title 18 of the United States Code that will provide explicit penalties for those who use fraud to obtain confidential phone records.

The bill imposes a prison sentence of up to 10 years and a fine of up to $500,000 on any person who in interstate commerce sells, transfers, purchases or receives confidential phone records of a telephone company without the prior consent of the customer.

The bill includes enhanced penalties for cases where the information is used in furtherance of crimes of domestic violence or threat to law enforcement officers or their families.

We need to pass this bill to demonstrate that we take seriously the obligation to protect the confidentiality of consumer telephone records and to make clear to data thieves that their conduct will result in a felony conviction.

This legislation supports crime victims, prosecutors, and companies and individuals who have been the targets of this fraud.

A companion measure is expected to be introduced soon in the Senate.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4709, the Law Enforcement and Phone Privacy Protection Act. I was pleased to join with Representatives SMITH, CONYERS and SCOTT to introduce this important legislation to protect phone records from thieves and opportunists.

The sale of confidential phone records is a serious problem. for approximately $100, anyone can buy an individual's private cell phone call history. These histories catalogue every outgoing and incoming call a customer makes or receives. This information should not be available for unauthorized sale on the Internet.

The primary method thieves use to obtain this information is known as ''pretexting''. This involves an individual with some key information—a cell phone number or possibly a Social Security Number—pretending to be the subscriber to get information about an account. The Law Enforcement and Phone Privacy Protection Act puts a stop to this by imposing criminal penalties for ''pretexting,'' As well as other methods of seeking to obtain such records through the use of fraud.

Furthermore, this legislation will provide additional punishment for those who illegally sell or obtain phone records knowing they will be used in a criminal act. This is extremely important for the protection of law enforcement officers and potential victims of domestic violence, whose call histories may be particularly desireable to those who wish to do them harm.

We all use telephones and cell phones with the assumption that information about who we receive calls from and make calls to will not fall into the wrong hands. I urge the members of the house to support this legislation to ensure that phone records are protected.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Law Enforcement and Phone Privacy Protection Act of 2006.

As America continues to prosper, cell phones are becoming increasingly central to our everyday lives. We use this technology to keep in closer contact with our families, manage our livelihoods, and stay in touch with friends. We trust that the records of private conversations remain safe. Law enforcement must have the tools necessary to ensure the privacy of our cell phone records and prosecute those who invade our lives.

Today, criminals can use our cell phone records to expose a government informant, steal our personal information, or commit other forms of fraud.

This bill takes strong action to protect the privacy of American's cell phone records. By providing tough new protections, we can better ensure the privacy of confidential cell phone records. Law enforcement and prosecutors can impose serious criminal penalties on those who unlawfully invade and use our cell phone records.

Congress has a duty to protect all Americans and their confidential cell phone records.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this bill. I believe it provides critical privacy protections to the more than 180 million Americans who use cell phones. It will also protect the privacy of more than 100 million American homes with wired telephones. And it will protect Voice over IP users, now more than 2 million Americans and rapidly rising.

I think we've heard too many stories of how easy it is to fraudulently obtain cell phone call records and even cell phone locations. We've heard of how one political blog bought Wesley Clark's cell phone records, but the fact is lots of ordinary Americans have reason to be concerned about the privacy of their phone records. Imagine what a criminal organization could do with the cell phone call records of an undercover law enforcement agent, or what an abuser could do with a spouse's cell phone location. No one should be able to get another person's phone records through fraud, and this bill makes it a crime to purchase or use phone records obtained through fraud.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee and Ranking Member CONYERS of the Judiciary Committee for their leadership in drafting this legislation, which I believe represents a sensible, bipartisan solution to a growing problem. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask the support of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4709, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. 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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 357) supporting the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 357

Whereas cystic fibrosis is one of the most common life-threatening genetic diseases in the United States and one for which there is no known cure;

Whereas the average life expectancy of an individual with cystic fibrosis is 35 years, an improvement from a life expectancy of 10 years in the 1960s, but still unacceptably short;

Whereas approximately 30,000 people in the United States have cystic fibrosis, more than half of them children;

Whereas one of every 3,500 babies born in the United States is born with cystic fibrosis;

Whereas more than 10,000,000 Americans are unknowing, symptom-free carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that all States consider newborn screening for cystic fibrosis;

Whereas the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation urges all States to implement newborn screening for cystic fibrosis to facilitate early diagnosis and treatment which improves health and longevity;

Whereas prompt, aggressive treatment of the symptoms of cystic fibrosis can extend the lives of people who have the disease;

Whereas recent advances in cystic fibrosis research have produced promising leads in gene, protein, and drug therapies beneficial to people who have the disease;

Whereas innovative research is progressing faster and is being conducted more aggressively than ever before, due, in part, to the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation's establishment of a model clinical trials network;

Whereas although the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation continues to fund a research pipeline for more than two dozen potential therapies and funds a nationwide network of care centers that extend the length and quality of life for people with cystic fibrosis, lives continue to be lost to this disease every day;

Whereas education of the public about cystic fibrosis, including the symptoms of the disease, increases knowledge and understanding of cystic fibrosis and promotes early diagnosis; and

Whereas the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation will conduct activities to honor National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month in May, 2006: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) honors the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month;

(2) promotes further public awareness and understanding of cystic fibrosis;

(3) advocates for increased support for people who have cystic fibrosis and their families;

(4) encourages early diagnosis and access to quality care for people with cystic fibrosis to improve the quality of their lives; and

(5) supports research to find a cure for cystic fibrosis by fostering an enhanced research program through a strong Federal commitment and expanded public-private partnerships.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 357, which supports the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month, beginning in May. Every year in the United States, about 1,000 children are born with cystic fibrosis, or CF, a life-shortening genetic disease.

According to the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, those children face a median life expectancy of 36 years, an average that, fortunately, has continued to increase as science and research have developed better treatment and drugs. And while a median life expectancy of 36 is unacceptably low, that figure is cause for hope for those living with the disease and, of course, their families. They know that in 1955, the year parents of children suffering from this disease formed the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, children born with CF usually did not live to attend preschool. As the life expectancy increases, those suffering with this disease and their families continue to work for a cure or a life-extending treatment.

Madam Speaker, while a cure for cystic fibrosis remains illusive, the symptoms and effects of the disease are fairly simple. CF is one of the most common life-threatening genetic diseases in the United States. More than 30,000 people in the United States have CF, and over half of them are children.

In addition, over 10 million Americans are unknowing, symptom-free carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene. Cystic fibrosis affects the lungs and digestive system.

□ 1500

The defective gene that causes CF triggers the production of abnormally thick mucus in the lungs that leads to restricted breathing, recurring lung infections, and in many cases digestive problems. The infections deteriorate the lungs and their capacity to deliver oxygen to the body, a condition that worsens over time and in many cases even leads to death or the need for a lung transplant. One of the goals of H. Con. Res. 357 is to promote the need for early diagnosis and the importance of newborn screening so that treatment of children with CF can begin as soon as possible to improve their health and longevity.

The five decades that have passed since the founding of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation have brought not only hope but years to the lives of those suffering from CF. The Cystic Fibrosis Foundation continues to be at the forefront of making more with less in the area of drug discovery and development. The Therapeutics Development Program, TDP, created and launched by the CF Foundation, has pioneered new ways to conduct cutting-edge, lifesaving research in a cost-effective and efficient manner. This program now includes 18 major research institutions across the country in an established clinical trials network. The TDP provides innovative companies with funding, raised through private donations to the CF Foundation, to undertake research and development on promising new drug candidates, and supports an extensive pipeline of potential new therapies. In fact, the CF Foundation currently has more than 30 drugs and therapies in various stages of clinical trials, any one of which could dramatically improve the life of someone suffering from CF. I believe that the innovative programs like the Therapeutics Development Program are part of the blueprint for more efficient and cost-effective health care and should be supported. So, as you can see, Madam Speaker, CF Foundation-sponsored research is adding precious years to the lives of those living with the disease so that they might live long enough to benefit once a cure is found.

Today there is more potential research on new drugs and therapies than funds to finance that lifesaving work. This is a problem created by a wealth of scientific riches, and one that I hope can be bridged by more public-private partnerships which leverage our world-class biotech and pharmaceutical companies with the capabilities of institutions like the National Institutes of Health to ensure that the discovery phase of identifying new drugs and compounds to treat cystic fibrosis continues. To that end the resolution before us today advocates strong partnerships between government resources like the NIH and nonprofits like the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation as a key means to improve care for those with ''orphan'' diseases like CF.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend my friend and colleague Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts for his leadership and work supporting this resolution and for our partnership cochairing a new Congressional Cystic Fibrosis Caucus. The Congressional Cystic Fibrosis Caucus, like this resolution, is intended to provide Members and the American public a better understanding of cystic fibrosis and the need to support the incredible work that is being done by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation as well as through public-private collaboration to find a cure.

I would also like to thank all those Members on both sides of the aisle who have cosponsored H. Con. Res. 357 and

those who have joined the Congressional Cystic Fibrosis Caucus. And anyone who is watching is welcome to call my office or Mr. MARKEY's office. We would like to have your support, and we look forward to it.

So, my colleagues, please join me in honoring and supporting the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month by simply agreeing to H. Con. Res. 357.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Members should direct their comments to the Chair and not to the television audience.

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

I thank my friend from Florida Mr. STEARNS. He and I have partnered on the resolution and on cofounding the Congressional Cystic Fibrosis Caucus. And I want to thank him for his commitment to CF, its cause, and the difference that this institution can make in helping to find the cure. It is, without question, something that we can agree upon on a bipartisan basis.

The resolution before us today is to support the goals and the ideals of the National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month, and it is really so that we can bring the most powerful four-letter word to this cause, and that word is ''hope''; hope that the United States Government will increase its funding, will help to find the cure for this dreaded disease, that we can give hope to the families who are affected by it. And today is a really important day on that path because for the first time we do have a caucus, and this resolution in a lot of ways will memorialize that and give more momentum to finding the cure.

CF is one of the most common life-threatening genetic diseases in the United States. People with CF produce abnormally thick, sticky mucus, which makes breathing very difficult. They find, as a result, they cough and they wheeze constantly and are at constant risk for life-threatening lung infections.

Approximately 30,000 children and adults in the United States have cystic fibrosis, but it affects far more than those 30,000 people. It affects all of the families and the loved ones of those people who are struggling with this horrible disease. It affects the moms who have to wake up at 5 a.m. so that they can pound on their child's chest before they go to work. It affects their siblings who have to wait with their sister while she goes to yet another doctor's appointment. And it affects the dads who worry that their child will never grow up to have a normal life. This resolution is about supporting these families and providing them with the hope for a better future.

Significant improvements have been made in the treatment of cystic fibrosis. A few decades ago many children with CF did not live past 10 years of age. Today life expectancy is 35 years of age, and much of these achievements are due to the hard work and the dedication of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. That is why CFF really stands for courageous fighting families, courageous fighting friends of those families.

Yet even with this incredible work of our courageous fighting families, we still have a long way to go to provide the people with CF with a normal and healthy life. It is time for Congress to become more involved in the pursuit of a cure. We need to make a greater investment in research and make a stronger commitment to the people with CF, their families, and their caretakers.

This is something which in the 21st century we should leave as a forgotten memory, but we can only do it if we provide hope now. It is the most powerful word in the English language: Hope that we can raise awareness of the families struggling with CF, hope that we can find better treatments and ultimately a cure, hope that our children will have to turn to the history books to find that there ever was such a thing as cystic fibrosis.

I thank, again, the cochair of the caucus Mr. STEARNS. This is now going to bring a larger, more powerful spotlight on this disease. And hopefully, working together in a bipartisan fashion, we can address this as a human issue and not as a Democrat or Republican issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 357, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS). This resolution would support the goals and ideals of National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month.

Cystic Fibrosis is one of the most common life-threatening genetic diseases in the United States. Approximately 30,000 people in the United States have cystic fibrosis, and about 1,000 new cases of cystic fibrosis are diagnosed each year. Tragically, more than half of those with CF are children. As I stand here today, more than 10 million Americans are unknowing, symptom-free carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene.

Significant improvements have been made in the treatment of cystic fibrosis. Just a few decades ago, children with CF did not live past 10 years of age. Today the life expectancy has improved, and the number of adults with CF has steadily grown. Even so, there is no cure for this disease, and much still must be done to provide people with CF with a normal and healthy life expectancy.

Early diagnosis is the key, and that is why it's so important that we work to further public awareness and understanding of cystic fibrosis. We must increase support for those affected by this disease and ensure that they have access to quality care, and we also must support research to find a cure for CF.

I am proud to provide my support to this cause, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 357 so that the month of May can be dedicated to educating all Americans about cystic fibrosis, about the courage of those who suffer from this disease, and about the important research underway to find a cure.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 357.

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. STEARNS. 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.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 349) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 349

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SOAP BOX DERBY RACES ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the ''Association'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races, on the Capitol Grounds on June 17, 2006, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that the Association shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Association is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays,

and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event to be carried out under this resolution.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 349.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 349 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 65th Annual Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to be held June 17, 2006. The resolution also authorizes the Architect of the Capitol; the U.S. Capitol Police; and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association, the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out this traditional event in compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby is one of the largest qualifying races in the country. This race takes place on Constitution Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Third Street, NW. Participants are residents of the Washington metropolitan area and range in age from 8 to 17. The winners of these races will represent the Washington metropolitan area at the national finals, held annually in Akron, Ohio.

I support this concurrent resolution, which continues our custom of authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for this exciting event, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), a good friend of mine and the prime sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 349, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

□ 1515

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me time. I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, for the 16th straight year, I am proud to sponsor the resolution allowing the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to hold its annual race on the grounds of the United States Capitol.

H. Con. Res. 349 authorizes the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board to work with the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to ensure that all the necessary arrangements are made to conduct this race in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds. The 65th annual Greater Washington Soap Box Derby will be held on Saturday, June 17.

Soap box derby racing, Madam Speaker, in our Nation's Capital has a long and rich tradition. In 1938, Norman Rocca beat out 233 other racers to win the inaugural Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, which was held on New Hampshire.

Over the years, thousands of the region's young people have participated in this great race, although the location has varied from the original site on New Hampshire Avenue to Capitol Hill, with stops on Massachusetts Avenue, Pennsylvania Avenue, and Eastern Avenue along the way.

The essence of the race has remained the same. homemade gravity-powered cars, the spirit of competition, and the pure joy of racing. The Soap Box Derby consists of dozens of drivers, both boys and girls, ranging in ages from 8 to 17. These racers are divided into three division: stock, superstock and masters. The local winners of each division will automatically qualify to compete with racers from around the world in the 69th All-American Soap Box Derby in Akron, Ohio, on July 22 of this year.

The festivities in Akron begin when the racers receive a police escort into town and conclude in the winner's circle with the awarding of scholarships and merchandise. In between, the racers and their families participate in a whirlwind of activities that leave them with enduring friendships and memories to last a lifetime.

The past 6 years, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby has had one of its participants finish in the top 10 in the All-American competition. In fact, last year's master's division champion, Robbie Reuss of Waldorf, finished an impressive second in Akron. Robbie's finish surpassed Gene Bean's third in the 1941 All-American and is the best finish for a representative of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. I am very proud of Robbie, and I am hopeful that this might finally be the year when one of our racers from the Greater Washington area is finally crowned world champion.

Madam Speaker, this event has been called the greatest amateur racing event in the world, and it is an excellent opportunity for the contestants from the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia to learn basic building skills while gaining a real sense of accomplishment.

Madam Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues, as I expect them to, to join me with the other original cosponsors of this resolution, Representative FRANK WOLF, Representative JAMES MORAN, Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Representative AL WYNN, and Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, in supporting this resolution and congratulating all the participants.

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

Madam Speaker, there are many things in America that are purely American. It is my understanding that the Soap Box Derby races that we have is purely an American phenomenon that started here. Other countries may have adopted it, but it is wonderful to be a part of this legislation that makes it possible for young men and young women to broaden their minds and their scientific knowledge as they develop the skills of building the eventual vehicle that they will ride, hopefully to victory.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to support, along with Mr. HOYER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. NORTON House Concurrent Resolution 349, and acknowledge the efforts of Mr. HOYER, who has been such a great and consistent champion for his constituents for this event.

House Concurrent Resolution 349 authorizes use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. On June 17, 2006 youngsters from the greater Washington area will race down Constitution Ave. to test the principles of aerodynamics in hand designed and constructed soap box vehicles. All the contestants, ages 9 through 16, construct and operate their own soap box vehicles.

Madam Speaker, the All American Soap Box Derby originated in 1933 and quickly became a national phenomenon. There are now more than 150 races currently taking place nationwide to determine 440 qualifiers for the national race finals held in Akron, Ohio.

Madam Speaker, many hundreds of volunteers donate considerable time supporting the event and providing families with a fun filled day, which is quickly becoming a tradition in the Washington, DC area. The event has grown in popularity and Washington is now known as one of the outstanding race cities.

Consistent with all events using the Capitol Grounds, this event is open to the public and free of charge. The organizers will work with the Capitol Hill Police and the Office of the Architect.

I support House Concurrent Resolution 349 and urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I join Mr. HOYER and Ms. NORTON, together with Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WYNN, in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 349, to authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. I especially want to acknowledge the dedication of Mr. HOYER, the resolution's annual sponsor, who faithfully introduces this resolution to authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for such a worthwhile event.

This annual event encourages all boys and girls, ages nine through 16, to construct and operate their own soap box vehicles. The

Washington event, which attracts a great number of spectators and extensive media coverage, has grown in size and has become one of the best-attended events in the country. The winner in each of three divisions wins a trip to the national race in Akron, as well as trophies and prizes.

The principles of aerodynamics are combined with fun and excitement for all participants and their families in the Greater Washington area. It is an excellent opportunity for parents to have direct involvement in their children's activities. The derby's mission is to provide children with an activity that promotes technical and social skills that will serve them throughout their lives.

The derby organizers will work with the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police to ensure the appropriate rules and regulations are in place for the event.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 349.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 349.

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. SHUSTER. 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.

AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4916) to authorize United States participation in, and appropriations for, the United States contribution to the first replenishment of the resources of the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4916

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

SECTION 1. FIRST REPLENISHMENT OF THE RESOURCES OF THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND.

The Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 39. FIRST REPLENISHMENT OF THE RESOURCES OF THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND.

''(a) CONTRIBUTION AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may contribute on behalf of the United States $150,000,000 to the first replenishment of the resources of the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund.

''(2) SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority provided by paragraph (1) may be exercised only to the extent and in the amounts provided for in advance in appropriations Acts.

''(b) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the United States contribution authorized by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated not more than $150,000,000, without fiscal year limitation, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Multilateral Investment Fund, or MIF, was created as a mechanism to stimulate innovation and economic growth for Latin America and Caribbean countries and is operated by the Inter-American Development Bank, IADB, an organization that oversees many programs and loans that benefit the economically challenged in those areas.

Projects funded through the MIF are focused on new development approaches that work to promote inclusive economic growth. The IADB has made the central goal of the MIF to use both grants and investments to demonstrate new ways in developing micro- and small enterprises, to build workers' skills, strengthen environmental management, and improve the functions of financial markets.

This legislation fulfills the President's FY 2007 budget request for $25 million, or a total of $150 million over 6 years, to be given in replenishing the MIF and meet the U.S. commitment.

At the close of FY 2005, the total amount of projects approved by the MIF exceeded $1 billion, encompassing 799 projects with an additional $1 billion in co-financing that was put to use in meeting MIF goals.

Our authorizing this new replenishment allows for a continuation of all the good work the IADB has been doing in the area of microfinance.

Microfinance projects are especially important to developing areas in helping break the cycle of poverty by providing a loan to start a small or microenterprise, a business usually defined as having less than 10 employees in an economic hardship area.

Through small business growth, areas are then able to demonstrate that they have potential to attract wider sources of capital and enable further expansion of services for microenterprises. Building the small firm sector offers the greatest potential to generating job growth, which will lead to lasting freedom from poverty.

The MIF has pioneered the creation of venture capital for small business in Latin America and the Caribbean and continues to look for opportunities that would improve venture capital for small businesses by supporting reforms and regulatory and legislative frameworks, and by helping to remove barriers to small business financing.

This legislation honors our commitment to these countries, will attract further capital investment and help create stable, reliable trading partners in these developing nations.

Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to have the ranking members of the full committee and my subcommittee, Mr. FRANK and Mrs. MALONEY, as well as my subcommittee vice chair, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Chairman SPENCER BACHUS, joining me in supporting this replenishment; and I ask for my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong bipartisan support of H.R. 4916, a bill that will authorize continued United States participation in and appropriations for the U.S. contribution to the first replenishment of the resources of the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund.

This bill was introduced with strong bipartisan support by Representative PRYCE, who chairs the subcommittee on which I serve as the ranking member, Congressman FRANK, Congresswoman BIGGERT and myself, and was reported unanimously out of the committee by voice vote.

The MIF is operated by the Inter-American Development Bank and is governed by a donors committee composed of representatives of 37 member countries. The United States is the MIF's largest contributor with 42 percent, and as such exercises considerable influence over its strategic direction and the individual projects it approves.

The MIF does exactly the kinds of things that those who follow the work of the international financial institutions on both sides of the aisle wish these institutions would do. Its principal work is to administer a private sector grant program to assist in developing microenterprises which particularly help small women-owned businesses, it builds workers' skills, it strengthens environmental management, and it improves the efficiency of financial markets in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Roughly 80 percent of MIF projects are undertaken in direct partnership with private sector business associations, trade groups and non-governmental organizations. Typically, MIF resources are matched dollar for dollar with contributions from these groups.

MIF resources also leverage additional funds from other sources, providing a multiplier effect for projects

that have consistently been recognized as among the most innovative and effective of multilateral development institutions.

The total authorization for U.S. participation contained in this legislation is $150 million over 6 years. The remaining member countries have pledged over $350 million. The first installment of the U.S. contribution, $25 million, was included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007.

The Financial Services Committee has conducted close oversight over MIF programs since the fund was first established in 1993. In 13 years of operation, MIF has worked with over 400 private sector organizations throughout Latin America and the Caribbean, approving over $1 billion for roughly 800 different projects. The MIF is the single largest source of technical assistance for this part of the world.

One area in which the MIF's work has attracted particular attention in recent years involves the impact of remittances, transfer of money by foreigners to their home countries in that region. Thanks to the fund's efforts, the fees accompanying sending of these moneys back home have been significantly lowered, from 15 percent to 5 percent. Thanks to MIF technical assistance, the recipients of these funds have channeled them into their countries' formal financial systems, helping them to create badly needed jobs.

Madam Speaker, I would like to note that the House report that accompanies this bill mentions that the U.S. has an overdue balance resulting from the U.S. pledge to the original MIF agreement. While no funds are included in this bill for that purpose, the committee urges the administration to seek funding to pay this amount in back dues.

MIF is an example of a program that actually works. It offers proof that multilateral institutions can provide win-win solutions. MIF shows that U.S. taxpayers can benefit while hard-working citizens of Latin America and the Caribbean who wish to start a business and compete in the global economy can pull themselves out of poverty.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend and chairman of the subcommittee, SPENCER BACHUS.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PRYCE, and will start by commending Chairman PRYCE and Congresswoman MALONEY and Congresswoman BIGGERT and also Ranking Member FRANK for this legislation.

A lot of citizens might be hearing this debate and they may be thinking, what has this got to do with the United States? What do problems in Latin America have to do with the United States? What is in it for me, my constituents might ask me? Why would you support spending $25 million a year on this program? What do Americans get out of this program?

I submit to you that this program is probably one of the best uses of our taxpayers' money for one simple reason: when I go home today, people say to me, illegal immigration; do something about illegal immigration.

□ 1530

Well, let me say this to fellow Members: if you want to do something about illegal immigration, this vote today, a ''yes'' vote on this bill, will do more from a practical standpoint to stem the flow of illegal immigration than anything else.

James Schlessinger, one of my favorite quotes is a quote of his when he says: ''When a problem has no solution, it is not a problem. It is a fact.''

Well, I can tell you that illegal immigration is a fact. But it is also a problem that has solutions. And the first solution, the first step to solving it we can take today by voting for this bill.

Now, why is that? Well, let me tell you about illegal immigration. Let me tell you about Mexico, one of the countries that benefits from this program. It creates small enterprises, small jobs in Mexico. In Mexico every year, 600,000 Mexicans enter the job force; but there is only room for 150,000 of them. So almost a half million of them cannot even get a job at any wage.

The ones that do get a job is at one-fifth of what Americans pay, American jobs. Guatemala, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, we are beginning to have more and more illegal immigrants from those countries. The reason? In the countries that I have just mentioned, about one out of every five young men or women that enters the job market can get a job.

So I can tell you it is a fact of life when they cannot get a job at any salary, they are going to try to come over here. Yes, we can build walls. Yes, we can employ more people on the border. But a cheaper, more practical, more long-term solution is this legislation today which will create the very jobs these countries need. And that is not the large government enterprises. It is the private enterprise businesses.

I close by saying this: another great thing about this program is we have partners. It is not a government program. The NGOs, the private sector business organizations, trade groups, they are all involved in this.

Let us vote ''yes'' on this. Let us start creating jobs in those countries and stemming the flow of illegal immigration.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree completely with the gentleman. This not only will help the economic development, but certainly will give immigrants a reason to stay in their own countries and develop their own economy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) who has done so much work in this area.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4916, the bill that really authorizes the United States' contribution to the first replenishment of the resources of the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund, which is often referred to as MIF.

I want to thank Chairman PRYCE for her leadership on the authorization bill and on all of the domestic and international economic development initiatives that she has undertaken since becoming chairman of the House Financial Services Domestic and International Monetary Policy Trade and Technology Subcommittee. It is an honor to serve as her vice-chairman.

I also thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for all the work that she has done as the ranking member of the committee. And I would like to thank Mr. BACHUS for really being able to put this all in context of what this really means for all of us in the United States and why this is so important.

It is important and in the U.S.'s best interest that we support international economic development initiatives as we fight the war on terror. It is especially important that we fund homegrown, microeconomic projects in developing countries.

These projects are often supported through MIF's technical and financial supports. The Inter-American Development Bank is doing important work to marry the public and private sectors, is working to engage the international community and pro-democracy, pro-free trade, and pro-free market.

Through a variety of initiatives, programs and projects, the bank is promoting sustainable economic growth in developing countries. Just as important as it is to the U.S., it is important to many developing countries to promote job growth, improve education, expand health care, enhance environmental standards, produce clean energy, develop sound infrastructure, and increase access to financial markets and institutions.

The MIF fund, which is operated by the International American Development Bank, is a critical component of all of these marks of economic stability for developing countries, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean, as they work towards stabilizing their governments and towards sustainable economic growth.

H.R. 4916 authorizes the U.S. contribution of $150 million to MIF and sends a strong message to our neighbors in the south, and to the international community and the leaders in the Inter-American Development Bank that we support their efforts.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the U.S. delegation that participated in the 47th annual Inter-American Development Bank meetings that were held earlier this month and for their hard work. In particular, I would like to commend the bank's leaders and staff for taking the helm of anti-corruption initiatives and for promoting ethical practices within the bank.

In addition, I would like to recognize the new Inter-American Development president, Luis Alberto Moreno, for his leadership in promoting public-private partnerships, especially those that involve small businesses.

I would also like to thank him for facilitating discussions about Latin American debt relief and development at this year's annual meeting. MIF is a proven winner in meeting important job creation and economic goals throughout the region.

By tapping the talents, strengths, and resources of private sector groups and organization, we can continue to help others help themselves. This is a great program that leverages small dollars into big results for many people throughout Latin America.

Madam Speaker, I am again pleased to lend my support to the chairman for her legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. It has been a pleasure working with the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4916, a bill to authorize U.S. participation in the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund (the Fund/MIF). The bill provides $150 million for the Fund. While this may appear to be a small amount compared to some of our other commitments to multilateral institutions, the reauthorization of the Fund represents an important step in our continuing efforts to underwrite economic development activities outside of our own borders.

In the broadest sense the Fund is designed to promote private sector development in Latin America and the Caribbean. There are two overarching themes related to the Fund. One is to reduce poverty and promote grass roots economic growth in this part of the world. By strengthening micro and small enterprise capacities, the Fund stimulates improvements in the business environment and engages the private sector in the development process. Two, by underwriting projects that promote innovation, the Fund pilots new concepts, determining their feasibility for the commercial market, as well as whether they can be adapted on a larger scale.

To date, more than 75 percent of Fund project activities have been undertaken in partnership with the private sector. More than $1 billion has been approved for 800 projects. Through these projects MIF has become one of the best known organizations with private sector partners in Latin America and the Caribbean. As the largest provider of technical assistance in the Region, it is no doubt why this reauthorization has bipartisan support. Indeed, the Fund provides a stellar example of how we can best use our resources to promote development, while reducing poverty and raising the standard of living of our neighbors. Madam Speaker, I urge support of the bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4916.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW OF HON. TRENT FRANKS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Julia Winding, Congressional Fellow of the Honorable TRENT FRANKS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 18, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

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,

JULIA WINDING,
Congressional Fellow.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENT OF HON. LOIS CAPPS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Ramesh P. Nagarajan, Legislative Correspondent of the Honorable LOIS CAPPS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 18, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

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,

RAMESH P. NAGARAJAN,
Legislative Correspondent,
Congresswoman Lois Capps.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW OF HON. BARBARA LEE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Michelle Christensen, Congressional Fellow of the Honorable BARBARA LEE, Member of Congress:

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

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

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,

MICHELLE CHRISTENSEN,
Congressional Fellow.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW OF HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Deborah Greene, Congressional Fellow of the Honorable DONALD M. PAYNE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

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,

DEBORAH GREENE,
Congressional Fellow.

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 3 o'clock and 40 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. PRICE of Georgia) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 25, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am resigning my seat on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct effective today.

The reasons that I am taking this action are fully set out in my letter to Democratic Leader Pelosi of April 21, 2006, which has been publicly released.

Most sincerely,

ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2006.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find thirty-five resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on April 5, 2006, in accordance with 40 U.S.C. §3307.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

SITE ACQUISITION AND DESIGN—U.S. BORDER STATION, NOGALES, AZ

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for site acquisition and design of a 217,924 gross square foot facility and 400 outside parking spaces, located in Nogales, Arizona, at a site acquisition cost of $2,450,000 and design and review cost of $7,386,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. BORDER STATION, SAN LUIS, AZ

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for construction of a 76,794 gross square foot facility and 80 outside parking spaces, located in San Luis, Arizona, at a design and review cost of $3,306,000, management and inspection cost of $3,854,000, and estimated construction cost of $34,869,000 for an estimated total project cost of $42,029,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. BORDER STATION CALEXICO, CA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for site acquisition and design of a 233,943 gross square foot facility and 197 new outside parking spaces, located in Calexico, California, at a site acquisition cost of $2,000,000 and a design and review cost of $12,350,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. SECRET SERVICE—REMOTE DELIVERY FACILITY II, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for construction of a mail processing and screening facility of 80,000 gross square feet and 104 outside parking spaces located in Washington, DC, at a design and review cost of $1,025,000, management and inspection cost of $2,358,000, and estimated construction cost of $36,229,000 for a combined estimated total project cost of $39,612,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. COAST GUARD CONSOLIDATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ST. ELIZABETH'S CAMPUS, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for construction of a 1,338,000 gross square foot facility and a structured parking garage containing 1,000 spaces, located in Washington, DC, at a management and inspection cost of $31,040,000, (design and review cost of $24,900,000 was previously authorized), and an estimated construction cost of $352,957,000 for an estimated total project cost of $408,897,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

DESIGN—U.S. BORDER STATION, COLUMBUS, NM

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, additional appropriations are authorized for construction of a 114,202 gross square foot facility and 33 new outside parking spaces located in Columbus, NM, at a design and review cost of $2,629,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

CONSTRUCTION—U.S. BORDER STATION, EL PASO, TX

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for construction of a 190,300 gross square foot facility including 100 new outside parking spaces, located in El Paso, Texas, at a management and inspection cost of $2,051,000 (design cost of $2,491,000 was previously authorized), and estimated construction cost of $18,166,000 for an estimated total project cost of $22,708,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

AMENDED PROSPECTUS—CONSTRUCTION—U.S. BORDER STATION, MCALLEN, TX

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, additional appropriations are authorized for construction of a 46,648 gross square foot facility and 96 outside parking spaces located in McAllen, Texas, at an additional design and review cost of $429,000 (design and review cost of $2,375,000 was previously authorized), additional management and inspection cost of $134,000 (management and inspection cost of $1,691,000 was previously authorized), and an additional estimated construction cost of $6,915,000 (construction cost of $13,872,000 was previously authorized) for a combined estimated total project cost of $25,416,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution. This resolution amends a Committee resolution dated July 23, 2003, which authorized $2,375,000 for design and review, $1,691,000 for management and inspection, and $13,872,000 for construction.

ALTERATION—EVERETT M. DIRKSEN U.S. COURTHOUSE, CHICAGO, IL

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Everett M. Dirksen United States Courthouse located at 219 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois, at an estimated construction cost of $89,629,000 and management and inspection cost of $6,942,000 (design cost of $8,152,000 was previously authorized), for a combined estimated total project cost of $104,723,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

AMENDED PROSPECTUS—ALTERATION—MARY E. SWITZER MEMORIAL FEDERAL BUILDING, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Mary E. Switzer Memorial Federal Building located at 330 C St., SW., in Washington, DC, at an estimated construction cost of $120,600,000, a design and review cost of $10,256,000, and management and inspection cost of $9,080,000, for a combined estimated total project cost of $139,936,000 (design and review, estimated construction and management and inspection cost totaling $116,325,000 were previously authorized), a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

AMENDED PROSPECTUS—ALTERATION—MAIN INTERIOR BUILDING, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Department of Interior's main headquarters building located at 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC, at a design and review cost of $11,213,000, a management and inspection cost of $20,900,000, and an estimated construction cost of $211,331,000 for an estimated total project cost of $243,444,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution. This resolution amends a Committee resolution dated June 23, 2003, which authorized an estimated total project cost of $220,265,000.

ALTERATION—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION CENTER FOR VETERINARY MEDICINE, LAUREL, MD

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Food and Drug Administration Center for Veterinary Medicine located on Muirkirk Road in Laurel, Maryland at an estimated design cost of $435,000, an estimated construction cost of $5,057,000, and management and inspection cost of $536,000, for a combined estimated total project cost of $6,028,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

ALTERATION—WHITE OAK BUILDING 130, SILVER SPRING, MD

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the White Oak Building located at 130 Dahlgren Road in Silver Spring, Maryland at an estimated design cost of $296,000, an estimated construction cost of $5,265,000, and management and inspection cost of $232,000, for a combined estimated total project cost of $5,793,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

AMENDED PROSPECTUS—ALTERATION—RICHARD BOLLING FEDERAL BUILDING, KANSAS CITY, MO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Richard Bolling Federal Building located at 601 East 12th Street, in Kansas City, Missouri at an estimated construction cost of $225,760,000, design and review cost of $15,917,000, and management and inspection cost of $22,233,000 for a combined estimated total project cost of $263,910,000 (estimated total project cost of $199,583,000 was previously authorized), a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

ALTERATION—VARIOUS BUILDINGS, ALBUQUERQUE, NM

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of three federal buildings, one located at 517 Gold Avenue, Albuquerque, New Mexico; the Chavez Federal Building and Courthouse; and the Albuquerque Courthouse, at an estimated design cost of $543,000, an estimated construction cost of $4,821,000, and management and inspection cost of $419,000, for a combined estimated total project cost of $5,783,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

ALTERATION—THURGOOD MARSHALL U.S. COURTHOUSE, NEW YORK, NY

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse in New York, New York at an estimated design cost of $16,393,000, an estimated construction cost of $201,640,000, and management and inspection cost of $9,849,000, for a combined estimated total project cost of $227,882,000 (design and review costs totaling $13,500,000 were previously authorized) a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

ALTERATION—FEDERAL BUILDING AND U.S. COURTHOUSE, MILWAUKEE, WI

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 517 E. Wisconsin Avenue, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin at an estimated design cost of $458,000, an estimated construction cost of $4,796,000, and management and inspection cost of $345,000, for a combined estimated total project cost of $5,599,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

ALTERATION IN LEASED SPACE—SECURITY WEST BUILDING, WOODLAWN, MD

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the alteration of the Security West Building, located at 1500 Woodlawn Drive, Woodlawn, Maryland, at a design and review cost of $1,310,000, an estimated construction cost of $16,382,000, and management and inspection cost of $2,123,000 for a combined estimated total project cost of $19,815,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

NEW CONSTRUCTION—MATERIAL PRICE INCREASES—VARIOUS PROJECTS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, additional appropriations are authorized for material price increases for the construction of projects located in Las Cruces, New Mexico; Del Rio, Texas; and two projects in El Paso, Texas, at an estimated additional construction cost of $19,155,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

DESIGN—VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized for the design of projects scheduled for the Eisenhower Executive Office Building (Phase III), located in Washington, DC at a design cost of $8,447,000; the Nebraska Avenue Complex, located in Washington, DC at a design cost of $1,200,000; the David Dyer Federal Building and Courthouse, located in Miami, Florida at a design cost $4,502,000; the George C. Young Federal Building-Courthouse, located in Orlando, Florida at a design cost of $2,563,000; the Dr. A.H. McCoy Federal Building-Post Office, located in Jackson, Mississippi at a design cost of $1,043,000; the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, located in Brooklyn, New York at a design cost of $4,723,000; the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, located in New Bern, North Carolina at a design cost of $1,279,000; and the Joseph P. Kinneary U.S. Courthouse, located in Columbus, Ohio at a design cost of $1,068,000 for a total design cost of $24,825,000, for which a prospectus is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

LEASE—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION, DENVER, CO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 D.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to 170,704 rentable square feet of space and 57 inside parking spaces for the Internal Revenue Service currently located in leased space at Dominion Plaza, 600 17th Street, Denver, Colorado and government-owned space at Building 53, Denver Federal Center, Lakewood Colorado, at a proposed total annual cost of $5,974,640 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. 3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to 144,000 rentable square feet and 10 parking spaces for the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, currently located in leased space at 1801 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, at a proposed total annual cost of $6,768,000 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE JUDICIARY CENTER, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. § 3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 376,219 rentable square feet of space for the Department of Justice currently located in leased space at 555 4th Street, NW, in Washington, DC, at a proposed total annual cost of $17,682,293 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CONSOLIDATION, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. § 3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 330,000 rentable square feet of space and 65 parking spaces for the Department of Agriculture currently located in multiple leased locations in the Washington, DC Metropolitan Area, at a proposed total annual cost of $15,510,000 for a lease term of 15 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. § 3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 325,000 rentable square feet and 17 parking spaces for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, currently located in leased space at 500 C Street, SW, Washington, DC, at a proposed total annual cost of $15,275,000 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE, METAIRIE, LA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for a superseding lease of up to approximately 197,084 rentable square feet and 650 parking spaces for the Department of Interior—Minerals Management Service, currently located at 1201 Elmwood Park, Metairie, Louisiana, at a proposed total annual cost of $4,730,016 for a lease term of 15 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, BALTIMORE, MD

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 538,000 rentable square feet and 1,076 parking spaces for the Social Security Administration, currently located in government-owned space at 300 N. Greene Street, Baltimore, MD, at a proposed total annual cost of $18,830,000 for a lease term of 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, BOSTON, MA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 268,452 rentable square feet and 228 secured inside and 20 outside parking spaces for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, currently located in multiple leased locations in Massachusetts, at a proposed total annual cost of $12,348,792 for a lease term of 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE WINCHESTER CENTER, KANSAS CITY, MO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 342,865 rentable square feet and 1,628 outside parking spaces for the Department of Agriculture, currently located in leased space in the Winchester Center at 6501 Beacon Drive, Kansas City, Missouri, at a proposed total annual cost of $6,727,011 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, PORTLAND, OR

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 134,159 rentable square feet of space and 200 inside secured spaces for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, currently located in multiple leased locations in the Portland area, at a proposed total annual cost of $4,695,565 for a lease term of 20 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—JEFFERSON PLAZA 1 AND 2, NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 347,947 rentable square feet and 2 inside parking spaces for the Department of Defense, currently located in leased space at Jefferson Plaza 1 and 2, Arlington, Virginia, at a proposed total annual cost of $10,438,410 for a lease term of 5 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 3100 CLARENDON BLVD., NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 221,084 rentable square feet and 16 inside parking spaces for the Department of Defense, currently located in leased space at 3100 Clarendon Boulevard, Arlington, VA, at a proposed total annual cost of $7,737,940 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ARLINGTON SQUARE, NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 143,572 rentable square feet for the Department of the Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service, currently located in leased space at Arlington Square, 4401 Fairfax Avenue, Arlington, VA, at a proposed total annual cost of $5,024,985 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to approximately 325,000 rentable square feet and 2 parking spaces for the Patent and Trademark Office in Northern Virginia, at a proposed total annual cost of $11,375,000 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

LEASE—SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to title 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized to lease up to 334,103 rentable square feet and 24 parking spaces for the Social Security Administration, currently located in leased space at 5107 and 5111 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia, at a proposed total annual cost of $11,693,605 for a lease term of 10 years, a prospectus for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to execution of the new lease.

Provided, That the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S.J. Resolution 28, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4709, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Con. Res. 357 and H. Con. Res. 349 will resume tomorrow.

Tonight both of these votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes.

APPROVING LOCATION OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 28.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 28, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—411

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

NOT VOTING—21

Bishop (UT)
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Fossella
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Jenkins
Lantos
Millender-McDonald
Moore (WI)
Oberstar
Osborne
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)

□ 1857

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Members are advised that persons may be present in the rooms adjoining the Chamber during this next vote under the authority of House Resolution 480 (relating to the Capitol Visitor Center film).

TELEPHONE RECORDS AND PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4709, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the 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 bill, H.R. 4709, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder

Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Bishop (UT)
Davis (FL)
Evans
Feeney
Ford
Fossella
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Jenkins
Lantos
Millender-McDonald
Moore (WI)
Oberstar
Osborne
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pryce (OH)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)

□ 1914

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from Washington on Tuesday, April 25, 2006. As a result, I was not recorded for rollcall vote Nos. 100 and 101. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall Nos. 100 and 101.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 100 and 101.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4297, the tax reconciliation conference report.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4297 be instructed—

(1) to agree to the following provisions of the Senate amendment: section 461 (relating to revaluation of LIFO inventories of large integrated oil companies), section 462 (relating to elimination of amortization of geological and geophysical expenditures for major integrated oil companies), and section 470 (relating to modifications of foreign tax credit rules applicable to large integrated oil companies which are dual capacity taxpayers), and

(2) to recede from the provisions of the House bill that extend the lower tax rate on dividends and capital gains that would otherwise terminate at the close of 2008.

ROADMAP TO BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give the Senate a roadmap to draft a border security bill that can pass the House of Representatives. The current Senate bill has three flaws that must be corrected.

First, the Senate bill waters down the employer sanctions by making then 10 times weaker than the House bill, from $5,000 fine down to $500.

Second, the Senate bill doesn't spend a single penny for a single border security fence in any urban area along the border.

Third, the Senate bill rewards illegal behavior with permanent citizenship. For example, if a person illegally snuck across the border, committed a felony by using a fake Social Security card, evaded law enforcement for 5 years, waved a Mexican flag and demanded amnesty, they would be rewarded with the chance for permanent citizenship.

The Senate should either fix the flaws in their bill or send over a giant pitcher of margaritas with it, because most sober Congressmen won't be able to vote for it.

JACKSON THEODORE POE

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a new son of Texas breathed the air of our free Nation with his birth on April 10, 2006. His birth made him an eighth-generation Texan, and he can trace his Scot, Irish and German roots to the proud days of the Republic of Texas.

Born in The Woodlands, Texas, at 6 pounds, 9 ounces, he bears a middle name that has been a family name for over 100 years and dates back to his ancestry in Germany. He is a gift from the Lord to his parents Kurt and Susie and to his four grandparents and his great-grandparents.

He is, by the chance of birth, an American. As a child he is the most important and the greatest of all American natural resources. Mr. Speaker, every time a child is born, the good Lord is making a bet on the future of our Nation.

As his grandfather, it is my hope that Jackson Theodore Poe lives the strong, rugged, determined life of a free man; that he will live with the words ''liberty'' on his lips, integrity in his heart and compassion in his soul; and that he never forgets duty, honor and loyalty. And that's just the way it is.

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.

NATIONAL TEACHERS HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize this year's inductees into the National Teachers Hall of Fame located in Emporia, Kansas. We have all had special teachers in our lives, and we are indebted to them for their desire and unending efforts to see that students achieve their fullest potential.

Now in its 15th year, the Hall of Fame continues its mission to honor exceptional teachers and to promote excellence in its teaching profession. Congratulations to the 2006 inductees, Peggy Carlisle, Floyd Holt, Harlan Kredit, Pat Graff and Linda Kaye White.

At Pecan Park Elementary in Jackson, Mississippi, Peggy Carlisle has used her talents to make science and math stimulating to her students. A 2005 Mississippi Hall of Masters teacher, she uses her skills to help students realize they are only limited by the size of their dreams. According to the parent of a former student, Mrs. Carlisle makes science interesting. Just

walking into her room lets you know that this is not a regular classroom, but a learning environment specifically arranged to get young minds thinking. By using many hands-on activities, she brings life to books and dusty old facts.

Floyd Holt, a physics teachers at Franklin D. Roosevelt High School in Hyde Park, New York, loves knowledge and conveys this to his students through his dedication to teaching. Floyd strives to make education interesting and create unique learning activities such as Spaceship Classroom of the Future. He has won the 1994 Presidential Award for Excellence in Science and Math in the USA and today also the 2000 USA Today Award.

According to a former student, what sets Harlan Kredit apart is that as well as he teaches biology, he teaches life even better. At Lynden Christian High in Lynden, Washington, Mr. Kredit believes kids need to connect to the world outside of their school for education to be meaningful and productive. He embodies this philosophy through his work as a ranger naturalist at Yellowstone National Park and through teaching environmental education to teachers at the American Wilderness Leadership School.

He is a recipient of the 1994 Washington State Conservation Teacher of the Year Award and the 2004 Presidential Award for Excellence in Teaching Science.

Pat Graff, a journalism, humanities and social studies teacher at La Cueva High in Albuquerque, New Mexico, is a bridge builder between different organizations, the media and business. She has had numerous students return to her school to give credit for her help and expertise and putting them on their current career path. Her additional accomplishments include being named the New Mexico English Teacher of the Year and also winning the 2004 Governors Award for Outstanding New Mexico Woman.

Lynn Kaye White of Haycock Elementary in Falls Church, Virginia, has shared her love of music and education around the world. She has traveled to Japan in 2003 with the Fulbright Memorial Fund and also to New Zealand to participate in the 2002 Fulbright Hays Seminar. She is able to seamlessly take the resources she has gathered from around the world and turn them into meaningful, substantive learning opportunities for her students.

Peggy, Floyd, Harlan, Pat and Linda exemplify what it means to be a teacher, what it means to make a difference. I commend the National Teachers Hall of Fame for their efforts to recognize great teachers. These five inductees collectivity have 134 years of teaching experience. I salute these men and women for their dedication to the students of this country. It is my hope that they will find satisfaction in knowing the positive difference they have made in the lives of their students. It is my honor to recognize these teachers here in the United States House of Representatives.

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

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

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL REPORT

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Permission to speak out of turn.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Centers for Disease Control released a report on the economic burden of injuries in the United States. The results were astonishing.

Every year injuries cost our economy $406 billion in health care, lost wages and lost productivity. The report goes as far as to list specifics on many different injuries; however, there is no listing on the costs of gun violence.

The public might ask how could the CDC avoid gun violence when listing the causes of serious injury in this country? The answer is simple: Congress won't let them.

That is right. Congress, in 1996, following the lead of their benefactors in the gun industry, refused to allow the CDC to report on the economic impact of gun violence. Independent studies show the cost to be nearly $100 million a year, but we can never be for sure because our government is prohibited from researching this public health issue.

In fact, the report on the CDC's Web page has a section dedicated to fireworks injuries, but no space dedicated specifically to firearms injuries or deaths. So the CDC can release information on a cause of injury that kills an average of four people per year, but not on the cause of thousands that are killed by gun violence every year.

However, the CDC cannot completely avoid the topic in its report. The report lists the top 10 causes of death among certain age groups, and, of course, homicide is prevalent, and of homicides of Americans more than 44 years of age, more than 10,000 were attributed to gun violence in 2003. In 1 year there were at least 10,000 people murdered with guns, and Congress won't allow the CDC to study how much these murders cost our economy.

Again, this defies common sense. The CDC isn't allowed to reveal how many Americans survive shootings, like my son did, each year, which adds an additional billions in cost to our economy as well. Gun violence is an epidemic in this country, and Congress is trying to stop us from learning the true impact of this public health crisis. This is a case of our government controlling the flow of information to protect the special interest group. What are they afraid of?

Is the congressional leadership afraid that if people know how much gun violence costs our economy, they would call for commonsense gun legislation? If people knew this information, would congressional leadership be forced to pass laws to keep military assault weapons out of the hands of criminals and terrorists? Would they be forced to stop passing legislation that protects the 1 percent of gun dealers who are responsible for selling 50 percent of the guns used in crimes?

Mr. Speaker, the American people have the right to know this information, and let the record show that the release of this information will have no affect on the right of law-abiding citizens to be able to own a gun. But the release of this information might help pass commonsense legislation that will make sure criminals and terrorists cannot legally buy guns, or allow for law enforcement agencies to share information of ballistic evidence.

Mr. Speaker, let's give the CDC the go-ahead to study this issue. The release of this information will make our Nation a safer, better place, and won't place a burden on the right of law-abiding American citizens to exercise their second amendment rights.

This past week it has been 5 years since Columbine. In the last 48 hours, we have seen many schools come under attack. They were prevented because our police got the information. We should allow also the CDC to be able to study why our young people are going to violence to commit and murder, 14, 17, 20 of their friends in school.

Mr. Speaker, gun violence is a health care crisis in this Nation, and until this Congress wakes up, until this country wakes up to be able to do something to reduce gun violence in this country, there are better ways that we could spend the money, certainly helping Medicare, certainly helping the poor get the health care that they need, looking at wellness centers instead of waiting too late until people are sick.

We can do something about this, but the American people need to know the facts and figures. It is only right that we do that.

□ 1930

TRIBUTE TO ONE OF IOWA'S OLDEST CITIZENS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Iowa's oldest citizens. At 110 years old, Letitia Lawson is the fourth-oldest Iowan and the oldest resident of Iowa's Fifth Congressional District. On April 10, 1896, Letitia was born on a small farm west of Milford, Iowa, to godly parents who,

she says, ''never knew anything but church on Sunday and school on weekdays.''

Having learned the importance of education early in her life, Letitia became a teacher in a one-room schoolhouse in Excelsior Township. Though she left this post to marry, farm, and raise three children, she never gave up her passion for teaching. Since retiring from the farm in 1970, Letitia has continued to pursue her love of teaching. As late as last year, Letitia spoke to students of the Okoboji Elementary School on two different occasions and offers weekly lessons to the students who deliver meals to her in her home.

A reliable champion of family, togetherness, and love, Letitia represents all that is good about the traditional American values that we in Iowa hold dear. On the occasion of Letitia Lawson's 110th birthday, I offer my congratulations and the best wishes from Congress.

AMERICA MUST RESIST TEMPTATION TO START A WAR WITH IRAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I know it is an election year, and I know President Bush's ratings are at an all-time low, and I know gas prices are very high and the people are restless. Nevertheless, I call upon my colleagues and the President to resist the temptation to start yet another war.

There is an old saying: ''Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.'' Well, friends, if we fall for the case being made to go to war against Iran, it will be ''shame on us.'' And I define bombing from 40,000 feet as war.

Just as we did in the months leading up to the invasion of Iraq, a country which had no connection to 9/11 and no weapons of mass destruction, this administration intentionally confused us with regard to Iraq. It is doing the same with Iran. The administration says they want compliance with nuclear treaties but makes it clear that they really will settle for nothing less than regime change.

When I said before the Iraq war that I believed the President would be willing to mislead us into the war if he believed misleading us was necessary to fulfill his plans, I was excoriated, but I was right. I do not characterize the President's motives. I assume he took us into war in Iraq because he sincerely believed it was the right thing to do. We know now that he was wrong about that. The world is less safe. The Iraqis are in turmoil. More Americans have died in the President's plan in Iraq than died in New York City and at the Pentagon.

What the President did with our Iraq policy is being replicated with our Iran policy. There was much to criticize about Saddam Hussein, and there is much to criticize about the ayatollahs and their front men in Iran. We have every right to demand that Iran adhere to its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and to pursue sanctions and other penalties. What we do not have the right to do is to make it impossible for Iran to satisfy our demands without regime change.

When we started demanding regime change in Iraq instead of demanding compliance with U.N. inspectors, we put ourselves on the path to war in Iraq. We are on the same plan and the same path in Iran. We will not talk with the Iranian government, and we will not stop talking about overthrowing it. It is impossible for the Iranian government to satisfy this administration and remain a government, although this administration will immediately deny that.

Every time it appears something is going to work out with the Soviet Union, or whatever, we pull the rug out from the negotiators. Because we don't want negotiation. We don't want to solve the problem. We want regime change. Somehow this administration has got it in its head that it has the right to tell other governments to step aside for people we like better. That is wrong.

We tried it with Mosaddegh and put in the Shah and we are back at it again. What we should do instead is to call their bluff and let them save face at the same time. If they say they want nuclear energy, we should say, okay, if it is nuclear energy you want, you won't mind having wall-to-wall U.N. inspectors watching every move you make to keep people from getting the wrong idea.

We make sure that they can't build bombs and let them have what they are entitled to under the NPT: civilian energy. We must quit making the leaders more popular. And we are doing it by making them the guys who stand up to the U.S. We must quit acting like we are going to invade any country that has the wrong regime.

If we attack Iran, as I fear we are on a course to do, we will unleash a hell unlike anything this region has seen. Iran is not Iraq. It has not been under sanctions for 10 years. It has not been bombed flat by the Gulf War. It is a strong nation with weapons. We will make ourselves once again less safe if we attack them.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has now been told on this floor, in public, on the record. The President will come here in about 6 or 8 or 9 months and give us a State of the Union. If he has taken us into a war in Iran, he will deserve what happens.

This country does not need another war. We have already proven the failure of that in Iraq; and because they won't change their mind, they keep doing the same thing over and over again. And now there is an election coming up. The 2006 election is coming and they want to distract us. That is why they are leading us towards Iran.

IRAN IS A TERRORIST STATE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Iran, as my colleague leaves the floor, is a terrorist state. They are trying to develop nuclear weapons, and the world and the United States cannot tolerate that. We will rue the day if we allow them to go forward with their nuclear weapons program. We will try diplomatic means, we will try economic sanctions, we will try anything to stop them; but we cannot allow them to build a nuclear capability, because they are a known terrorist state, period.

And I want to say one more thing about my colleague's comments about weapons of mass destruction not being found in Iraq. Many people thought that Iraq sent those weapons out of the country. Well, one of our special ops organizations in the last two or three days found 800 canisters, 800 canisters, of chemical weapons, the type that was used to kill the Kurds, 10,000 women and children, Kurdish children, during the regime of Saddam Hussein, and also the kinds of weapons that were used in the Iran-Iraq war.

So saying there were no weapons of mass destruction, when we have actually found 800 canisters in just the last few days, proves that that is not correct.

TIME FOR THE IRAQI PEOPLE TO ASSERT CONTROL OVER THEIR POLITICAL DESTINY

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, the Iraq war is now in its 4th year, and I, like many of my colleagues and millions of my fellow citizens, are troubled about the direction the conflict is taking.

I have been to Iraq three times to visit our troops there, and I have spent time with our wounded here and in Germany. They have done everything we have asked of them, and they have done it magnificently. While we have a moral obligation to do whatever we can to avoid having Iraq spiral into an all-out civil war, now is the time for the Iraqis themselves to decide if they wish to be one country. And, Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to take steps that will ensure that 2006 is a year of significant transition to full sovereignty for the people of Iraq.

This is a conflict that has come to grief in many ways. In the fall of 2002, I voted to authorize the use of force against Iraq because of the threat that Saddam Hussein had stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, and because I was concerned that he had an

active nuclear weapons program. If you go back and look at the debate in the House and Senate, this was a decision taken by the Congress to prevent Iraq from acquiring or using or transferring nuclear weapons.

Months later, as American forces pushed across the Kuwaiti frontier and into Iraq, we were on a hunt for weapons of mass destruction. Delivering the Iraqi people from the brutality of Saddam Hussein was a noble act, but the promotion of democracy in Iraq was not our primary reason for going to war. Similarly, we knew the Shiite majority had suffered terribly under the Ba'ath regime, and freeing them from the oppression of the Sunni minority was an added benefit of the invasion. But reordering the ethnic balance of political power in Iraq was not our primary purpose for going to war.

Soon after the fall of Baghdad, it became clear that many of the pre-war assumptions that had guided the President and his advisers were wrong. There were no chemical or biological weapons, there was no nuclear program, and while many Iraqis celebrated the ouster of Saddam Hussein, they did not line the streets of Baghdad to greet our troops with flowers. In fact, within days, there emerged the beginnings of what would become an organized and deadly insurgency that would quickly put an end to General Tommy Franks' plan to pare down the 140,000 troops in April 2003 to about 30,000 by September 2003.

In recent months, even as our military has become more adept at combating the insurgency, the nature of the struggle in Iraq has changed yet again. Long-simmering ethnic tensions, which had been suppressed under Saddam's totalitarian regime, have threatened to tear the country apart. While the full-scale civil war that many feared in the wake of the bombing of the Askariya mosque in Samarra has not yet come to pass, most observers believe the country is currently in the grip of a low-level civil war that could erupt into a full-scale conflict at any time.

The ongoing sectarian strife has been exacerbated by the protracted struggle among and inside Iraq's political factions over the formation of a permanent government. Last week's decision by the Shiite parties that make up the largest block in parliament that was elected 4 months ago to replace Prime Minister Ibrahim al-Jaafari with Jawad al-Maliki paves the way for the formation of a broad-based government. The question is now whether this hopeful development will be enough to pull Iraq back from the precipice.

There is a broad census among experts here and abroad that Iraq's future will be determined by politics and not by force. The formation of a permanent Iraqi Government, one that will have the power of legitimacy and vision to assume primary responsibility for securing and governing the country, is a necessary precondition to ending the insurgency, preventing a civil war, and allowing large-scale reconstruction to begin.

Consequently, our role in Iraq must become more political and less military. For if there is one thing that Iraqis of every ethnic, religious, and political stripe can agree on, it is that they do not want foreign troops in their country indefinitely.

I support a responsible redeployment of our troops during the course of 2006 so we are not drawn into sectarian conflict and so Iraqis are forced to take primary responsibility for securing and governing their country. A responsible redeployment of American coalition forces will have to be done in stages to build greater Iraqi sovereignty and control over security, not civil war. We should also publicly declare that the United States does not seek to maintain a permanent military presence in Iraq, and I have cosponsored legislation to prevent the establishment of permanent bases, which can only serve as a catalyst for the insurgency and for foreign jihadis.

Devising and implementing a successful end-game in Iraq will be difficult, but an open-ended commitment to remain in the country is untenable and unwise. The American people want Iraq to succeed and for a representative government there to survive and to lead to a better future for the Iraqi people. But it will ultimately be the Iraqi people who must decide whether they wish to live together in peace as one country or continue to murder each other in large numbers. We cannot decide that for them.

In the fight against the malicious al Qaeda in Iraq, foreign jihadis bent on destroying a government chosen by the Iraqi people, we are in solidarity with the Iraqi people who want a better life for their children. But, Mr. Speaker, we will not stand as a shield between Iraqi sects bent on killing each other. The new prime minister and leadership have the next 30 days to form a strong unity government. We hope they will be successful in that task, and we hope that the Iraqi leaders understand that the patience of the American people is running out.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraq war is now in its fourth year and I, like many of my colleagues and millions of our fellow citizens, am deeply concerned about the direction that the conflict is taking.

I have been to Iraq three times to visit with our troops there and I have spent time with our wounded here and in Germany. They have done everything that we have asked of them and they have done it magnificently.

Tragically, these American heroes are still being killed and wounded daily. Over 2,300 troops have been killed and thousands more have been injured. American taxpayers are paying approximately $194 million a day for the war according to the Congressional Budget Office—that's more than a billion dollars a week. A new CRS report puts the current costs of continued operations in Iraq and Afghanistan at close to $10 billion a month, with most of that money going to Iraq.

While we have a moral obligation to do whatever we can to avoid having Iraq spiral into all-out civil war, now is time for the Iraqis themselves to decide whether they wish to be one country. And, Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to take steps that will ensure that 2006 is a year of significant transition to full sovereignty for the people of Iraq.

This is a conflict that has come to grief in so many ways. In the fall of 2002 I voted to authorize the use of force against Iraq because of the threat that Saddam Hussein had stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and because I was convinced that he had an active nuclear weapons program. If you go back and look at the debate in the House and Senate, this was a decision taken by the Congress to prevent Iraq from acquiring and using or transferring nuclear weapons.

Months later, as American forces pushed across the Kuwaiti frontier and into Iraq, we were on a hunt for weapons of mass destruction. Delivering the Iraqi people from the brutality of Saddam Hussein was a noble act, but the promotion of democracy in Iraq was not our primary reason for going to war.

Similarly, we knew that the Shiite majority had suffered terribly under the Ba'ath regime and freeing them from the oppression of the Sunni minority was an added benefit of the invasion. But reordering the ethnic balance of political power in Iraq was not our primary purpose for going to war.

Soon after the fall of Baghdad, it became clear that many of the prewar assumptions that had guided the President and his advisors were wrong. There were no chemical or biological weapons; there was no nuclear program; and, while many Iraqis celebrated the ouster of Saddam Hussein, they did not line the streets of Baghdad to greet our troops with flowers. In fact, within days there emerged the beginnings of what would become an organized, deadly insurgency that would quickly put an end to General Tommy Franks' plan to pare down the 140,000 troops in Iraq in April 2003 to about 30,000 by September 2003.

In recent months even as our military has become more adept at combating the insurgency, the nature of the struggle in Iraq has changed yet again. Long-simmering ethnic tensions, which had been suppressed under Saddam's totalitarian regime, have threatened to tear the country apart. While the full-scale civil war that many feared in the wake of the bombing of the Askariya mosque in Samarra has not yet come to pass, most observers believe that the country is currently in the grip of a low-level civil war that could erupt into full-scale conflict at any time. I am especially concerned by media reports that Shiite militias have been deploying to Kirkuk, Iraq's third largest city, in a bid to forestall any attempt by Kurds to assert control over this major center of Iraq's oil-rich north.

The ongoing sectarian strife has been exacerbated by the protracted struggle among and inside Iraq's political factions over the formation of a permanent government. Last week's decision by the Shiite parties that make up the largest bloc in the parliament that was elected four months ago to replace Prime Minister Ibrahim al-Jaafari with Jawad al-Maliki paves the way for the formation of a broad-based government. The question now is whether this hopeful development will be enough to pull Iraq back from the precipice.

There is a broad consensus among experts—here and abroad—that Iraq's future will

be determined by politics and not force. The formation of a permanent Iraqi government—one that will have the power, legitimacy and vision to assume primary responsibility for securing and governing the country—is a necessary precondition to ending the insurgency, preventing a civil war and allowing large-scale reconstruction to begin.

Consequently, our role in Iraq must become more political and less military; for if there is one thing that Iraqis of every ethnic, religious and political stripe can agree on, it is that they do not want foreign troops in their country indefinitely.

I support a responsible redeployment of our troops during the course of 2006 so that we are not drawn into sectarian conflict and so that Iraqis are forced to take primary responsibility for securing and governing their country. While the process of training Iraqi security forces has gone more slowly than many had hoped, recent reports have indicated that we are making progress and that every week more Iraqi units are capable of taking a greater role in combating the insurgency.

A responsible redeployment of American and coalition forces will have to be done in stages to build greater Iraqi sovereignty and control over security, not civil war. In the first phase of the redeployment, our forces should be gradually withdrawn from insecure urban centers and moved to smaller cities where reconstruction is supported by the local population, and to remote bases where our troops will be able to support Iraqi units if necessary. Over time, these troops will be withdrawn from Iraq altogether and redeployed outside the country, either in the region or back to the United States. We should publicly declare that the United States does not seek to maintain a permanent military presence in Iraq and I have co-sponsored legislation to prevent the establishment of permanent bases, which can only serve as a catalyst for the insurgency and for foreign jihadis.

Devising and implementing a successful endgame in Iraq will be difficult, but an open-ended commitment to remain in the country is untenable and unwise. The American people want Iraq to succeed, and for a representative government there to survive and lead to a better future for the Iraqi people. But it will ultimately be the Iraqi people who must decide whether they wish to live together in peace as one country or continue to murder each other in large numbers. We cannot decide that for them.

In the fight against the malicious Al Qaeda in Iraq, foreign jihadists bent on destroying a government chosen by the Iraqi people, we are in solidarity with the Iraqi people who want a better life for their children. But we will not stand as a shield between different Iraqi sects bent on killing each other. The new Iraqi prime minister and leadership have the next thirty days to form a strong unity government. We hope that they will be successful in this task. But our hopes in Iraq have too often led to disappointment, and the Iraqi leaders must understand that the patience of the American people is running out.

TRIBUTE TO AIR FORCE TECHNICAL SERGEANT WALTER MOSS, JR.

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, I rise tonight to pay tribute to a native Houstonian, Walter Moss, Jr., who voluntarily served our Nation in Iraq and who died doing so. He was assigned to the 366th Civil Engineer Squadron, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, or the EOD, Flight as a noncommissioned officer in charge of the EOD Resources Element, Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho.

On March 29, 2006, Tech Sergeant Moss became the 200th Texas member of the Armed Forces killed in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, Texans are only 7 percent of the United States population, but make up 10 percent of the volunteers in Iraq and Afghanistan. Further, almost 9 percent of the military deaths in Iraq are Texans.

Additionally, Moss was the first airman from Sather Air Force Base in Iraq to be killed in action during Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was 37 years old. In his long military career, he specialized in the dangerous job of detection and removal of explosive devices.

□ 1945

He was killed while trying to defuse a makeshift bomb while conducting operations near Baghdad. The terrorists in Iraq use the improvised explosive devices, or IEDs, as a cowardly way of murdering Iraqi women, children, civilians and Americans. The terrorist use of IEDs is one of the most dangerous threats to our troops in uniform in Iraq.

Technical Sergeant Moss was the first line of defense between IEDs and his fellow military comrades. Since being deployed to Iraq in January, Sergeant Moss had responded to more than 200 calls. Those 200 calls meant that Moss had perhaps saved the life of an American or Iraqi civilian.

Born in Houston, Texas, Moss attended Aldine High School. He joined the Air Force upon graduation from Aldine and soon married his high school sweetheart Georgina.

From the beginning of his military career, Moss stood out as a leader. His motivation earned him a coveted spot assisting the United States Secret Service. During his 16-year military career, he guarded the likes of former President George H. Bush and the First Lady.

While stationed in Guam, he disposed of 12,500 pounds of hazardous World War II munitions and supported the Secret Service again in protecting Hillary Clinton. In 1997, he and his family were stationed at the 31st CE Squadron, Aviano Air Force Base, Italy. He was handpicked from his unit to provide EOD support during the Middle East peace talks where he ensured then-Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's safety.

Moss had two children, Andrew, 13, and Veronica, 9. A military traveling family, they had already lived with their father in Guam, Italy and Turkey.

Technical Sergeant Moss was deployed in support of Operations Southern Watch, Allied Force, Desert Strike, Northern Watch and Iraqi Freedom. He was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters, and the Air Force Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster.

Even though he was in the Air Force, the Navy and Marines honored him with the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, and he will be awarded the Bronze Star with Valor and the Purple Heart.

I attended Technical Sergeant Moss' funeral in Spring, Texas, and I talked to his father Walter Moss, Sr. Walter told me he was proud of his son, proud of the life he chose, and proud of the country he served. At the funeral there were a great number of Air Force personnel, strangers, citizens, family, and even a motorcycle group carrying large American flags.

I would like to extend my prayers and condolences to his father Walter, his mother Rebecca York, his brother Brian, his relatives and friends in Idaho and Texas, his wife Georgina, and his children Andrew and Veronica. He died as he lived: Protecting Americans.

Our hearts are filled with gratitude for the brave airmen such as Technical Sergeant Walter Moss. He sought out danger so others would not face danger. He was a father, a husband and a brother. His unyielding courage was an inspiration to his fellow airmen and his family. He was an American patriot, and he was a cut above the rest of us.

And that's just the way it is.

URGING ACTION ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, everyone is talking about gas prices. This morning President Bush presented the Nation with, he said, a ''plan to lower gas prices.''

A little over a year ago on June 6, 2005, energy was $2.09. I use that date because that was the date that the President of the United States signed his energy bill that he hailed would be a great improvement for energy and energy prices here in America. $2.09. Today in Chicago it stands on average a little over $3 in the Chicago area. Over a little less than a year ago when the President signed his energy bill, the one that this Congress delivered to him, energy was $2.09 a gallon. Today in Chicago gas is $3.32 a gallon.

In the year in which we debated the energy bill, the oil and gas interests spent $86 million lobbying this Congress and got $14.5 billion in taxpayer subsidies. They spent $86 million lobbying the House of the American people, and they got a $14.5 billion gift.

You cannot get that type of return on Wall Street. That was about a 10 percent return. You cannot get a return like that on any other investment where you give $86 million to influence the people's House and get $14.5 billion of hard-earned taxpayer money, and energy is trading at $75 a barrel.

I understand if you want to help the oil and gas companies at $17 a barrel, $25 a barrel to help them drill for energy. At $75 a barrel, I would expect Exxon and Mobil and Chevron and Phillips, all who are making not just good money, historic record prices, would actually be able to go on their own and drill without the taxpayers having to pay for it.

So not only are we paying a record amount of $3.50 a gallon, not only are they making record profits, but at $75 a barrel, the taxpayers are paying them $14.5 billion. So the American consumer pays more at the pump, and they pay more on April 15 because of what this Congress did. Over the last year, in less than 1 year, energy went from $2.09 to $3.30, but that is only one example.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMANUEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that we are drilling for oil in Texas, California, Oklahoma, and Nebraska. How did the gentleman vote when we wanted to drill in the ANWR, which is 3.5 times the size of Texas? We could have gotten almost 2 million barrels of oil a day, and it would have helped these prices.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I voted against that; and I vote against giving them $14.5 billion because I do not believe there is a worse example of corporate welfare, only to be followed by the prescription drug bill and the corporate tax bill that was a $5 billion problem. You all handed out $145 billion to corporate interests. Only in Washington do you try to resolve a $5 billion problem that cost you $145 billion, and it still did not resolve the original $5 billion problem.

I bring this all up for one simple point: For the last 5 years, this is supposed to be the people's House, and when that gavel comes down, it is supposed to open the people's House, not the auction house. And from the prescription drug legislation to the energy legislation to the corporate tax bill, you have sold off America's interests. Billions of dollars have been spent lobbying the people's House, and it shows when you go from product to product, from line to line. That is what has happened here.

Now all of a sudden everybody is worried about how we are going to deal with the energy problem. When you had an energy bill, you hailed it as a great victory for the American people. Since that time energy has gone up more than a buck a gallon at the pump.

But that is also an example of what has happened with the corporate tax bill and the pharmaceutical bill. People have used their influence. I do not bemoan what the energy companies have done. I do not bemoan what the pharmaceutical companies have done. I do not bemoan what the HMO industry has done. I do not bemoan what corporate interests have done to influence this Congress. What I bemoan is what the Congress has done for that money and what they have done to the American people's interests. And what is happening here, because now this week I think it is ironic we are all talking about energy, this Congress is going to bring up a lobbying bill. That piece of legislation has become the incredible shrinking legislation. It does nothing. The Washington Post called it ''a watered down sham. Simply a joke.''

USA Today writes, ''Congress still doesn't get it. After more than a year of negative headlines about political corruption and money-soaked alliances with lobbyists, House leaders are weakening their already anemic excuse for reform.''

It doesn't deal with an independent Office of Public Integrity. It does not ban gifts from lobbyists. It does not close the revolving door for Members who leave here. It does not deal with disclosure of lobbyists' solicitation of campaign checks.

The lobbying legislation we are dealing with is exactly the energy legislation we dealt with. The two are the same pieces of legislation. Those who have given and they are giving their checks because all that is left on K Street is checks. There are no checks and balances left in this system.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5020, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–438) on the resolution (H. Res. 774) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5020) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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.)

THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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. LEACH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, with mounting sectarian tensions and unabated insurgent violence, I rise today to discuss the deeply troubling situation in Iraq and its implications for the national interests of the United States.

Sometimes it is harder to know how to end a war than to start one. Just as it is important to think through the ''why'' of committing troops to a conflict, we must also think through the ''why'' of ending an engagement. Timing is a key element of both considerations.

Perspective is always difficult to bring to bear on events of the day. Developments of this week, however, could provide Washington with a seminal opportunity to stimulate a rethinking about the philosophical basis for a war that we initiated, with the goal of assessing how a great power can and should disengage.

Many people have noted analogies between America's involvement in Vietnam and the U.S. intervention in Iraq. My sense is that a number of these analogies are quite frail. But the one I am most concerned about relates to America's extraordinary difficulty in disengaging from Vietnam.

A key problem for Washington in trying to wind down its commitment in Vietnam was how to develop a mutual accommodation with the other side that would lessen the prideful pitfalls that often occur when political figures are forced to reassess policies. In the end it was the Paris Peace Accord which facilitated the withdrawal of American troops.

A negotiating avenue in a third-country capital does not appear to lend itself to a resolution of the Iraqi situation at this time. Nonetheless, I find it remarkable that in an autobiographical tome Henry Kissinger wrote that in December 1968, shortly after Richard Nixon had asked him to be his National Security Council Director, he met with the President-elect to discuss the direction of the new administration's foreign policy. They determined together, he noted, that their policy would be to get out of Vietnam.

After reading this passage I asked him years later at a Library of Congress symposium why they did not just proceed to do that. Kissinger looked at me for a moment and then uttered words I will never forget. ''Young man,'' he said, ''we meant with honor.''

I then asked him if honor required escalation. ''Absolutely,'' he responded.

In the Iraq circumstance, the executive branch has provided three broad rationales for American intervention. First, it hinted that there was an Iraqi connection to the attacks on 9/11. Then

it suggested that America and the world faced an imminent threat from Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. When these two justifications for the U.S.-led invasion turned out to be without foundation, the administration fell back on the goal of spreading democracy in Iraq and the broader Middle East as the basis for ongoing U.S. engagement.

From an American perspective, the case for extending the reach of democracy abroad always has a ring of validity, although many have concluded that imposing democracy from the outside is not a proven or necessarily compelling art form. Intriguingly, however, it would appear that today in Iraq democracy building provides a credible rationale for American disengagement even though it was a secondary and possibly flawed basis for original intervention.

In the aftermath of elections held 3 months ago, the Iraqis have finally formed a government which will have under its jurisdiction, although perhaps not complete control, a newly formed Army and a fledgling police apparatus. Based on three elements, credible national elections, a new government and a new infrastructure of security, the U.S. is positioned to begin and, almost as consequently, to announce a steady process of disengagement.

In the middle of the Vietnam War, Senator Aiken proposed that we simply declare victory and get out. This may have been good politics then, but there is no basis for suggesting victory was at hand. Ironically, the formation of a new government today may provide the most promising claim of some success in Iraq. Not to take advantage of the circumstance could be a lost opportunity. This may indeed be the last timely movement for decisive decision-making.

Lyndon Johnson knew his Vietnam policy was failing, but he chose to pass it on to a successor who proceeded to escalate an already escalated conflict. To the degree there is relevance to Presidential precedent, it would seem far wiser for this administration to set the conditions and proceed with withdrawal rather than leave such a decision to a future President.

The reason a democracy-based framework for disengagement needs to be articulated is that it allows the United States to set forth a basis for ending the occupation that is on our terms and on our timetable. If we don't develop and announce a plan and a rationale for disengagement, we could at some point find ourselves withdrawing with the other side claiming it forced us out through destructive anarchy, i.e., insurgent attacks and suicide bombings, or through the insistence of the elected government in Baghdad.

Democracy implies consent of the governed and when a large percentage of the Iraqi people want us to leave, as opinion polls indicate is the case today, the U.S. should be hard-pressed to follow the original neo-con strategy of establishing and maintaining a semi-permanent military base in the country.

Here a note about the Crusades is relevant. While Americans use the word loosely and conjure up quaint cartoon images King Arthur and his knights, citizens of the Muslim world consider the Crusades living history, and it is no accident that Osama bin Laden refers to us as crusaders. For al Qaeda, the pushing out of U.S. forces would be an extension of the Crusades, an act of multi-century consequences. That is why it is so important to apply reason and public reasoning to the disengagement process.

This war has precipitated a great loss of confidence in and respect for the United States around the world. Quite possibly Iraq will be a better country because of America's intervention. But if we hang around too long, the Iraqi government and our government may suffer consequences even more negative than has so far been evidenced. Indeed, with each passing day of occupation, it appears our presence is increasingly inspiring more instability than stability.

It is true that precipitous withdrawal might be counterproductive and that precise timetables have disadvantages. But it is difficult for me to believe anything other than the declaration of a credible plan and reason for disengagement, coupled with a steady drawdown policy, is the wisest course of action today.

In a novel development, Congress has required the establishment of an "Iraq Study Group," under the aegis of the U.S. Institute for Peace, to be chaired by former Secretary of State James Baker and former Representative Lee Hamilton. At the risk of presumption, I would hope the perspective outlined above will be one of the approaches it and the Administration review. There are risks in too abrupt a departure; but a prolonged occupation leads too easily to the kind of retributive civilization clash that misserves America as well as peoples of the region.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHERNOBYL DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, April 26, the world will commemorate the 20th anniversary of the world's worst nuclear disaster at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in the Ukraine when it was under Soviet control.

The explosion released into the air radiation equivalent to 90 Hiroshima-size bombs in the heavily populated areas of northern Ukraine, southern Belarus and southwestern Russia.

□ 2000

Millions of people throughout the world were affected by this disaster, and millions more continue to live with its consequences on a daily basis. Some have written about the North European countries being affected by what has been termed "white winds," the white winds that came from Chernobyl. Radioactive contamination continues to harm the health of men, women and children throughout our world. It is critical that we do not allow ourselves to forget the looming consequences of Chernobyl, which are with us still today, lest the tragedy repeat itself. We must remind our fellow Americans and the world that those problems continue to exist, and the countries that were affected by Chernobyl require assistance in resolving them. In order to achieve this goal, the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, in cooperation with the Chernobyl Challenge '06 Coalition, is organizing a series of events at the end of this month to commemorate this solemn anniversary. I am very pleased to cooperate with our co-chairs of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, CURT WELDON of Pennsylvania, Congressman SANDER LEVIN of Michigan, Congressman ROSCOE BARTLETT of Maryland, along with myself. Tomorrow, April 26, at 10 a.m. here in the Rayburn House Office Building foyer will be a 1-day photo exhibit entitled "Chernobyl 20." The exhibit will include photographs by some prominent artists illuminating the human stories behind the Chernobyl catastrophe and highlighting the dignity and hope of its survivors. We welcome the public to come tomorrow and view this photo exhibit in the Rayburn House Office Building foyer. It begins at 10 a.m. and will remain there the entire day.

On April 27, the following day, Thursday, from 2 in the afternoon until 6, in HC–6 here in the Capitol, a congressional briefing will feature expert testimony on Chernobyl issues including radiation and health, agriculture and food, environment, economics and U.S. assistance and the containment of the fourth unit reactor. The ambassadors of Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia will provide brief remarks to inform about the current situation with respect to Chernobyl and their countries. If citizens are interested, they can contact our office at our Web site, rep.kaptur@mail.house.gov for information.

On Thursday, April 27 as well, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. in the evening, in B369 Rayburn House Office Building, the Chernobyl Challenge '06 Coalition, in cooperation with our Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, will hold a congressional reception and Members of Congress will have an opportunity to speak. Again, if citizens are interested they can contact our Web site at rep.kaptur@ mail.house.gov.

The Congressional Ukrainian Caucus is very grateful that for the briefing that will be held on Thursday, from 2 to 6 in Room HC–6, the Capitol Building, that some of the following speakers will appear, from the Chernobyl Children's Project International and the Children of Chernobyl Relief and

Development Fund, their executive directors, several pre-eminent scientists from major organizations, public and private sector universities, talking about the illnesses that plague people today as a result of this huge catastrophe. And then, finally, those who have served as ambassadors to our country and ambassadors from the affected nations will address what we can do in the way of additional international response to meet today's challenges still arising from the Chernobyl catastrophe.

I have never seen birth defects as I have witnessed among the children affected by this continuing tragedy in Chernobyl. The thyroid cancers, the conditions to the heart, the distortions of the human form related to radiation resulting from Chernobyl are horrendous.

The southern part of Belarus is largely depopulated, though some people who are refugees from Afghanistan are moving into the area, incredibly, and eating and planting seeds in the ground and eating contaminated food and infecting themselves even until this day. There is so much for the American people to understand. Though it was 20 years ago, Chernobyl lives as it will for thousands of years to come.

USING HISTORY AS A GUIDE

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. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that bothers me is how some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle come down here and paint a picture using history as a guide that is totally inconsistent with what I, as a Member of Congress for 24 years, have seen and believe.

The President of the United States and the Congress's number one responsibility is to protect this country from enemies, both domestic and foreign. After the attack on 9/11, the President of the United States went after the bad guys, the terrorists. And Saddam Hussein, we were told, was building weapons of mass destruction. In the early 1980s the Israelis attacked a nuclear production site in Iraq because he was trying to build a nuclear weapon. In the Iran/Iraq war he used chemical weapons to kill Iranians during that war. He killed thousands and thousands of innocent women and children, Kurds, using chemical weapons. And in just the last couple of days, some of our expert military personnel in Iraq have found 800 canisters, 800 canisters of chemical weapons, the type that were used to kill Kurds and kill people in the Iran/Iraq war. That is a weapon of mass destruction. We just found it. And so people that say that there are no weapons of mass destruction, or were none, we are starting to find those. And we believe that many of those weapons were carted out of the country before we invaded.

And when I hear my colleagues say there was no connection between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein, and we had no reason to go in there, the fact of the matter is we know that Uday, Saddam Hussein's son, had leaders of the al Qaeda movement in Baghdad in the hospital and at other get-togethers many, many times. There was a loose-knit association between the Taliban, al Qaeda, Saddam Hussein and others who want to do the Free World ill. That is a fact. And how we see people trying to distort history to say, oh, my gosh, America's made a terrible mistake by going into Iraq really bothers me. The President is doing his dead level best to defeat the terrorists and protect this Nation and the world. There have been attacks in Spain, in France, in England, the United States and other places, in Bali, the terrorists in Egypt just recently. And we cannot back down to the terrorists. We cannot appease them. The President is doing the right things.

Now, regarding Iraq, we are turning the war over to the Iraqis. Eleven million people went to the polls and voted for freedom, democracy and a government; and that government will be formed. It is being formed as we speak.

But we are reducing our troop forces. I understand we have gone from 161,000 just recently to a troop reduction of 30,000 down to 131,000. So we are reducing our forces, and we are turning it over to the Iraqis as they are able to take care of the problems themselves.

The terrorists are going to continue to try to tear up jack over there. They are going to try to drive everybody out and destroy democracy. But it is in our interest and the Free World's to stay the course. And if we don't, we will rue the day that we didn't.

And I want to end up one more time by saying to my colleagues who were talking about Iran early today, the gentleman from Washington, Iran is a terrorist state. We cannot allow them to develop a nuclear capability. And if we do that, we will be dead sorry we did.

IRAQ DEMOCRACY PROMOTION

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the notion that the Iraq war is all about building freedom and democracy across the broader Middle East has been a staple of White House talking points for nearly as long as we have had our troops in harm's way.

But a few weeks ago, courtesy of a front-page story in The Washington Post, we learned something interesting about the President's actual nuts and bolts commitment to democracy. He doesn't have one. That April 5 story by Peter Baker reveals that when it comes to promoting democracy, the bottom line reality doesn't match all the fancy rhetoric.

The administration, in fact, is dramatically reducing funding for programs and organizations that do the nitty-gritty work of helping nations train their people to build and sustain a democratic infrastructure, political parties, unions, a free press and other institutions.

The National Democratic Institute of International Affairs and the International Republican Institute will, according to The Post, be running out of USAID grant dollars in a matter of days. Only a special earmark is keeping them open for business.

The U.S. Institute of Peace has seen funding for its democracy programs in Iraq slashed by nearly two-thirds. The National Endowment for Democracy recently received its last $3 million to spend in Iraq. As one vice-president at the U.S. Institute of Peace pointed out to The Post, the combined cost of all the programs dedicated to encouraging Iraqi democracy amounts to less than what we spend on the military occupation in Iraq in a single day.

Of course, in addition to being expensive in treasure, this military campaign has carried a devastating human cost, namely, 2,390 American men and women killed, all in the name of democracy that is in danger of never taking hold. It is not surprising, I guess, that this administration would short-change democracy promotion. After all, these are the folks who thought there was no hard work involved in creating a free society. They thought all you had to do was drop a few bombs, kick out a brutal dictator, and democracy would miraculously and spontaneously spring from the oil wells or something. That is one of the reasons their post-war planning was so tragically inadequate.

But this war was never really about building democracy in any real sense. If that had been the justification presented to the American people in 2002, this body and our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol would never have authorized the President to use military force.

No, it was only after the whole weapons of mass destruction thing turned out to be a fraud that the administration started casting about for another rationale. And they came up with this fanciful notion that the war would give rise to democracy, not just in Iraq, but among its neighbors and across the region.

Mr. Speaker, we can encourage democratic elements in Iraq without a military campaign that is killing Americans, killing Iraqis, and fomenting a civil war. It is time to bring our troops home and start investing in true democracy building efforts.

I have offered a new approach to national security called SMART. This stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. And its core is the notion of investing in nations' democratic potential without resorting to military force.

There are many elements to SMART. It calls for fighting terrorism and stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction through stronger multilateral relationships and improved intelligence. It demands that the United States live up to its nuclear nonproliferation commitments. It would redirect money we are spending on obsolete Cold War weapons toward homeland security and energy independence. But perhaps most important of all, it is a humanitarian program designed to improve living conditions in troubled regions of the world, to address the oppression and the deprivation that often give rise to terrorism in the very first place. That means supporting programs that promote sustainable development; human rights education; peaceful conflict resolution, educational opportunities, particularly for women and girls; and democracy building.

It is time for the United States to actually put its money where its mouth is on promoting democracy.

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

(Mrs. BLACKBURN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEDICARE PART D

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here on this Chamber floor, thousands of seniors in my district and millions across our country are suffering through piles of Medicare drug plan offers; and in far too many cases, these seniors are faced with a difficult dilemma. They are suffering under the weight of too much information, with too little time in which to make a choice on what drug plan they will use under the Medicare prescription drug program.

□ 2015

Their decision is by no means simple. The drug plans our seniors choose will define their health care options for years to come. If they do not make a decision and wait until the May 15 deadline passes, they will face penalties and higher prices for the drugs that they need.

This week the Bucks County Courier Times, a daily paper in my district in Pennsylvania, mentioned the drug program dilemma faced by one senior. Mary Ann Morgan was fighting through the details and complications of the new program. She said, ''It's the same as if you're going to buy a stock. The fine print is hard to figure out.''

Traditionally, Medicare's assurance has been that for the elderly and persons with disabilities that they will not be alone when confronted with the full burden of their health care costs. However, the Medicare prescription drug benefit has changed, and if the nearly 3,000 seniors I have met through 12 town halls can represent a sample of opinion, many seniors do not yet understand the prescription drug program and do not plan to sign up for coverage.

Despite the administration's long public information campaign, for many months polls have consistently indicated only 37 percent of those eligible for Medicare say they only partially understand the program. Sixty-one percent state they simply do not understand the program. Approximately one in four seniors, 24 percent, say they plan to join the program, while 54 percent say they do not plan to join, and 22 percent have no opinion.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services projected that 39.1 million Medicare beneficiaries would have creditable prescription drug coverage for 2006. Of this total, HHS projected that 29.3 million beneficiaries would be enrolled in part D plans, and nearly 10 million beneficiaries would have creditable drug coverage under qualified plans such as employer- or union-sponsored plans.

Mr. Speaker, the most recent enrollment figures released just last month indicate that only 19.7 million beneficiaries are enrolled in a Medicare part D prescription drug plan, a number that falls short of the hoped for estimate of 29.3 million. This rate of enrollment cannot be viewed as a success. Members of Congress must act to modify the original plan.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that there is a simple solution to this problem. Our seniors need more time, and Congress should provide it to them. Congress changed Medicare to give our seniors more choice in what has historically been a highly structured government program. Congress cannot in good conscience allow thousands of seniors to suffer penalties simply because they could not make an informed decision for their health care coverage and do so in time.

It is for these reasons that I introduced H.R. 4399, legislation that will extend the initial year's enrollment period an additional 6 months, until November 14, 2006. My legislation would also extend the enrollment period for an additional 4½ months for all subsequent years. And, finally, under my legislation penalties would be suspended for 2 years when seniors enroll late in the program.

I call on my colleagues to join as a cosponsor of H.R. 4399 to give Mary Ann Morgan and thousands of seniors like her more time to make the best use of the choice that they have been given.

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

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

ROGER TOUSSAINT AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PENSION BENEFITS

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the Special Order time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, Roger Toussaint, the president of Local 100 of the Transport Workers Union, is in jail in New York City tonight. Toussaint's crime is that he took a stand against New York Governor Pataki's sneak attack on public employee pension benefits. When the Governor's puppet appointees on the New York Metropolitan Transport Authority Board had already reached agreement on all other items during labor contract negotiations, the Governor ordered that a cut in pension benefits be added as a new demand. Although it was a cut proposed for the future employees, Roger Toussaint said, ''No. I will not be a party to an agreement that sells out the unborn.''

Roger Toussaint would not allow the Governor to set a precedent for all future State, city, county, and later on it would spill over to Federal employees, and they would have shoved in their face at the bargaining table this precedent of having cut public employee pension benefits. A domino effect would roll right across the entire Nation, and no public employee pension benefits would be safe. ''Strike'' was the rallying cry at that moment, and that rallying cry deserves the support of all working families across the Nation.

The private sector, the corporate butchers, have been carving up private employee pension benefit funds for some years now. Indeed, those of us who serve on the Education and Workforce Committee know that there is an impending pension bankruptcy crisis which may produce shock waves similar to the savings and loan scandal. Private pension benefits for workers we know are endangered, but we have all assumed repeatedly that pensions for public employees are safe, they are secure.

Roger Toussaint's confrontation with the Metropolitan Transit Authority dramatically exposes the fact that public employee pension benefits are also

in danger. Governors, mayors, and legislative bodies can carve up pension benefits even faster than the private sector if working families and their representatives do not remain vigilant and stand up against these attempts.

Ten days in jail they have ordered for Roger Toussaint. Two and a half million dollars they have fined the TW Local 100 organization. Dues check-off privileges have been taken away. The Governor and his MTA puppet board are trying to destroy the union that stood up and exposed the plot to swindle the workers out of their pension benefits. They want to destroy Roger Toussaint, the labor rebel. They want to smother the union rebellion.

Roger Toussaint should not remain an unsung hero. Now is the time for all working families to come to the aid of an heroic labor leader. Listen to the final words of Roger Toussaint at the door of the jail: ''I stand here today because a judge has found me guilty of contempt of court. The truth of the matter is I have nothing but contempt for a system that gives employers free rein to abuse workers.''

Now is the time for all labor organizations across the country to come to the aid of TW and Roger Toussaint in New York.

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

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

THE PEOPLE OF BELARUS

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the Special Order time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate to be part of a foreign observer team to observe the failed Presidential elections in Belarus on March 19. Why was it a failure? One, because about 400 political activists were arrested prior to the election. There was prevoting that no one could account for and credit as being valid. I attended with a colleague of mine from Portugal, a member of Parliament, Suarez, and at the end of the evening after visiting 19 precincts, we were not allowed to see the ballots, nor were we allowed to observe the counting of the ballots. There was also no ability for the opposition candidates to campaign and get time on the state-sponsored TV station.

Why is this important, and why do I bring this up today? Well, after the election there was a rally in Oktyabrskaya Square, and this is a photo from one, a protester with a banned flag. There were over 10,000 folks that rallied at this square, many of them staying in the evening through the next day over a period of weeks until the regime finally got fed up, which resulted in a crackdown of the protesters and imprisonment of, and I think there were about 685 on this list, 700 political activists who were jailed for protesting a failed election and rallying for the cause of freedom and democracy and the rule of law. In the square slogans that stated ''Long Live Belarus''; ''Freedom''; the announcement of one of the Presidential candidate's names, Milinkevich, those were the cries of people who want freedom, democracy, and the rule of law.

This was the regime's response. One of those jailed who is still in jail is opposition leader Alexander Kozulin. Kozulin was also a Presidential candidate. He remains in jail today and imprisoned unlawfully and will undoubtedly remain for the immediate future. On March 30 Dr. Kozulin was formally charged with two counts of hooliganism under part 2, article 339 of the Criminal Code. Now, hooliganism is taking part in a democratic rally and publicly speaking his concerns on freedom and democracy and the rule of law. Actions which disturbed the public peace, so the regime says, and active participation in them under article 342 is against the regime's laws. These crimes carry a maximum sentence of 6 years. Dr. Kozulin has yet to be assigned a trial date and will remain in prison until the regime succumbs to international pressure and assigns him a trial date to prove his innocence.

Tomorrow, April 26, as was stated by another of my colleagues tonight, is the anniversary of the Chernobyl disaster. Now, Chernobyl is in the Ukraine, but much of the fallout area is in the country of Belarus, and the prodemocratic organizations and movements and the political activists will be rallying again for freedom, democracy, and the rule of law.

The President/dictator of Belarus is an individual named Lukashenko, and since the election is now over and many of the international media has left the country, he may feel that it is within his power to continue to be ruthless and destroy and suppress the freedom movement in Belarus. My time tonight is to just talk to him, the folks in the country of Belarus and the people who yearn for freedom and democracy that the world will be watching the events of tomorrow's rally.

I hope that my colleagues here on the floor will stand with me in support of freedom of Belarus during this time and will work with the Belarusian people to bring free and fair elections to their country. Countries that are democratic historically have peaceful relationships with their neighbors who are also democratic. It is incumbent upon this House that is the bastion of freedom, democracy, and the rule of law to be of aid to those people who yearn to be free. That is what this Special Order is about tonight.

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 gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

LARRY NELSON

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the Special Order time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a friend and a fellow Georgian Larry Nelson, who, after years of hard work and success, has been elected to the World Golf Hall of Fame this year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call my colleagues' attention to this picture of Larry at my left. Look at that picture-perfect swing. I can only dream about that.

Larry Nelson, indeed, is an inspired golfer and an inspirational athlete. Throughout his successful 36-year career, Larry has risen to the top of his game, and he has remained there while racking up victory after victory. In the last 32 years on the PGA and the Champions tours, Larry has won 10 events, including 3 majors. His career is highlighted by his PGA championships in 1981, 1987, and his 1983 win at the United States Open. He is also a three-time member of the U.S. Ryder Cup team.

Larry's place among golf's greatest is well deserved. During the earlier part of his career in the 1980s, there were only three other golfers besides Larry who managed to win three major tournaments: Jack Nicklaus, Tom Watson, and Seve Ballesteros.

□ 2030

Larry Nelson undoubtedly belongs with these legends of golf.

We often hear of self-made men, and Larry is certainly one of them. Mr. Speaker, as a sergeant in the United States Army during the Vietnam conflict, golf was not even a blip on his

radar screen. In fact, he said he thought it was a game for sissies. Indeed. But upon his return to the States from Vietnam, Larry found himself drawn to golf. One day he noticed a golf center across the street from the Lockheed Martin plant in my hometown where he worked. Thus, the Sam Snead Golf Center in Marietta, Georgia, became the first training ground for his new passion.

For Larry, golf came naturally. He broke 100 on his first round. That is a little discouraging to me, Mr. Speaker. In this recent time in the district, I found one day to go out on the golf course, and I don't think I broke 150. But Larry broke 100 on that very first round, and enjoyed it. He said this many times, he enjoyed dedicating himself to the techniques and strategy of the game. Indeed, the qualities that it takes for victory and success, that determination and the hard work, that has to be put in every day. As Larry told the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, ''I fell in love with it, and I got better every day.''

His humbleness aside, Larry was dedicated to his game, and he worked hard to achieve those goals. He graduated from qualifying school in 1973; and by 1979, just 6 years later, he had already won his first PGA tour victory, capturing the Jackie Gleason Inverrary Classic.

Larry Nelson's career saw some amazing highlights. In 2000, he finished number one on the tour. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, he finished number one on the tour, and he was named the Champions Tour Player of the Year. Larry won a total of 19 tournaments; and, listen to this, he finished second 24 times. Just think about how difficult that is, to finish second in a major tournament.

He was never one to brag about his accomplishments, but anyone who looks at Larry Nelson's career knows that it has been outstanding.

Mr. Speaker, when Larry is inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame in St. Augustine this October, he will assume his place among golf's greatest. This is the 11th year Larry has been on the Hall of Fame ballot, and I know many golf lovers join me in saying it is about time. I am so pleased Larry's accomplishments are receiving the distinction that they so much deserve.

Larry Nelson's life and career serve as an inspiration to all of us in any walk of life, an inspiration to pursue new interests and work to achieve the highest levels of success through faith in one's God-given talents, and Larry indeed has that gift.

When he was recently asked about how much longer he would be a golfer, Larry replied that he will keep playing as long as he enjoys it. Knowing Larry's love for the game, I predict we will get to see his successes for some time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Larry Nelson on his past accomplishments and his present induction into the Golf Hall of Fame.

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

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

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

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

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS ON BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2006 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2006 THROUGH FY 2010

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2006 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 401 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through April 21, 2006.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2006 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2006 and fiscal years 2006 through 2010. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2006 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation as well as the 302(a) allocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2007 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills or amendments thereto that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 95

[Reflecting action completed as of April 21, 2006—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2006	Fiscal years 2006–2010
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,144,384	(1)
Outlays	2,161,420	(1)
Revenues	1,589,892	9,080,006
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	2,137,666	(1)
Outlays	2,157,194	(1)
Revenues	1,607,180	9,176,059
Current Level over (+) / under (−)		
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	−6,718	(1)
Outlays	−4,226	(1)
Revenues	17,288	96,053

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2007 through 2010 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2006 in excess of $6,718,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2006 in excess of 4,226,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 outlays to further exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2006 in excess of $17,288,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 in excess of $96,053,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION

[Reflecting action completed as of April 21, 2006—Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2006		2006–2010 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	−23	−24	−57	−64
Difference	−23	−24	−57	−64
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	100	100	500	500
Current Level	−12	−25	28	33
Difference	−112	−125	−472	−467
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	100	100	2,000	2,000
Current Level	1,141	981	2,283	2,240
Difference	1,041	881	283	240
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	2,210	2,210	3,356	3,356
Difference	2,210	2,210	3,356	3,356
Government Reform:				
Allocation	50	50	50	50
Current Level	−1	−1	0	0
Difference	−51	−51	−50	−50
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	−25	−25	−27	−27
Difference	−25	−25	−27	−27
Judiciary:				
Allocation	6	6	6	6
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−6	−6	−6	−6
Resources:				
Allocation	8	8	50	50
Current Level	0	2	1	3
Difference	−8	−6	−49	−47
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	3,027	0	4,107	0
Current Level	4,445	662	37,375	1,521
Difference	1,418	662	33,268	1,521
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	350	346	1,537	1,914
Current Level	705	720	311	373
Difference	355	374	−1,226	−1,541

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of November 2, 2005 (H. Rpt. 109–264)		Current level reflecting action completed as of April 21, 2006		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	17,088	18,691	17,031	18,747	−57	56
Defense	403,280	372,696	393,131	406,132	−10,149	33,436
Energy & Water Development	30,495	30,273	30,495	30,696	0	423
Foreign Operations	20,937	25,080	20,937	25,213	0	133
Homeland Security	30,846	33,233	30,846	33,184	0	−49
Interior-Environment	26,159	27,500	26,159	28,760	0	1,260
Labor, HHS & Education	142,514	143,802	142,514	143,848	0	46
Legislative Branch	3,804	3,804	3,804	3,809	0	5
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	44,143	81,634	44,143	41,803	0	−39,831
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	57,854	58,856	57,854	58,537	0	−319
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	65,900	120,837	66,518	121,433	618	596
Unassigned	0	430	0	0	0	−430
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	843,020	916,836	833,432	912,162	−9,588	−4,674

STATEMENT OF FY2007 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 401 OF H. CON. RES. 95—REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF APRIL 21, 2006

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority
Appropriate Level	23,158
Current Level:	
Elk Hills	0
Employment and Training Administration	2,463
Education for the Disadvantaged	7,383
School Improvement	1,435
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	1,389
Special Education	5,424
Vocational and Adult Education	791
Payment to Postal Service	73
Section 8 Renewals	4,200

	Budget Authority
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	0
Total	23,158
Current Level over (+) / under (−) Appropriate Level	0

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2006.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2006 budget and is current through April 3, 2006. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report). This is my first report of the second session of the 109th Congress.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,
Acting Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF APRIL 3, 2006

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,607,180
Permanents and other spending legislation [1]	1,354,569	1,313,097	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	1,333,823	1,323,802	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−479,958	−479,958	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	2,208,434	2,156,941	1,607,180
Enacted this session:			
Katrina Emergency Assistance Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–176)	250	250	0
An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act for the Low-income Energy Assistance program for 2006 (P.L. 109–204)	1,000	750	0
Total, enacted this session:	1,250	1,000	0
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	−72,018	−747	n.a.
Total Current Level [1 2 3]	2,137,666	2,157,194	1,607,180
Total Budget Resolution	2,144,384	2,161,420	1,589,892
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	17,288
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	6,718	4,226	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2006–2010:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	9,176,059
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	9,080,006
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	96,053
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

1. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–171) was enacted early in this session of Congress, but is shown under "enacted in previous sessions" as requested by the Budget Committee. Included in current level for P.L. 109–171 are $980 million in budget authority and −$4,847 million in outlays.

2. Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes the following amounts:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Emergency requirements enacted in previous session	74,981	112,423	−7,111
Katrina Emergency Assistance Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–176)	−250	0	0
National Flood Insurance Enhanced Borrowing Authority Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–208)	2,275	2,275	0
Total, enacted Emergency requirements:	77,006	114,698	−7,111

3. Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are also off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

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 OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it is to be back in front of my colleagues talking about items that are of such remarkable importance to us across our United States. We have been away for 2 weeks now at home on a district work period, and it is my privilege to come on back and take this leadership hour. I thank the leadership for allowing me to spend a few moments with some of my colleagues to talk about an issue that has really come to the fore in the past couple of weeks. But first I want to just introduce the Official Truth Squad once again.

The Official Truth Squad, many folks know, began with a group of Republican freshmen Congressmen and -women who said after about 6 months here in Washington that, well, you know, there seems to be a tone or a tenor to the debate here that is not productive, and there seems to be a lot of personal animosity that is getting in the way of solving the remarkable challenges that we have here in our Nation.

So we thought it was appropriate, because oftentimes when the anger and the emotion get greatest, that is when truth flies out the window, we thought it was appropriate to form this Official Truth Squad. What we try to do is to come before the House of Representatives almost every night when we are in session and to talk about particular issues that are of importance to the American people and talk about them in a way that hopefully is a little more positive, a little more enthusiastic about the solutions to the challenges that we have before us as a Nation, but grounded in truth, because if you don't talk about truth, you can't get to the right solutions. Everybody knows that.

We have been very, very pleased with the response that we have had really across the Nation, because one of the things we were so disturbed by was the general level of politics, of what I call the politics of division. The politics of division are tried and true, and they occur when people pit one group in our society against another and make it so that you have got to be for one and against another, and you can't be for both. It just really makes it difficult to solve problems when you have that kind of rhetoric going on.

There was a gentleman that kind of put it all in perspective a little over 100 years ago, the Reverend William Boetcker, who was a public speaker and a leader of the day back at the turn of the 20th century, the 19th to the 20th century. One of his heroes was

Abraham Lincoln, and he attempted to crystallize what he thought would be Abraham Lincoln's philosophy on social discourse in different sectors of society.

I find it helpful always to look back at this quote, and I will share it with the House this evening, Mr. Speaker. This is a quote: ''You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift; you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer; you cannot encourage the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred; you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.''

Really, I think that crystallizes what ought to be the American philosophy, because we are all in this boat together. We have all of these challenges that we must face together, and truly there are not necessarily Republican solutions or Democrat solutions, but there are American solutions. But unless we work together, we really won't be able to get to the right solutions.

As I mentioned, we have all been home for the past 2 weeks on our district work period. I have had an opportunity to meet with so many constituents across the Sixth District of Georgia, and I know that my colleagues have talked with their constituents and their friends and neighbors at home.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that one of the most important issues that is now confronting us as a Nation is the issue of energy prices, gas prices at the pump. We have seen a significant increase over the past number of weeks and months, and I think it is important when we talk about this issue, especially to talk about truth.

I thought I would begin just by sharing, everybody knows what the gas price is in their community. They range from, in my hometown it was $2.89 when I drove to the airport this morning for a gallon of gasoline. It goes down in some areas of the Nation to $2.40, $2.50. In some areas it is up in the high $3s.

Because we are interested in the truth here, I thought it would be helpful to share what some of the prices are around the world in other Western nations. What are these nations paying? This is what they were paying 2 weeks ago, the latest numbers we have. Belgium, $6.10 for a gallon of gas; France, $5.00 for a gallon of gas; Germany, $5.96 for a gallon of gas; Italy, $5.91 for a gallon of gas; the Netherlands, $6.73 for a gallon of gas; and the United Kingdom, Great Britain, $6.13 for a gallon of gas. At the same time in the United States, $2.88 on average for a gallon of gas.

That sounds like a lot of money, and indeed it is, but when we compare it to the rest of the world, which is the truth about this situation, it is extremely important that we talk about these numbers in a way that allows the American people to have as much information as possible when it comes to the issue of gasoline prices and energy prices. Otherwise, we are all just getting up here giving our opinion.

This brings me to the favorite quote of the Official Truth Squad, and that comes from a former Senator from the State of New York, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who used to say, ''Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts.''

Mr. Speaker, that is so true about this issue and so many others, because unless we are talking about facts, unless we are talking about the truth, we can't get to the right solutions. So I would encourage my colleagues across the House to remember this when we are dealing with issues, especially as important as those that relate to energy prices and gasoline prices.

We are going to talk tonight about how we got to where we are, where are we, what the situation is and what kinds of things the United States and this Congress is doing in a positive and productive way to solve the challenges that we have in the area of energy.

I will be joined by a number of colleagues. First I am joined by a great friend and colleague from Tennessee, the Congresswoman from Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, who has been an incredible leader in our conference about so many areas, including the economy. She participated in small business, and just brings a wealth of experience and information to the table. I know that she has some thoughts to share with us tonight on the issue of energy and gas prices.

I welcome you this evening.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership on the issue. As you were saying, we are all in this boat together when we look at the energy issue and look at not only the fuel for our cars, but for our homes, how we generate electricity, how we address the energy needs of a booming economy, how we address the energy needs of a growing population.

As you said so very well, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue, this is an American issue, and we need to go back and let history be a great teacher for us on this issue. How did we get to this point? This issue didn't just happen last week or last month or even last year. This is something that has been growing for a period of time. I really look at it as something that has been coming together over the past 30 years, when we look at what has happened with this.

If we go back to the mid-70s, a good start date to take for the sake of discussion on this issue is 1976. The reason we go back to 1976, Carter was President then and that was the last year that we had a refinery built in this country. That was the last year in which a new refinery, oil or gas refinery, was built on U.S. soil.

What we saw happen was an increase in regulation from the EPA and from OSHA and different environmental groups and different demands that environmental groups would place on creating or developing a new refinery or going out and exploring for oil or gas or developing new technologies to extract oil and gas to bring forward for the refining process.

Since 1976, we have seen layer upon layer upon layer of mandates, of rules, of regulations, that have made it very, very difficult to bring forward new technologies so that we can meet the energy needs of this Nation.

□ 2045

So that we are meeting the energy needs of this Nation. Great for instance. When you inventory what we had on line with refineries in 1981, there were 324 oil and gas refineries in this country in 1981. Today there are 148 refineries; 148 refineries. And, you know, the last refinery that went up in this country was out in Yuma, Arizona. It took 5 years and 4 months to get through the permitting process to put that refinery in place.

So we see that what we have done is to put in place a process where we have fewer refineries that are working, and fewer refineries to actually process the oil and gas that we need. Now at the same time our population is growing, we have more cars on the road, and we have more houses. Home ownership is at an all-time high.

We need to be processing 21 million barrels of oil a day. We have the capacity to refine 17 million barrels of oil a day. So what we have is a very tight supply line, and it is difficult for us to meet those needs with the current infrastructure that is in existence.

What we have to do also is couple those facts of fewer refineries and making it very difficult to do exploration and development. Now, you know, and I will tell you, the liberals on this issue need to realize the double-talk ought to stop. The double-talk needs to stop because you cannot have it both ways.

You do want oil and gas, but then you do not want the prices to be high, but you do not want to go drill in ANWR, you do not want to inventory the Outer Continental Shelf, and you do not want to extract any of those gas deposits that are there, and heaven knows, let us not go drill in the West. And that is what we have the tendency to hear.

But at the same time, they are saying gas is too high, we need to immediately move to alternative fuels. But then they say, you are not doing enough for alternative fuels, but the gas prices are too high. And, you know, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is that kind of double-talk that makes it very difficult to sit down and work out a solution to this that is going to help us with this issue.

And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I look at this with the fewer refineries, with the lack of exploration and development, Hurricanes Rita and Katrina taking fully 25 percent of our refineries off line, and what you have is the perfect storm of an energy crisis. And at

the same time that is happening, we are switching from the MTBE to ethanol.

There are some supply line problems with the distributors there. And, yes, this has been a very difficult week. And I am like most persons. I go to fill up my car, and I just, you know, gasp at the price. And I think, my goodness, this is not what we are used to. This is not what we have planned for. This is not what we have budgeted for. It is so expensive.

And I held town hall meetings, as you were saying, as the gentlemen from Georgia was saying, visiting with my constituents. And you talk to those who are on the school boards who are saying, you know, it is costing more to run buses, and you talk to those who are running their county governments. They are saying, our supply costs and our fuel costs are going up.

And it says, yes, indeed we need to do something. And I think it is very important that we realize that there are some things we can do in the short term. There are some things that we will do that will affect the midrange, and then we need to be very conscious as we look at a long-range plan, and as we look at working toward an energy independence day.

And, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the gentleman from Georgia in returning another night to talk a bit more about energy independence day and how we would get there and what that would look like.

And I think that as we look at this issue, we know legislatively there are some things that we can do and have done. We have passed the Energy Policy Act from the committee where I hold a seat, Energy and Commerce. And we first passed that piece of legislation in 2001, and it languished across the dome with our friends in the Senate. And finally this past June we were able to get that signed into law and passed to put $8 billion on to alternative fuels development, to simplify some the permitting process so that it is easier for those refineries to stand up and begin processing the fuels that we need.

You know, there is another piece of legislation, the Gas Act, that we passed after Katrina took place, and that is the piece of legislation we passed in this body on a 212–210 vote. It would federalize and put in place Federal penalties for price gouging. Unfortunately we did not have any help from our friends across the aisle on that. And we felt it was important to put in place, to federalize price gouging. Now, that piece of legislation that we passed is sitting in the Senate. The liberals are holding it up. It is time for us to pass this.

I yield to the gentlemen from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I have got a number of posters about what, in essence, is the double-talk that you raise. Our good friends on the other side of the aisle, the liberals on the other side of the aisle, tend to talk one way, and then they vote another.

I just wanted to highlight the one you just mentioned, because this Gas Act is so remarkably important for energy independence for our Nation. It was roll call vote 519. This is what the Truth Squad is all about, bringing you information, facts that you might not be able to have otherwise. Roll call vote 519 in 2005, the Gas Act. Every single Democrat voted no. Every single one voted no, which just crystallizes that double-talk that you highlighted so very, very well.

I yield back.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman will yield. Yes, this is one of the things, and let us continue to look at this poster. You know, do we care more about caribou in ANWR, or do we want to come into an area that is an enormously large area and go into an area land-mass-wise that is about the size of the State of South Carolina, and go into an area that is about the size of the Atlanta airport and drill, and go in on ice roads during the winter and drill?

You know, I mentioned that we need 21 million barrels of oil a day, and that we have the capacity for 17 million. In that field in the North Atlantic Wildlife Refuge, that field would yield as much as 1 million barrels a day. So I think that this is the time when we have to say, where are our priorities? And how are we going to use the fossil fuels that we have while we try to wean ourselves from foreign oil, and while we develop alternative sources, and as we look at this electric power generation?

I was in another State in a coastal area with one of our colleagues, and we were going across a bridge. I had been speaking in one area, and we were going to the other for a speech. And there were two power plants on either side of this bridge out in this bay. And as I looked out there, I said, oh, are these on hydroelectric power? What are we using? What is the source here? Is it wind? Is it water?

One was burning coal; the other was burning oil and gas. You know, you have to say, if they are both using fossil fuels, why are we doing that and not being good stewards of our fossil fuels and using all of those other natural resources that we have?

So this is a time for us to say, let us be very thoughtful, let us learn some lessons from what has happened over the past 30 years. Let us look at what happens when you give environmental groups the say over how you are going to develop your energy policy. When you say we are going to work day in and day out, and we are going to keep you from drilling, let us look at the lessons that we have learned and what ends up happening in the long run.

And as we look at conservation and preserving efforts, which will help us with the short-term fix, when we look at the legislative efforts that will help us in the midterm and the long term, let us be very, very mindful that every piece of legislation that we pass is going to have some consequences whether intended or unintended, and we need to be very mindful of that.

With that I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her perspective and a cogent laying out of exactly what this situation is that we have right now, how we have gotten into this situation, and what sort of alternatives that we have.

And your statement about things beginning 30 years ago is so appropriate, because this did not happen overnight. We find ourselves in this situation now because of the policies of past Congresses, policies of past administrations, and the action of so many folks that brought us to this point right now.

And it is not going to be fixed overnight, but we are well on our way. We want to assure the American people that we are well on our way to making it so that we are energy independent. I appreciate your presentation so much.

I do want to highlight a couple of our items that were discussed as we move forward with the Official Truth Squad and talk about energy policy and gas prices. So much of the discussion that you have heard by some of our friends on the other side are talking about, in fact it has been this evening in the well and earlier today in the well, and they talk immediately about their solution, which is always to either put a cap on something or to tax something. And you have got to listen carefully, because sometimes the language is couched. But price controls or a windfall profit tax we have heard bandied about, increase the taxes. But the truth is that that action would be extremely detrimental. And I say that with all sincerity, pointing to the Official Truth Squad poster.

And folks will say, well, how do you know that? Well, we know that because of history. And history has a tendency to repeat itself unless you learn from it. And there is great history that we have, and it is not that long ago. There is a wonderful policy primer that was put out by the Cato Institute in Washington. It has got great information about what they call the case against oil price controls and windfall profit taxes, and they do so in a very academic and appropriate way by citing the information that we have available to us just a generation ago. And I want to read some of the information that was presented in this. And I will quote from it a number of different times.

One of the broad conclusions that they make is that, quote, free markets are more efficient than controlled markets. And goods and services are more available and less expensive in free markets as opposed to controlled markets.

So restricting product prices for profit opportunities invariably reduces investment in conservation and new supply. Now, that may seem counterintuitive, but if you restrict the opportunity for our system to work, our market system to work, our free market system to work, if you restrict that in certain ways, then what happens is that people say, well, I will not invest in new forms of energy. I will not invest in the new opportunity to find more oil. I will not invest in things that will declare our dependence on foreign oil. I will go invest in something elsewhere if the government is not involved. And it actually decreases supply. And we had a very clear example of that in the 1970s and the 1980s when price controls were enacted by this Government, and when the windfall profit tax was in place between 1980 and 1988.

There was an economist, Joseph Kalt, who, in 1981, a Harvard economist, I do not often quote a Harvard economist, Mr. Speaker, but I will tell you that he has some sage advice for us. And Kalt studied the price controls that were enacted in the 1970s, and he drew these conclusions.

He stated that price controls and the incentive to import created by the entitlement program reduced the incentive to bring new domestic oil to market. These are the things being considered on the other side of the aisle right now, and being touted as the be-all and end-all.

Kalt calculated as a result, domestic production was .3 to 1.4 million barrels per day lower, lower than it would have been otherwise. Clear example that price controls do not work.

In spite of that fact, clearly a demonstration, truthful demonstration, of what happens when you restrict that market.

Another quote, a few observations about the price control experience of the 1970s jumped out at the analysts. First, price controls are simply ideas in theory, but they are extremely complicated exercises in practice.

□ 2100

Second, a tremendous amount of political pressure inevitably arises under price control regimes to provide regulatory benefits to favorite producers at the expense of less-favored producers, thus distorting markets even further.

Third, price controls have unintended consequences and often exacerbate the problems they ostensibly are designed to address.

Again, if you want to tell what the future is going to be, and you want to enact policies that have been tried in the past, then it is a pretty good bet that if you look at the consequences of the policies that were tried in the past, that you can tell what the future is going to be. Hopefully we want to look in a sober way at the policies that were enacted in the past so that we can determine whether or not we want, in fact, to go down that same path.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that going down that same path for price controls and windfall profit tax, which sound wonderful, I mean they really do. I mean, you say we ought not to be having to pay that much at the gas pump. If we are paying that much, then somebody else is just making too much money.

The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that the policies of price controls and windfall profit tax don't have their intended effect. They don't result in a decrease in price significantly, and they significantly decrease the amount of availability, which then indeed drives up prices even more.

The conclusion of this treatise on price controls and windfall profit tax is very telling and, I think, very instructive. It goes as follows. The observation that price controls induce scarcity and impose net losses on the economy is as uncontroversial among economists as are observations about gravity among physicists. Let me read that again. Sometimes you can get lost in really the magnitude of a statement like that, but I think it is important, and it is very instructive for us as a Congress, for us as a Nation. The observation that price controls induce scarcity and impose net losses on the economy is as uncontroversial among economists as are observations about gravity among physicists.

He goes on to say the experience of the 1970s further suggests that price controls may not even achieve their stated goal of reducing consumer prices. Intervention in oil markets historically has improved the welfare of politically popular market actors, primarily small independent oil producers and small refinery owners rather than the welfare of consumers.

Whether politicians intended that to be the case is unclear. Regardless, if wealth distribution is the rationale for price controls and windfall profit taxes, general individual and corporate income taxes are certainly less costly and more equitable than sector-specific market intervention.

Now, people often support price controls and windfall profit taxes because they don't believe that oil producers have a moral right to higher-than-normal earnings. Mr. Speaker, how often have we heard that the last 2 weeks, that these profits are immoral? I heard it, certainly heard it. I heard it from the other side of the aisle.

He goes on there somehow there is a widespread sentiment that it is somehow wrong for owners to profit when exogenous events greatly inflate the value of commodities that they own. Yet those who hold that opinion don't oppose windfall capital gains for homeowners. In fact the public tends to cheer rising home prices and reacts to falling home prices as a problem to be solved.

Now, why is it morally wrong for some parties but not others to periodically earn windfall profits is a mystery that we cannot solve. That is the writers of this paper.

Regardless of the moral issues involved, Federal efforts to take excess profits from oil companies whether via price controls or excise taxes are bad public policies. They fail to achieve their proximate aim, which is to reduce prices paid by retail consumers, but do manage to reduce supply, increase imports and impose steep costs on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you, those comments, that statement, that conclusion of history, which is truth based upon what happened, is extremely telling. They fail to achieve their proximate aim, which is to reduce prices paid by retail consumers, so they don't decrease the prices. They don't decrease the prices.

If you put price controls on, and you put in place what is euphemistically called a windfall profit tax, it doesn't decrease the price. What it does do is it manages to reduce supply, increase imports and impose steep costs on the economy.

I don't know that there is a more clear evidence that moving in the direction of price controls or windfall profit taxes would just be the wrong thing to do, wrong for the economy, wrong for consumers, wrong for my constituents, wrong for the American people. I am hopeful that my colleagues will be mindful of the information that we have available to us about past actions.

I also want to just point out that when you hear people talk about how it is, quote, immoral, unquote, for somebody to earn that kind of profit, please harken back, harken back to the politics of division that I mentioned before, that the philosophy that was felt to be that of Abraham Lincoln and those who had a sensibility about how we as a society ought to move forward, and remember what he said. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. That is oh so true, Mr. Speaker.

I do also want to cite one other portion of this treatise. You have heard a lot of people talk about price fixing or collusion between oil companies for the cost of gasoline at the pump. This is a citation in this paper, but it is very telling because it is a nonpolitical arm of the government talking, and it is independent individuals who drew these conclusions.

The conclusion that they drew is significant. We are unaware of any governmental investigation since the formation of the OPEC cartel that has found evidence of price fixing or collusion in U.S. gasoline markets. The Federal Trade Commission concludes that, quote, the vast majority of the FTC's investigations have revealed market factors to be the primary drivers of both price increases and price spikes. Those investigations, it should be noted, were undertaken by both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Mr. Speaker, I am so disturbed when I go home and I hear people at home talk about the inability of Congress to get together and solve problems. What

I say to them is that the level of demagogy on the part of many here is very disturbing, and it does a disservice to us all.

Again, these aren't Republican problems, they aren't Democrat problems, they are American problems, they are American challenges. We solve them best if we solve them together. I urge my colleagues to work together to not throw around the kind of language that we have already heard again today by others, because it is destructive, doesn't help.

What is the problem? Now, my good friend from Tennessee alluded to much of the problem, and I want to refer to a number of things that she said. I want to remind folks, though, about The Official Truth Squad favorite quote, and that is, again, because we are going to talk about facts now, that is from Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who said, everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but you are not entitled to your own facts. Let's talk about some facts. Let's talk about why gas prices are high now.

You will hear a lot of folks conjecture and throw around things that they say are the reason that gas prices are so high. But I think there are, there are five or six general areas that can be distilled as to addressing why gasoline prices now are at the level that they are.

Remembering though, Mr. Speaker, that gas prices in other nations, other Western nations, are significantly greater. Remember the U.K., $6.13 for a gallon of gasoline; Germany, $5.96 for a gallon of gasoline; Belgium, $6.10 for a gallon of gasoline. But why are gas prices at an average of $2.88 in the United States?

There are a number of reasons. First reason that can be clearly pointed out is that we are in that time of year where we are changing gasoline blends, and this change disrupts the supply chain. What happens is that between winter and summer, the seasonal blends traditionally cause spikes at this time of year in gas prices. We are fond of saying at home, we have been for the past number of years, you hear people say, well, it is time for summer vacation, so they will crank up the prices again. But what is happening is there is a different formula of gasoline, the season blend of gasoline that is used in the summer, as opposed to the winter. That cost, just that shift to that different blend, causes some increase in price.

Also, the Energy Policy Act that we passed in 2005 ends the federally mandated oxygenate requirement for some gasoline blends beginning on May 5. Fearing an exposure to MTBE lawsuits, Mr. Speaker, fearing an exposure to MTBE lawsuits, refiners are, instead, turning to ethanol, and that is causing a significant increase in the cost of gasoline.

I will say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that there are three things that consistently drive up the cost of doing any business and providing increased cost to the bottom line for a service or a product. You know what these are well, Mr. Speaker. They are taxation, they are litigation, and they are regulation.

My good friend from Tennessee earlier talked about a lot of the regulatory challenges that we have in the area of energy policy that make it so that the cost of gasoline is higher than it ought to be. But what you just heard is that there are oil companies that because of the true threat of litigation have changed their formulation to include ethanol instead of MTBE. That cause, that threat of litigation, has caused a significant increase in the cost of gasoline, the addition of ethanol that they are using in place of the MTBE. Information agency estimates that the switch from MTBE to ethanol is responsible for an additional 5 cents a gallon in cost. Remember, that is a switch that much of which is brought about because of the risk of litigation.

Now, there are also tariffs on ethanol imports. So more intervention has resulted in tariffs on ethanol imports, which companies say they are relying on in greater quantities, and that those tariffs add 54 cents a gallon to a gallon of ethanol. Reports forecast that we might need an additional $2 billion of ethanol this year alone.

Mr. Speaker, 2 billion gallons of ethanol, 54 cents a gallon, an extra $0.05 a gallon for the switch. Mr. Speaker, that looks to me like something over $1 billion. That has got to be made up. So that is driving the cost.

Now, that is truth. Changing the gasoline blends, the addition of ethanol, those are two specific areas that have resulted in a marked increase in the price of gasoline at the pump.

Now, we can talk all we want about price controls and windfall profit taxes and the like, but they will not affect either of those costs at all. Not at all. In fact, they will decrease the supply if we adopt any of those, quote, solutions.

What is another reason that the price of gas is up right now? Gulf coast disruption. Tight supplies mean even one unscheduled refinery shutdown with can drive up gasoline prices; 22.3 percent of gulf coast oil production is still shut down from the hurricanes of last fall, 22.3 percent of gulf coast oil production is still shut down. That results in about over 300,000 fewer barrels of domestic oil available to Americans on any given day. So we have got some factual reasons why the price of gasoline at the pump is significantly increased.

What else? World supply and demand. Supply and demand. Our need for oil has grown, but we face new competition from other markets, particularly India and China, significantly increased economies. Their increase in economic viability is positive for the world, results in increased opportunities for all in the world, but they have a significant increase in demand for oil.

Our domestic production and our refining capacity haven't kept up. The gentlewoman from Tennessee earlier talked about the lack of any new refinery in our Nation coming on line in the last 30 years. It is phenomenal, Mr. Speaker, it is phenomenal.

□ 2115

It is not right. And that has been a result of significant policies that have increased regulation, have increased the threat of litigation, and taxes have been so significant so that they haven't brought new refineries on line. Those kinds of things do not happen overnight. They do not happen overnight. And these problems haven't happened overnight.

We are not functioning in a vacuum either. It is not like you can order crude oil from one place in the world and expect it to always be there. Threats of supply reduction from Nigeria, Iran, and Venezuela have also caused crude oil prices to rise. So there is some real certain truthful reasons why the price of gas is what it is right now, not some conjecture. You don't have to make anything up. There is real evidence as to why the price of gas is what it is.

Fifth. Lack of domestic oil production. Here is one that really irks many folks in my district. They say, we've got gasoline available, we've got oil available right under our own Nation and within our own properties and off our own shores that can be obtained with great respect for the environment, that can be obtained safely, so why on Earth doesn't Congress enact the opportunity to be able to get that oil?

We are going to need much more oil before we ever kick our dependence on it, without a doubt. But, unfortunately, current law leaves nearly 100 billion barrels of oil out of reach to Americans. Out of reach to Americans. It is American oil. It is an American resource. And until that changes, American families will continue to pay more than they should for gasoline.

At a time when we import most of our crude oil and, increasingly, gasoline, these restrictions also undermine the Nation's security and prop up authoritarian regimes around the world. I will tell you, my folks at home are fed up. They say, look, we've got to, as a government, make certain that we can utilize the resources that we have.

And, finally, Washington inaction. Now that is something that probably is as true for this as it is for many, many other areas; but these problems, as I mentioned, took decades to develop and to come about. Most folks don't remember that 10 years ago this Congress passed the opportunity to utilize some of those resources that I mentioned and that President Clinton vetoed, vetoed the opportunity to, in an environmentally safe way, take care or utilize the resources that we have available to us in Alaska.

That is a fact. That is the truth. That is the truth. And that is what we

are here tonight to talk about, is the truth behind why gas prices are where they are and what the solution is. So by way of summary, the gas prices are significant and high, higher today than they have been in the past for a variety of reasons. Changing gasoline blends, the addition of ethanol, disruption down on the gulf coast, world supply and demand, lack of our own domestic oil production, and then Washington inaction. Bureaucratic Washington inaction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that has been helpful to my colleagues listening and those folks listening around the Nation as we talk about the extreme importance of addressing an issue that during our 2 weeks home I heard an awful lot about.

I am pleased to be joined by a number of colleagues, and now I would like to introduce a good friend and colleague, a member of the freshman class, a member of the Official Truth Squad, Congresswoman VIRGINIA FOXX from North Carolina. She has a great background of study, and I have always been impressed with her ability to crystallize an issue and to do the due diligence on how we got to a situation, how we arrived at a problem and what the solution is.

I look forward to her comments this evening on the issue of energy and gasoline prices, and I yield to Congresswoman VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Congressman PRICE. I appreciate very much again your leadership in bringing the information from the Truth Squad here to the floor of the House and am pleased to join you and Congresswoman BLACKBURN tonight to talk about energy prices.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats sure do like to have their cake and eat it too. Over and over again they complain about something and then turn right around and oppose any commonsense solutions offered by Republicans. I think you have done a good job of talking about some of the issues related to the high price of gasoline. None of us likes to pay a high price for gasoline, and those of us who are Members of Congress who have large districts probably are affected by it as much as a lot of the average Americans are because of our ability to get out in the districts and travel and visit with our constituents.

But Democrats have a way of talking about things and doing something differently. They are giving us a hard time now about the high price of gasoline. They talk about the deficit, they whine about the deficit, but they vote against slowing the growth of spending. They complain about the President's plan in Iraq, but they offer no alternatives. They say we need to increase border security, but they vote against the bills that would do just that. The list goes on and on.

The Democrats' latest case of hypocrisy is that they hold a press conference to complain about our rising energy prices, even though their actions have contributed directly to the problem. For a party that claims it is looking out for the best interests of the American people, it has a funny way of showing it.

For decades the Democrats have fought to stop production of all forms of energy. They voted against increasing domestic energy supplies, which would not only lower prices but create more jobs here at home. They have opposed Republican efforts to lessen the tax burden at the pump. They have opposed nuclear energy and renewable fuels. They have opposed cracking down on price gouging.

Republicans have been working hard, Mr. Speaker, to address rising energy prices, but all the Democrats do is vote ''no,'' and we don't think that ''no'' is an energy policy. Democrats have traditionally, again, and consistently opposed all GOP efforts to increase domestic energy production. For nearly three decades environmental extremists and their liberal allies in Congress have fought to halt production of all forms of energy. In fact, Democrat obstructionists have repeatedly voted against Republican efforts to increase domestic supply, encourage innovation and technology advancement, and lower the tax burden Americans pay at the pump.

Let me talk a little bit about the specifics on that. Five times Democrats have had a chance to vote for comprehensive energy reform for programs to expand the use of nuclear energy and renewable fuels, and five times they said no. And this is just in recent years.

July 25, 2005, H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, on agreeing to the conference report. It passed the House by a recorded vote of 275–256, but 124 Democrats voted ''no.''

June 15, 2004, H.R. 4503, Energy Policy Act of 2004, on passage, 152 Democrats voted ''no.'' It passed by 244–178.

November 18, 2003, H.R. 6, Energy Conservation Research and Development, on agreeing to the conference report, 154 Democrats voted ''no.''

So they have consistently voted ''no'' on issues that would help us increase the energy supply.

We think that folks need to ask the minority leader some questions about rising gas prices and her record on that, and the Democrats' record on it. They have fashioned an abysmal record on energy issues that are important to the American public, yet now they have the temerity to complain about the strain of rising gas prices.

Here are some questions that need to be asked. In the face of rising gas prices for working families, why have you and your Capitol Hill Democrats consistently opposed measures designed to increase the supply of American energy?

With world energy prices rising because of increased demand, why did 124 of your House Democrats vote against the energy bill in 2005 to encourage the expansion of clean nuclear energy supplies?

Question number three that could be asked: In the face of rising gas prices for Americans, why did 196 of your House Democrats vote against the 2005 energy bill that would have streamlined the process of refinery expansion and construction that is so critical to the future of America's energy infrastructure?

Question number four: With gas prices for working Americans on the rise, why do you oppose major labor organizations, such as the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, who actively petitioned the Congress to increase domestic energy supplies to create jobs for their workers?

And last but not least, the fifth question: In the face of rising gas prices for working families, why do you and the Democrats continue to vote ''no'' on every responsible proposal that would put Americans to work producing more of our own American energy to lower prices?

Again, the Democrats want to have it both ways. They want to talk about the problem and put it off on us, but they want to avoid coming up with a way to solve the problem. We need to ask these questions of the Democrats and put them on the spot about why gas prices are so high.

They are responsible for it, because they have refused to allow us to come up with ways to provide alternative energy. I hope Americans will write their Members of Congress, particularly the Democrats, and say to them: Why are you doing this? Why do you want gas prices to be so high and hurt working Americans?

Congressman PRICE, I think I am going to let you tidy up this session, since you have done such a great job of it, and thank you for letting me be a part of it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you, Congresswoman FOXX, so very much for your wonderful observations and really astute observations about many of the challenges that we have and bringing some truth to this issue of gasoline prices and why we are in the situation that we are in right now.

As we have talked about, this isn't a Republican problem or a Democrat problem; it is an American problem. And so we work best when we work together to solve these problems. So I encourage friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make certain that as we move forward with this situation that we work together. Political demagoguery and casting aspersions on either side is just not helpful to the solution.

Now, we have reviewed the clamor that we have heard out there currently for price controls and windfall profit taxes and those kinds of things that we have demonstrated clearly don't work. Remember, the truth is that they do not work and we know that because of the history.

We have also talked about what has resulted in the situation that we are

in, why our gas prices are high. We have reviewed the items that have brought about the situation that we currently find ourselves in.

I thought it would be helpful to at this point very briefly talk about what has been done, because a lot has been done. Again, these problems that we have and the challenges that we have are a product of decades of activity that have put us in this situation, so these aren't going to be solved overnight. And anybody that says that they have the solution to bringing down gas prices right now is just not being truthful with the American people. And I think it is important to say that, because the truth is that the solution to this will happen over time, and it will happen by a number of things: increased production, conservation, alternative fuels, and all sorts of things.

I want to just share with you, Mr. Speaker, some of the things that have already been enacted. The Gasoline For America's Security Act of 2005 was passed, as was the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 had some very specific items in it. It strengthens current supply. Strengthens current supply. It allows for new domestic oil and gas exploration and development. It requires the Department of the Interior to inventory oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf to enable the Federal Government to better assess the extent of these resources.

Again, when I go home, I hear people say, why don't you get to work and utilize the resources that we have? The technology is there to be able to do it in a very environmentally friendly way. It is a tough question to answer.

□ 2130

We are moving forward on that, and we need the help of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The Energy Policy Act also encourages building of new refineries and expanding existing refineries. We need to streamline those regulations and decrease the amount of litigation exposure that those refineries have. Remember, we have not brought a new refinery on line in this Nation in 30 years, and we wonder why we are in the situation we are in.

The bill includes $2.9 billion for fossil energy research to ensure more efficient exploration and development of oil, gas and coal, while decreasing the environmental impact of fossil energy production and its use.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 also increases conservation. That is extremely important. Conservation is so important to this solution, and anything we can do as a Nation and as a people to conserve fuel goes right to the bottom line. It improves things immediately.

The bill increases funding to $17.5 million over 5 years to the Department of Transportation to continue its work on improving the CAFE standards which set fuel emission standards for cars and light trucks sold in the United States.

It increases funding to the Department of Energy's Clean Cities Program, provides tax credits for the purchase of hybrid fuel cell advanced clean-burn diesel and other alternative-power vehicles. That is important.

When I talk to groups, I always try to ask how many folks own a hybrid vehicle. At this point only none or one or two folks raise their hand. I am hopeful in a year we will see tens of hundreds of people in my district, or thousands or more across the Nation. The tax credit is up to $3,200 per individual depending on the vehicle. That ought to be a great incentive, and it begins to make hybrid vehicles become competitive with other vehicles that are sold.

The bill also provides a 30 percent credit, up to $30,000, for an investment in alternative fuel refueling stations. A lot of the problem is we do not have many of those stations right now, and it is important to bring those on line.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 also embraces new fuel choices, authorizes $3.7 billion for a hydrogen fuel cell program, and requires 7.5 billion gallons of renewable fuel to be included in all gasoline sold in the United States by 2015.

Many of us are working to try to make certain that we bring that kind of will and enthusiasm to bringing about energy independence for our Nation within the next 10 years.

It includes $3 billion dedicated to developing affordable, efficient, renewable energy technologies and promoting their widespread use.

It promotes clean and renewable fuels by providing incentives for clean coal technology and renewable energy such as biomass, wind, solar and hydroelectricity. It extends the renewable electricity production credit through December 31, 2007, and authorizes the issuance of $800 million of tax credit bonds before December 31, 2007, to support renewable investment in municipal power authorities, rural cooperatives, and others.

I think it is important to talk about those things that we already have done because I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, when you go home and when you talk to your constituents, I know when I go home and I say we have done these things, they say, ''I have never heard about it.'' You are right, people do not hear about these things because they are not mentioned on the nightly news. This Congress does not get any credit for the positive work it is doing on the nightly news. You do not read about it in your newspapers, and you have a portion of individuals in this Chamber who want to down-talk and demagogue every single issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is just not productive. It is not positive. It does a disservice to every individual across this Nation, so I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get together and work to make certain that we can continue to solve the energy challenges that we have as a Nation.

We are blessed to live in a wonderful and a glorious Nation. We are the hope of the world and continue to be a vessel of opportunity for so many people around the world. We do ourselves best when we work together and talk positively about the challenges that we have and positively about the solutions and make it so we can solve those challenges together as opposed to the kinds of difficult conversations that some folks tend to degrade into so quickly.

I urge my colleagues to work together as we move forward on the challenges as they relate to gas prices and energy policy.

I look forward to coming back and joining my colleagues once again for the Official Truth Squad, putting a little truth and positive perspective in front of the United States House of Representatives and the American people.

DEBT AND THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). 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 rise this evening as whip of the 37-member strong fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. I rise this evening on behalf of the Blue Dogs, who are very concerned about this, our Nation's debt, which is $8,353,429,193,726 and some change. That means for every man, woman and child alive in America at this moment, it means their share of the national debt is $28,000. Many of America's priorities will continue to go unmet until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

I plan to spend a good part of this hour discussing the debt and the deficit, but I just heard some things from a group that calls themselves the Official Truth Squad. They had the nerve to come to the floor of the United States House of Representatives and say it is the Democrats that are responsible for $3-a-gallon gasoline at the gas pump. But the best one of all was when they blamed it on former President Clinton. Mr. Speaker, give me a break.

The American people know for the last 5 years and for the first time in 50 years, the Republicans control the White House, the House and the Senate. It is they who have failed to give us an energy policy that will allow us to become less dependent on foreign oil. They know that Democrats like myself have tried time and time again to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

We have a bill in committee, in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, of which I am a member. We have a bill in the committee that mandates 10 percent ethanol in all gasoline and 5 percent biodiesel in all diesel fuel, and yet

the Republican leadership refuses to give us a hearing let alone a vote on this bill that will reduce our dependence on foreign oil. It will create new markets for America's farm families. It will mean that we pay 60 to 70 cents less per gallon at the pump; and yes, it will reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

When we talk about alternative and renewable fuels, don't let anyone tell you that is too futuristic. I am here to tell you if we can strap a four-wheeler on a rocket and shoot it to Mars and control it from NASA's headquarters in Houston, it is American people that did that, and in America we have people with the know-how to create alternative and renewable fuels; not only ethanol and biodiesel, but many other forms that will reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

It was last August, 8 months ago, last August that I went to all 29 counties in my congressional district and called on the President to suspend deliveries to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and I did this because I know it is a short-term solution, and it works. President Bush's daddy did it in 1991, and the price of a barrel of oil dropped $11 overnight. President Clinton did it in 2000, and the price of a barrel of oil dropped $6. My question is why did it take this President 8 months to decide to announce today something I called for him to do last August, and that is to suspend deliveries to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve?

It is 8 months too late, and that means we have lost a number of farm families that will not be back in the business of providing America with a safe and reliable source for food and fiber. If we are not careful, we are going to become just as dependent on foreign countries for our food and fiber as we have for our energy supplies.

So I am very concerned that tonight all we heard from the Republican side of the aisle and this so-called Truth Squad is that it is the Democrats and President Clinton that are responsible for the high prices of gasoline.

Let me say that the American people are sick and tired of the partisan bickering going on the floor of the House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, it should not matter if it is a Democrat or Republican idea; it should only matter if it is a commonsense idea, and does it make sense for the people that send us here to be their voice.

I am going to continue to push for ethanol and biodiesel and other renewable and alternative fuels that will reduce our dependence on foreign oil and bring down the price we pay at the pump because, Mr. Speaker, I represent a very large and rural district where it is not uncommon to travel 50 and 100 miles each way each day to a job. Our working farm families can no longer afford the prices we are seeing at the gas pump.

Mr. Speaker, I am also proud that the President finally today suggested something that I put into a bill last September that the Republican leadership refused to give me a hearing or a vote on, and that is calling on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the big oil companies to determine if what we have been seeing is in any way related to price gouging. I can tell you if it is, the big oil companies responsible for that, they should not be put in the jail, they ought to be put under the jail. Why did it take this President 8 months to heed my call for a Federal Trade Commission investigation and to heed my call to suspend deliveries to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve? I am sure it has something to do with his approval rating now reaching an all-time low of 32 percent.

Now, I wasn't here this evening to discuss energy, but I got a little fired up when the other side of the aisle decided they were going to say it was the Democrats and President Clinton who are responsible for $3-a-gallon gasoline at the pump.

I am joined this evening by a good friend and colleague within the Blue Dog Coalition to talk about the debt and the deficit. He is a real active member of the Blue Dog Coalition, the group of 37 fiscally conservative Democrats, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be on the floor to set the record straight. I, too, heard what the Republicans were just saying. The American people are a lot of things, but they are not fools. They know that the President is a Republican. They know that the Senate is in the hands of the Republicans. They know that this House of Representatives is in the hands of the Republicans. The Republicans are leading the country.

When Democrats were leading this country, at least one of our Presidents, President Truman, said, the buck stops here. Not these. They say the buck stops with the Democrats when we are the minority party. There is not a bill we can get passed here because we are the minority party. It is wrong as wrong can be for the Republicans to point fingers and try to blame the Democrats for this huge increase in prices. This belongs where it ought to be: On the failed policies of the President.

Now, I like the President. I find the President to be a very fine person, and I hold him in great personal esteem, but I totally disagree with his policies. And the people of this country disagree with his policies.

Now let us talk about the truth. We have had the Truth Squad just speak, and I am sort of reminded of this story of a good friend of mine. Her name was Isabella. One day in New York City Isabella had a vision, and so she changed her name to Sojourner Truth. She went all over this country speaking, and everywhere she went, people would ask her about her funny name.

She would say, Let me tell you about my funny name. The Lord gave me ''Sojourner'' so I could travel the world showing the people and speaking to them. But I told the Lord I needed another name, and he gave me ''Truth'' so I could tell the truth to people.

Mr. ROSS, that is what the American people are expecting us to do tonight, to be sojourners of truth and to tell the truth. There is no more burning issue. Yes, we must talk about the deficit, but we have to talk about this gas price. We have to talk about the raising of it because it is what is on the hearts and minds and souls of the American people. They are fed up to here with these huge, gigantic gas spikes and gas prices.

□ 2145

Many people can't even make it. I was just out in my district in Douglas County down on Dorsett Shoals Road this past Sunday. And one of my constituents, a little lady, came out and said, Congressman, please do something about these gas prices. Where is our country headed? Where are we going? Please do something about securing our borders. Where is our country going? I am here to tell you, Mr. ROSS, the American people are very, very concerned about the lack of direction and going in the wrong direction that this country is headed in. Nowhere is it more startling than in these gas prices.

Now, let me bring this to your attention, Mr. ROSS, because this really gets to me. And I want to talk about this for a moment. In this article, I think it was from one of the media, the New York Times or Washington Post. I don't have it correct. But they began to talk about something that brings home the point.

Now, let me preface this by saying, I am a capitalist. I was trained at the best school of business in the world, the citadel of capitalism, the Wharton School of Finance where I got my MBA. Served on the board of directors there for 6 years. So I am a capitalist. I believe in the profit motive. I understand all of that.

But listen to this that we hear about the CEO at Exxon-Mobil. For his efforts, Mr. Lee Raymond, who retired in December, was compensated more than $686 million from 1993 to 2005, according to an analysis done for the New York Times by Brian Foley, an independent compensation consultant. That amounts to $144,573, every day.

Now, I am for profit. But there is a difference between profit and greed, and that is what is upsetting the American people. At a time when we have diminishing oil resources, at a time that the fuel prices are skyrocketing, these oil companies are making huge profits.

Now, all I say is this: Don't we owe it to the American people to ask these executives from these oil companies to come before Congress and explain this to us?

The American people are asking questions. I know your constituents are asking questions: How can it be? And not only that, if we move over to Chairman Ray Irani of Occidental Petroleum, He received $63 million in

total compensation just last year. And over the past 3 years, Irani has reaped more than $135 million.

I am not kicking anybody for making money. This is a free enterprise system. It is a capitalistic system. But we are not dealing with peanuts. We are not dealing with renewable stuff. We are dealing with a life and death, very valuable diminishing resource called oil that we are dependent on, not just for us to make our economy go. It also is the juice that enables us to fight our wars, protect this country. There is a lot at stake with this.

Meanwhile, we want the truth. Here are the facts: the price of gas, while all of these profits are going on, the price of gas has doubled. Profits for big oil and gas companies have quadrupled at the time that gas prices have zoomed up, while American families' incomes have been stagnated.

Many small independent gas stations are reporting that they are being gouged by big oil companies. Now, if they are saying that, shouldn't we investigate? Shouldn't we take a look? That is all that I am saying. I am saying we need to bring the oil industry individuals in and get them under oath to provide us with some answers.

No, this is not a Democrat or Republican situation. It is all of our situation. But I tell you, when they are in charge, it is wrong to blame us.

Mr. ROSS. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia and his thoughts on this energy crisis. And he is right, these oil company executives, I would invite them to come to my district and look into the eyes of farm families that are no longer in business, working families who are having to make difficult decisions about how to spend their money because of the high price of gasoline just to get to and from work.

And yet this administration, this Republican-led Congress continue to tell us that life is getting better. It is getting better for whom? Gasoline prices are up 80 percent. Health care costs are up 50 percent. College costs are up 40 percent, and incomes are down in this country. That concerns me. And as one of the 37 members of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, we understand that all of this is directly related to this, the national debt, which is now $8,053,429,193,726 and some change, which equates to every man, woman and child in America, including the children being born today, their share is $28,000. We call that the debt tax, D-E-B-T. And that is one tax that cannot go away until our Nation gets its fiscal house in order. A lot of people think the deficit doesn't matter, that the debt doesn't matter, that we can simply print more money. That doesn't happen. It doesn't work that way.

Unfortunately, here's how it works. We are borrowing money from the Social Security trust fund, which I am adamantly against. Now, I understand, the first bill I filed as a Member of Congress was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund. Now, I understand why the Republican leadership refused to give me a hearing or a vote on that bill, because the projected deficit for fiscal year 2007 is $348 billion. That is the number you will hear a lot. But the reality is that it is $548 billion. The difference is they are taking the money from the Social Security trust fund with absolutely no provision on how or when that money is going to be paid back.

Now, when I go to the bank to get a loan, my banker asks me how I am going to pay it back, where's the money going to come from to pay it back, and when am I going to pay it back. Our government should be no different. The politicians in Washington should keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund. But, instead, this is what we get.

Forty-five percent of the debt is being borrowed from foreign central banks and foreign investors. Forty-five percent of the deficit is coming from foreigners. In fact, this administration, in the last 6 years, has borrowed more money from foreign central banks and foreign investors in places like China and Japan and South Korea than the previous 42 Presidents combined. And if we are not careful, if we are not careful, those foreigners are going to influence and have an impact and have control of our Nation's monetary policy. And we already see what is happening with interest rates.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSS. I will yield, yes, ma'am.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me just congratulate the Blue Dog Coalition. I have listened to this very articulate explanation, if you will, of the national debt; and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Arkansas and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

I just want to thank you for acknowledging or at least bringing to the attention of the American people the impact of the deficit. Just a reminder that when the Clinton administration left office there was a surplus. And so this issue of the national debt and deficit is crucial.

And I would just simply leave with this thought: I also heard you talk about the gasoline prices and, obviously, there is an enormous range of issues that we need to discuss with that, the ethanol issue and, of course, the strategic petroleum reserve.

But let us remember that the people who are most harmed by where we are today, the deficit and gasoline prices, are hardworking, struggling American families. These are people who get up every day, turn the lights on early and get in their cars to make ends meet. And, frankly, even though the President has offered some suggestions today as it relates to gasoline pricing, I don't think this House should rest a moment until we address this question.

Many people will say, I represent the energy company so I am not here to suggest that there is a single answer. But I think the energy company should come to the table, I think the President needs to have the bully pulpit, if you will, and some relief needs to go directly to mom and pop senior citizen at the gas pump. And I hope, as you continue your discussion this evening, that Americans will understand that Democrats are prepared to fix this horrible debt to protect the Social Security trust fund which is a very important issue, but also respond to the struggling Americans or the needs of fixed-income persons when it comes to this crisis in gasoline pricing. It is not tomorrow, next week; it is now. This Congress needs to stand up and address this question, and they need to do it now. And I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. The gentlewoman from Texas brings up a very interesting point in terms of our energy crisis and how it dovetails with our debt, one of the important points we have got to look at so we can see the dangerous track we are on. Mr. ROSS, you just went through one of the most disturbing facts of our debt and that is the indebtedness that we are in to our foreign investors, borrowing more money from them than all the 42 Presidents combined. But let us look at who they are. Let us look at who they are who are controlling our financial security. They are the very same nations that are controlling our energy security. China and India, on the one hand, Japan, the OPEC countries, the countries in the Middle East, on the other hand. Each of these areas are controlling our debt, and they are controlling our oil.

The United States of America consumes 25 percent of the world's energy. But we produce or have access to just the refining and production capacity of just 5 percent. Put that together with the fact that one thing nobody mentions, not the President, not anybody, but it needs to be mentioned, and that is that why should we be taking this time to plan the future of this great country on a diminishing resource?

Every point, and I bring this to you again, this is a quote from a president, former president of Exxon-Mobil. I talked about the other's salary a minute ago to show the discrepancy. Here's what, 3 years ago, John Thompson, president of Exxon-Mobil said. He said, we estimate that the world's oil production from existing oil fields is declining at an average rate of 6 percent a year. To meet projected demand in 2015, the industry will have to add about 100 million barrels a day in new production. That is equal to 80 percent more than we are producing today, and oil is not a replenishing asset.

That brings me to the issue of where we really need to be planning for the future of this country is not on a diminishing resource of oil that is not

going to be there in the future. We have got to look elsewhere. And I tell you this, Mr. ROSS: if Brazil can take sugar cane and solve their energy crisis and turn it into fuel for their automobiles with ethanol, why in the world can't we do that in America with our corn or with our other biofuel capacities, with our research? We have got the American can-do spirit. The problem is we need to unleash it, and we have got to do it, not depending upon oil that is a diminishing resource, but have the vision, have the courage to look to the future.

And I tell you, surely, if Brazil can solve their problem with using one of their natural replenishable resources of sugar cane to provide their major source of fuel, surely we can do as well as that. And we must do that.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and the fact that our Nation is $8.3 trillion in debt has a direct impact on all of America's priorities, many of which are going unmet today because of this enormous debt. I mean, it is $8.2 trillion, but it is growing by nearly $1 billion a day. We are sending $279 million a day to Iraq, $57 million a day to Afghanistan. This President, in this year's budget, proposes cuts to things like education and student loans to the tune of $2 billion. And yet the same budget, the same budget includes over $200 billion in new tax cuts for those that are primarily earning over $400,000 a year. It is about priorities, and priorities should begin with bringing down the high price of gasoline and diesel fuel; and priorities should begin with reducing our dependence not only on foreign oil but on foreign central banks and foreign investors to fund our government.

□ 2200

The U.S. is becoming increasingly dependent on foreign lenders. Foreign lenders currently hold a total of about $2.174 trillion of our public debt. Compare this to only $23 billion in foreign holdings in 1993.

The top 10 current lenders, countries that this President and this Republican Congress continue to pass tax cuts with money that they are borrowing from these countries: Japan, $668.3 billion. China, you can see here in 2000, and these are based on numbers from the United States Treasury and the United States Census Bureau, the public debt held by China quadruples under President Bush by billions of dollars. In 2000, when the President took office, our government had borrowed $62 billion from China, and in less than 6 years this chart shows that we have now borrowed $257 billion from China. This was printed on February 23, 2006. We cannot get them printed and updated quickly enough because the new number is $262.6 billion. United Kingdom, $244.8 billion. Our Nation has borrowed $97.9 billion from the Caribbean Banking Center. I had never heard of such. Taiwan, $71.6 billion. OPEC nations, $77.6 billion that we have borrowed from them. With the excessive price we pay at the pump, they are getting the profits. They are getting so much in profits on our backs that they are then turning around and lending our Nation money so that these Republicans in Congress can keep borrowing money from OPEC to give their rich buddies a tax cut.

And I would submit to you if you earn over $400,000 a year, you ought to be for this. If you earn less than $400,000 a year, this is not a good deal for you, and it is certainly not fair to your children, who have got to pay this back someday.

Korea, $68.3 billion. Germany, $65.2 billion. Canada, $54.9 billion. And to round out the top 10 list of countries that our Nation has borrowed money from to fund tax cuts, Hong Kong, $48.3 billion.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. The American people are fed up with this, I assure you.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman is so right. The gentleman is so correct on that.

In a moment we are going to be hearing from the cochair for policy for the 37-member-strong fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, and it is interesting what the gentleman from Tennessee is about to present to us. This is a little known report.

And before we get into this, let me just let you know, Mr. Speaker, that every Tuesday night, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, a group of 37 fiscally conservative Democrats, we come to the floor of the United States House of Representatives to talk about the budget, the debt, the deficit, and how this directly impacts America's priorities. And, Mr. Speaker, if you have any questions, comments, or concerns of us, I would encourage you to e-mail us at BlueDogs@mail.house.gov. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage you to e-mail us your thoughts, concerns, or questions to BlueDogs@mail.house.gov.

Very few people in our Nation, in fact, very few people in this Congress, know about this little known report. It is called the Financial Report of the United States Government, and this is the 2005 edition. Very few copies of this report are printed. Very few copies are circulated.

Contrast that, Mr. Speaker, to this: This is the budget of the United States Government. It is delivered with a lot of fanfare to every Member of Congress's office. You always read about it and see it in the newspaper, radio, and television. You hear about it and see it, and this is the budget for fiscal year 2007. The budget of the United States Government, you get an idea of how thick it is. It is a big document, and it is delivered each year to all 435 Members with a lot of fanfare.

This document, however, is delivered only to a handful of people, and it is only delivered to them because the law requires it, but it is a financial report of the United States Government. And here is what is interesting about this report: When we tell you that the deficit for 2005 was $319 billion, that is based on cash-basis accounting. Now, the Financial Report of America, and I believe it was Senator John Glenn that introduced the legislation, Congress requires the Secretary of the Treasury to issue this Financial Report of America using accrual-based accounting. It is this Congress through various laws that require every business in America with revenues over $5 million to use accrual-based accounting. They get in a lot of trouble with the IRS if they do not, and yet our government does not use the accrual accounting method, and our government certainly is bigger than $5 million in revenue every year. Our government uses cash-based accounting. And based on cash-based accounting, the deficit for 2005 was $319 billion.

Maybe the reason this is not widely distributed and not very well known is because when the Financial Report of America issued by President Bush's Secretary of the Treasury, as required by law, uses an accrual-based accounting method, this little document reveals that the true deficit for 2005 was not $319 billion. It was $760 billion. Lord knows we are not trying to make it sound any worse than it already is because at $319 billion it is one of the largest deficits ever in our Nation's history. It is hard now to believe that we had a balanced budget in this country from 1998 to 2000, but we did. And yet under this administration and this Republican-led Congress, we have got the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history for 6 years in a row, and that is based on the cash-based accounting method. And when you look at the accrual accounting method, it is much worse.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, the cochair for policy for the 37-member-strong, fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, Mr. Jim Cooper, who discovered this document. And I yield to him to better explain it to all of us.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Arkansas for yielding and my friend from Georgia for his remarks.

If the gentleman from Arkansas would not mind, I might take that podium because of the easel next to it, because I brought a chart with me tonight.

Mr. ROSS. Please do.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciated the gentleman's remarks because he was exactly on track. There are two basic methods of accounting. One is simple, it is based on the cash basis. That means when you pay for something, you have to acknowledge it on the books.

We all know that we live in a credit card economy, and it is easy to buy things with plastic, and you know that when you sign that little piece of paper after you put down your credit card, you have effectively bought it even

though you have not paid the bill yet. You might not pay the bill until the end of the month or the end of the year, but it is important to acknowledge the fact that you have bought it when you put down the plastic.

That is essentially what the accounting method that my colleague from Arkansas was describing does. It is called accrual accounting, A-C-C-R-U-A-L. Now, it has nothing to do with the word ''cruel.'' It is not a mean form of accounting. In fact, it is probably the kindest form of accounting because it remembers our elderly, it remembers our sick, and our disabled not just when their bills are due, but when their needs arise. And that is when we should pay attention to our seniors, our sick, and our disabled.

I brought with me a chart tonight that asks a very simple question. Here we are in the Congress of the United States. This is the greatest country in the history of the world. You would think that in a recent year we would be able to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and tell the American taxpayer how big our deficit was. Well, there are different ways of measuring it, and let me list the ways for you tonight.

One is the way that my colleague mentioned, the U.S. budget that the President talks about so much. I am going to have breakfast at the White House in the morning with the new OMB Director, Rob Portman, a former colleague of ours, and I am going to be discussing this with him in the morning. It will be interesting to see what his reaction is. Under the OMB approach of cash accounting, the deficit last year was $319 billion. That was the third highest figure in U.S. history. It is about 2.6 percent of GDP. So it is huge and worrisome. They claim it is shrinking, but let me show you these other deficit measures again for the same year, 2005. If you do not allow us to borrow money from Social Security, the gross borrowing for the U.S. that year was $494 billion. So in a sense our true deficit in 2005 was not $319 billion. It was $494 billion, because I do not know anybody back home who supports our borrowing from Social Security in order to reduce the appearance of the size of the deficit.

But here is the number that my colleague from Arkansas mentioned as well: This is using real accounting, accrual accounting, like all businesses of any size in America have to use by law. If you apply that to the U.S. Government, you get a shocking result. The budget deficit jumps $441 billion to $760 billion using modern accounting. And guess what. This deficit is not shrinking, as OMB claims. This one seems to be growing rapidly. And that number equals almost all domestic discretionary spending in America, defense and nondefense. That is a huge number. That is a deficit as large as basically all the money that Congress has any say over during the year because the rest of it is in entitlement programs and the interest on the national debt.

As bad as that is, look at these other numbers. These are truly scary numbers because if you believe, as I do, that Social Security is the most solemn obligation in the United States, you cannot ignore Social Security. And as good as this document is using modern accounting, it basically ignores Social Security because it has got a little paragraph in here on page 12 that says in the section ''Other Responsibilities,'' oh, by the way, the Social Security unfunded liability situation is trillions of dollars. Well, that needs to be accounted for in the annual budget deficit, and if you account for it in the annual budget deficit, it means that the budget deficit in the year 2005 was basically $1.7 trillion, many times larger than the figure the administration releases.

But guess what. Not only is Social Security a sacred obligation of our Nation, so are other programs like Medicare. Medicare takes care of our elderly and our disabled, and it, too, is a solemn obligation of our Nation. But it, too, is ignored in this document, ignored in the annual deficit figure. If you factor that in, the true deficit for the year 2005 was not $319 billion, was not $494 billion, was not $760 billion, was not $1.7 trillion. It was $2.747 trillion, or $2,747 billion. That is a number so large, it is almost impossible to imagine. It is literally as large as the entire Federal budget itself.

So if you want to measure the budget deficit accurately, I think you have to acknowledge there is not just one measure. There is the old-fashioned cash measure, which can be used, but is unrepresentative of our true obligations under credit card accounting and under the needs that we have with Social Security and Medicare. If you used a more modern accounting, suddenly the deficit looks a lot larger. In fact, if you include Social Security and Medicare, the deficit is, in fact, larger than most citizens can imagine.

Very few people know this. It will be interesting tomorrow morning at breakfast to see whether the new Director of OMB knows this because these numbers are so large, they literally represent a crisis for our Nation. It is a crisis not only for this generation, but for future generations, because what a deficit means is it is borrowing money, oftentimes, as my colleague from Arkansas said, from foreign nations, and these folks expect to be repaid with interest. And that puts a terrific debt burden, D-E-B-T, on the backs of our kids and grandkids as they struggle to pay the interest costs. Pretty soon interest alone will take up almost $400 billion or $500 billion a year of American productive capacity. That is a shame because that money could be invested in roads and schools and future productive opportunities for our young people. Instead it will be paid in interest to foreign central bankers. It is the only tax that can never be repealed.

□ 2215

It is a tax that will not go away until we once again return to the days of budget surpluses, when we can pay down that debt. But we are a long way from home right now, because the Nation is on the wrong track. We are headed in the wrong direction, and we need to acknowledge these truthful deficit measures so we can better understand our current plight.

It is important that the American people be informed of all the facts, not only the President's budget, but also the financial report of the United States Government which was issued by his own Department of Treasury, but which they printed so few copies of that they literally don't want you to see it.

So I would like to yield back my time to my colleagues from Georgia and from Arkansas. I appreciate your holding these issues up for the American people so the entire Nation can be involved in the debate. It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that all the American people see what is really going on in our great country, because our responsibility in this generation is to keep our country great.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the points, just to add to what you are saying to show the real gravity of this situation, is this: Just the interest, just the interest alone that we are paying back on this, is the fastest growing part of our budget. Just the interest. Combined, that interest amounts to more than all of what we are spending for veterans, for education and for our own homeland security. The interest just is overwhelming.

Now, I want to make a point, because you brought it home, and as you were explaining that, the gentleman from Tennessee, I was reminded of a little history lesson here. If you would look back through history at all of the great civilizations, great nations, from the Roman Empire to the British Empire to the Ottoman Empire, they all collapsed from three important things: Global overreach, diminishing resources at home and an overwhelming, irresponsible debt in the hands of foreigners.

We are on the verge of handing our country over to foreigners, in our fiscal area, in our petroleum area and because of a lack of security on our borders.

I tell you, Mr. ROSS, the American people are dialed in on this. They are concerned about this and they want some leadership. They want vision. They want our borders secure. They want America to be America.

Why can't we be independent in our resources, if we can make fuel to run our automobiles from corn? We know we can. Do you know why? Because the very first automobile manufactured by Henry Ford, the Model T, you know what it was fueled by? Ethanol made from corn. What more evidence do we need?

Mr. ROSS. I would say to the gentleman from Georgia, I could not agree

with you more. The point we are making I believe this evening, I hope this evening, is as long as we have got this massive debt, which is costing us half a billion dollars a day in interest payments alone, as long as we continue to borrow $1 billion a day, increasing the $8.3 trillion debt by $1 billion a day, then America's priorities will continue to go unmet.

We talk about investing in alternative and renewable fuels. The Potlatch Corporation with their plant in Cypress Bend, Arkansas, in my congressional district, has been recognized for their efforts in publications including the Wall Street Journal, I believe.

They have a plan. They have the ability to take the wood, if you will, the timber, if you will, that is left in the woods that is not used in a manufacturing process, combine that with what is left on the sawmill floor, and they can power at least five towns the size of my hometown of Preston, Arkansas. To invest in that kind of equipment and technology and to make the thing economically feasible, it is going to have to be mass produced on a large scale, so they are in search of money to go forward.

In the energy bill there is money to invest in these types of alternative and renewable fuels, but because of the massive debt there is only $150 million. Don't get me wrong, $150 million is a lot of money to a country boy from Prescott, Arkansas. But my point is this: To be able to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and to make our Nation more energy self-sufficient, to get this project off the ground to where it can be mass produced, they need $100 million. There is $150 million for similar type projects for all of America. They need $100 million of it.

My point is we are not investing nearly enough in alternative and renewable fuels. $150 million is a lot of money, but our Nation is spending three times that, $500 million every day simply paying interest on the national debt, when we could be investing in alternative and renewable fuels to bring down the high energy bills that are having a negative effect, a horrible impact on America's working families, America's seniors and America's farm families.

Just look at what interest payments on the debt are doing. The red on this chart is the net interest that is being paid in billions of dollars. The blue is how much we spend on education. Yes, we will spend more money paying interest on the national debt in about 100 days than we will spend on education in 365. Homeland security is the green bar. Veterans. I might remind you, we have got a whole new generation of veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan, including my brother-in-law, who is in the United States Air Force, and my first cousin, who is in the United States Army.

So look where our priorities lay in this country. Until we can get our Nation's fiscal house in order, this Republican Congress is going to continue to spend half a billion dollars a day paying interest on the national debt, while education and homeland security, keeping America safe and our veterans, will continue to get the short end of the stick.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a double-ended stick too, because we must understand what this means in terms of the President will say, well, we are borrowing this money, we are making these budget cuts for tax cuts, so we can give tax cuts to the top 10 percent of this country, when they are not tax cuts. America needs to understand, they are not tax cuts. They are deferred tax increases, deferred tax increases, because somebody has got to pay for that.

It is not fair. I have got two lovely little grandchildren. I love them to death. I have got two children. That debt is going to be on them. That is not fair. It is not fair to do that.

Now I need to talk about one other thing so that we will know clearly, as you spoke on renewable energy programs and as we talk about this budget, the budget that again we will hopefully not have the votes for again. But let's talk about it, because you have got to look at the President's actions and the Republican administration's actions.

Like I said earlier when we first started out, you can't blame the Democrats. We are not in charge. I hope that the American people will give us that opportunity this November to be in charge. Then we will be responsible.

But I guarantee you one thing; we won't point the finger at the Republicans. We will say, as Harry Truman said, ''The buck stops here.'' We will say, as John Fitzgerald Kennedy said, ''Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.'' We will do what Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, ''The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.''

That is what the American people are waiting for. They are waiting to be challenged. They are waiting to be inspired. We don't need our country run by the Middle East, by Iran, Iraq or Saudi Arabia. We don't need it run by China or India. That is not what made America great. America became great because of our own inventiveness. We can become energy independent. All we have to do is unleash the mighty, free enterprise spirit within America.

If we know that oil is a diminishing resource, it is foolish for us to plan the future of this great Nation on a ready supply of oil, when we know it is running out. We have proven that. We have got to be bold. We must have vision. We must understand, and we must not be like those other previous civilizations on whose bleached bones are written those pathetic words, ''too late.'' Rome moved too late, the Ottoman Empire moved too late, the Dutch Netherlands moved too late and even Great Britain moved too late.

Will we move too late, Mr. ROSS? I don't think so, because there is too much can-do spirit in this country. That is what made America what it is, and that is what is going to take us forward. We have the leadership, we have the will, we have the vision, and we can be what the American people want us to be.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman from Georgia is correct in talking about not only do we understand what the problem is, record debt, record deficits, but we also have a solution to the problem.

As members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, all 37 of us, we have a 12-point plan for meaningful budget reform. These are not rocket science ideas; they are common sense ideas.

One of them is promoting accountability within our government. I have talked about this before, and I am going to continue to talk about it, because I continue to have these manufactured homes located in my congressional district.

FEMA has this so-called FEMA staging area at the Hope Airport in Hope, Arkansas, and the idea was that manufactured homes, 14 and 16 foot wide, 60 foot long, and they are fully furnished, they would come and go. Hope is 450 miles from the eye of Hurricane Katrina.

Well, they all came, and none of them ever went. As a result, at one time we had 10,477 brand new, fully-furnished manufactured homes sitting at the airport in Hope, Arkansas. They were going to use these old World War II era runways, taxiways and tarmacs, and you can see that is what they did with some of them. Then they started to have to use pasture land.

Here is a better shot. When I say pasture land or hay meadow, you get the idea what I am talking about. Here are these mobile homes sitting there on the grass.

So when I started getting on them and raising this issue back in December, I thought FEMA would get these homes to the people who lost their home and everything they owned in places like Mississippi and Louisiana. But instead, FEMA's response to this is they are now spending $4.3 million laying gravel on this pasture to keep the manufactured homes from sinking, instead of getting the homes to the people that need them.

They claim they won't locate them in Louisiana and Mississippi in flood plains. Why didn't FEMA think about that before they went out and spent nearly $1 billion on these mobile homes? FEMA says it is okay to put tents in flood plains, it is okay to put almost 80 million camper trailers in flood plains, but, no, not mobile homes, not even temporarily for 18 months. So people continue to live in hotel rooms, they continue to live in tents, they continue to live in campers across Louisiana and Mississippi.

You would have thought that FEMA would have figured this thing out since

last August when Hurricane Katrina hit. Unfortunately, we had a horrible tornado come through Arkansas and Tennessee, numerous tornadoes, I might add, which literally destroyed the community of Marmaduke, Arkansas. It took a number of Congressmen, a number of Senators, a Governor and I don't know who all else two weeks to get FEMA to move 25 of these 10,477 mobile homes from Hope, Arkansas, to Marmaduke, Arkansas.

We come to find out they have simply moved them to a so-called FEMA staging area at Marmaduke, and are telling those homeless it might take 30 days to process their paperwork to see if they can get one of these homes.

This is a symbol of what is wrong with this administration, this Republican Congress and their Federal Emergency Management Agency. I will continue to raise this issue and continue to give you an update, Mr. Speaker, as long as we have got a single home sitting at the airport at Hope, Arkansas, while people remain homeless from these horrible natural disasters.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the current update as I understand it is we now as of tonight have 10,112 manufactured homes sitting there at the airport in Hope, Arkansas. This is an example of the lack of accountability within our government, the kind of accountability that we need if we are going to get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. ROSS, you cannot help but feel compassion for the American people. They deserve much better than this, with Katrina, the natural disasters that are happening and the lack of response of FEMA. You talk about FEMA. I had a similar problem in my own district, where we had literally thousands of trailers sitting right there on the campus of Ft. Gillem.

□ 2230

Weeks, weeks, weeks went by, not going down into the Louisiana area. Lack of coordination, lack of proper direction.

The American people deserve much better than this, and we are going to give them much better. We have got to change the direction of this country. It is implicit in the debt that we are having. It is implicit in the response and the concerns with the rising gas prices. It is implicit in what is happening with the depletion of our military and our armed services, in the service of Iraq and Afghanistan. It is implicit in the situation with the Dubai Ports deal, even to think that they would turn over the security of this country to a company owned by a country who was only one of three countries to recognize the Taliban as the authority, ruler, in Afghanistan, while we have got our young men and women dying and fighting the Taliban. A tremendous disconnect.

And it is obvious it is there. As I said at the outset, we are here to be sojourners of truth. And we are sojourners of truth here tonight.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Tennessee for joining me this evening as we discuss this huge issue, this debt, and deficit facing our country, as we do every Tuesday night.

We began the hour with a debt, $8,353,429,193,726 and some change. Just in the last hour since we have been discussing the debt and the deficit and what it means to America and how America's priorities are not getting funded because of it, how our veterans are not being taken care of, our school children are not being taken care of, our Nation is not nearly as safe as it should be because of America's priorities cannot be met as long as we do not have our fiscal house in order.

But during this hour that we have stood here talking about this, this administration, this Republican Congress has increased the national debt to the tune of about $41 million. In fact, this is no longer the national debt. The debt now is $8,353,470,859,833. Just in the hour we have been here, our national debt increased by more than $41 million.

It now stands at $8,353,470,859,833 and some change. It is time for this Nation to get its fiscal house in order. Forty-nine States are required to have a balanced budget. As members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, we believe our Nation should have a balanced budget. Small businesses are required to have a balanced budget. And America's working families and seniors and farm families are required to have a balanced budget.

It is time for America to have a balanced budget. Madam Speaker, as members of the 37 Member strong, fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, we will continue this dialogue and this debate on the House floor every Tuesday night until we have an administration and a Congress that will get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

With that, Madam Speaker, if you have any questions for us, in the time remaining, I would encourage you, Madam Speaker, if you have questions or comments or concerns, I would encourage you, Madam Speaker, to e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov. That is bluedog@mail.house.gov.

GOLD AND THE U.S. DOLLAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, the financial press and even the network news shows have begun reporting the price of gold regularly.

For 20 years, between 1980 and 2000, the price of gold was rarely mentioned. There was little interest, and the price was either falling or remaining steady. Since 2001, however, interest in gold has soared along with its price.

With the price now over $600 an ounce, a lot more people are becoming interested in gold as an investment and an economic indicator. Much can be learned by understanding what the rising dollar price of gold means.

The rise in gold prices, from $250 per ounce in 2001 to over $600 today has drawn investors and speculators into precious metals markets. Though many already have made handsome profits, buying gold, per se, should not be touted as a good investment. After all, gold earns no interest, and its quality never changes. It is static and does not grow as sound investments should.

It is more accurate to say that one might invest in a gold or silver mining company, where management, labor costs, and the nature of new discoveries all play a vital role in determining the quality of the investment and the profits made.

Buying gold and holding it is somewhat analogous to converting one's saving into $100 bills and hiding them under the mattress, yet not exactly the same. Both gold and dollars are considered money, and holding money does not qualify as an investment. There is a big difference between the two, however, since by holding paper money, one loses purchasing power. The purchasing power of commodity money, that is gold, however, goes up if the government devalues the circulating paper currency.

Holding gold is protection or insurance against government's proclivity to debase the currency. The purchasing power of gold goes up not because it is a so-called good investment. It goes up in value only because the paper currency goes down in value. In our current situation, that means the dollar.

One of the characteristics of commodity money, one that originated naturally in the marketplace, is that it must serve as a store of value. Gold and silver meet the test; paper does not. Because of this profound difference, the incentive and wisdom of holding emergency funds in the form of gold becomes attractive when the official currency is being devalued. It is more attractive than trying to save wealth in the form of a fiat currency, even when earning some nominal interest.

The lack of earned interest on gold is not a problem once people realize the purchasing power of their currency is declining faster than the interest rates they might earn. The purchasing power of gold can rise even faster than increases in the cost of living.

The point is that most who buy gold do so to protect against the depreciating currency, rather than as an investment in the classical sense. Americans understand this less than citizens of other countries. Some nations have suffered from severe monetary inflation that literally led to the destruction of their national currency.

Though our inflation, that is the depreciation of the U.S. dollar, has been insidious, average Americans are unaware of how this occurs. For instance,

few Americans know nor seem concerned that the 1913 pre-Federal Reserve dollar is now worth only 4 cents. Officially, our central bankers and our politicians express no fear that the course on which we are set is fraught with great danger to our economy and to our political system.

The belief that money created out of thin air can work economic miracles if only properly managed is pervasive in the District of Columbia. In many ways, we should not be surprised about this trust in such an unsound system. For at least four generations our government-run universities have systematically preached a monetary doctrine justifying the so-called wisdom of paper money over the foolishness of sound money.

Not only that, paper money has worked surprisingly well in the past 35 years, the years the world has accepted pure paper money as currency. Alan Greenspan bragged that central bankers in these decades have gained the knowledge necessary to make paper money respond as if it were gold.

This, they argue, removes the problem of obtaining gold to back the currency and hence frees the politician from the rigid discipline a gold standard imposes. Many central bankers in the last 15 years became so confident they had achieved this milestone that they sold off large hordes of their gold reserves. At other times they tried to prove that paper works better than gold by artificially propping up the dollar by suppressing the market price of gold.

This recent deception failed just as it did in the 1960s when our government tried to hold gold artificially low at $35 an ounce. But since they could not truly repeal the economic laws regarding money, just as many central bankers sold, others bought. It is fascinating that the European central banks sold gold while the Asian central banks bought it over the last several years.

Since gold has proven to be the real money of the ages, we see once again a shift in wealth from the West to the East, just as we saw a loss of our industrial base in the same direction.

Though Treasury officials deny any U.S. sales or loans of our official gold holdings, no audits are permitted, so no one can be certain. The special nature of the dollar as the reserve currency of the world has allowed this gain to last longer than it would have otherwise.

But the fact that gold has gone from $250 an ounce to over $600 an ounce means there is concern about the future of the dollar. The higher the price of gold the greater the concern for the dollar. But instead of dwelling on the dollar price of gold, we should be talking about the depreciation of the dollar.

In 1934, a dollar was worth one-twentieth of an ounce of gold. $20 to buy one ounce. Today a dollar is worth one-six-hundredth of an ounce, meaning it takes $600 to buy one once of gold.

The number of dollars created by the Federal Reserve and through the fractional reserve banking system is crucial in determining how the market assesses the relationship of the dollar and gold.

Though there is a strong correlation, it is not instantaneous or perfectly predictable. There are many variables to consider. But in the long term, the dollar price of gold represents past inflation of the money supply. Equally important, it represents the anticipation of how much new money will be created in the future.

This introduces the factor of trust and confidence in our monetary authorities and our politicians, and these days the American people are casting a vote of no confidence in this regard and for good reasons.

The incentive for central bankers to create new money out of thin air is two-fold. One is to practice central planning through the manipulation of interest rates. The second is to monetize the escalated Federal debt politicians create and thrive on.

Today, no one in Washington believes for a minute that runaway deficits are going to be curtailed. In March alone, the Federal Government created a historic $85 billion deficit. The current supplemental bill going through Congress has grown from $92 billion to over $106 billion, and everyone knows it will not draw President Bush's first veto.

Most knowledgeable people therefore assume that inflation of the money supply is not only going to continue, but accelerate. This anticipation, plus the fact that many new dollars have been created over the past 15 years that have not yet been fully discounted, guarantees the future depreciation of the dollar in terms of gold.

□ 2245

There is no single measurement that reveals what the Fed has done in the recent past or tells us exactly what it is about to do in the future. Forget about the lip service given to transparency by the new Fed Chairman Bernanke. Not only is this administration one of the most secretive across the board in our history, the current Fed firmly supports denying the most important measurement of current monetary policy to Congress, the financial community and the American public.

Because of a lack of interest and poor understanding of monetary policy, Congress has expressed essentially no concern about the significant change in reporting statistics on the money supply. Beginning in March, though planned before Bernanke arrived at the Fed, the central bank discontinued compiling and reporting monetary aggregates known as M3. M3 is the best description of how quickly the Fed is creating new money and credit. Common sense tells us that a government central bank creating new money out of thin air depreciates the value of each dollar in circulation. Yet this report is no longer available to us, and Congress makes no demands to receive it.

Though M3 is the most helpful statistic to track Fed activity, it by no means tells us everything we need to know about trends in monetary policy. Total bank credit, still available to us, gives us indirect information reflecting the Fed's inflationary policies. But ultimately the markets will figure out exactly what the Fed is up to, and then individuals, financial institutions, governments and other central bankers will act accordingly.

The fact that our money supply is rising significantly cannot be hidden from the markets. The response in time will drive the dollar down while driving interest rates and commodity prices up.

Already we see this trend developing, which surely will accelerate in the not-too-distant future. Part of this reaction will be from those who seek a haven to protect their wealth, not invest, by treating gold and silver as universal and historic money. This means holding fewer dollars that are decreasing in value while holding gold as it increases in value.

A soaring gold price is a vote of no confidence in the central bank and the dollar. This certainly was the case in 1979 and 1980. Today gold prices reflect a growing restlessness with the increasing money supply, our budgetary and trade deficits, our unfunded liabilities, and the inability of this Congress and the administration to rein in runaway spending.

Denying us statistical information, manipulating interest rates, and artificially trying to keep gold prices in check won't help in the long run. If the markets are fooled only on the short term, it only means the adjustments will be much more dramatic later on, and in the meantime other market imbalances develop.

The Fed tries to keep the consumer spending spree going, not through hard work and savings, but by creating artificial wealth in stock market bubbles and housing bubbles. When these distortions run these courses and are discovered, the corrections will be quite painful as was witnessed with the collapse of the NASDAQ bubble. Likewise a fiat monetary system encourages speculation and unsound borrowing.

As problems develop, scapegoats are sought and frequently found in foreign nations. This prompts many to demand altering exchange rates and protectionist measures. The sentiment for this type of solution is growing each day. Though everyone decries inflation, trade imbalances, economic downturns and Federal deficits, few attempt a closer study of our monetary system and how these events are interconnected.

Even if it were recognized that a gold standard without monetary inflation would be advantageous, few in Washington would accept the political disadvantages of living with the discipline

of gold since it serves as a check on government size and power. This is a sad commentary on the politics of today.

The best analogy to our affinity for government spending, borrowing and inflating is that of a drug addict who knows if he doesn't quit, he will die, yet he can't quit because of the heavy price required to overcome the dependency.

The right choice is very difficult, but remaining addicted to drugs guarantees the death of the patient, while our addiction to deficit spending, debt and inflation guarantees the collapse of our economy.

Special interest groups, who vigorously compete for Federal dollars, want to perpetuate the system rather than admit to a dangerous addiction. Those who champion welfare for the poor, entitlements for the middle class or war contracts for the military industrial complex all agree on the so-called benefits bestowed by the Fed's power to counterfeit fiat money.

Bankers who benefit from our fractional reserve system likewise never criticize the Fed, especially since it is the lender of last resort that bails out financial institutions when crises arise. It is true, special interest and bankers do benefit from the Fed and may well get bailed out, just as we saw with the long-term capital management fund crisis a few years ago.

In the past, companies like Lockheed and Chrysler benefited as well. But what the Fed cannot do is guarantee the market will maintain trust in the worthiness of the dollar. Current policy guarantees that the integrity of the dollar will be undermined. Exactly when this will occur, and the extent of the resulting damage to the financial system, cannot be known for sure, but it is coming. There are plenty of indications already on the horizon.

Foreign policy plays a significant role in the economy and the value of the dollar. A foreign policy of militarism and empire building cannot be supported through direct taxation. The American people would never tolerate the taxes required to pay immediately for overseas wars under the discipline of a gold standard. Borrowing and creating new money is much more politically palatable. It hides and delays the real costs of the war. The people are lulled into complacency, especially since the wars we fight are couched in terms of patriotism, spreading the ideas of freedom and stamping out terrorism. Unnecessary wars and fiat currencies go hand in hand, while a gold standard encourages a sensible foreign policy.

The cost of war is enormously detrimental. It significantly contributes to the economic instability of the Nation by boosting spending, deficits and inflation. Funds used for war are funds that could have remained in the productive economy to raise the standard of living of Americans now unemployed, underemployed or barely living on the margin.

Yet even these costs may be preferable to paying for war with huge tax increases. This is because although fiat dollars are theoretically worthless, value is imbued by the trust placed in them by the world's financial community. Subjective trust in a currency can override objective knowledge about government policies, but only for a limited time.

Economic strength and military power contributes to the trust in a currency. In today's world trust in the U.S. dollar is not earned, and, therefore, fragile. The history of the dollar, being as good as gold up until 1971, is helpful in maintaining an artificially higher value for the dollar than deserved.

Foreign policy contributes to the crisis when the spending to maintain our worldwide military commitments become prohibitive, and inflationary pressures accelerate. But the real crisis hits when the world realizes the king has no clothes in that the dollar has no backing, and we face a military setback even greater than we already are experiencing in Iraq. Our token friends may quickly transform into vocal enemies once the attack on the dollar begins.

False trust placed in the dollar once was helpful to us, but panic and rejection of the dollar will develop into a real financial crisis. Then we will have no other option but to tighten our belts, go back to work, stop borrowing, start saving, and rebuild our industrial base while adjusting to a lower standard of living for most Americans. Counterfeiting the Nation's money is a serious offense.

The Founders were especially adamant about avoiding the chaos, inflation and destruction associated with the continental dollar. That is why the Constitution is clear that only gold and silver should be legal tender in the United States. In 1792, the Coinage Act also authorized the death penalty for any private citizen who counterfeited the currency. Too bad they weren't explicit that counterfeiting by government officials is just as detrimental to the economy and the value of the dollar.

In wartime many nations actually operated counterfeiting programs to undermine the dollar, but never to a disastrous level. The enemy knew how harmful excessive creation of new money could be to the dollar and our economy. But it seems we never learned the dangers of creating new money out of thin air. We don't need an Arab nation or the Chinese to undermine our system with a counterfeiting operation. We do it to ourselves with the all the disadvantages that would occur if others did it to us.

Today we hear threats from some Arab, Muslim and some Far Eastern countries about undermining the dollar system not by dishonest counterfeiting, but by initiating an alternative monetary system based on gold. Wouldn't that be ironic? Such an event theoretically could do great harm to us. This day may well come not so much as a direct political attack on the dollar system, but out of necessity to restore confidence in money once again.

Historically paper money never has lasted for long periods of time, while gold has survived thousands of years of attacks by political interests and big government. In time the world once again will restore trust in the monetary system by making some currency as good as gold.

Gold or any acceptable market commodity money is required to preserve liberty. Monopoly control by government of a system that creates fiat money out of thin air guarantees the loss of liberty. No matter how well intended our militarism is portrayed or how happily the promises of wonderful programs for the poor are promoted, inflating the money supply to pay these bills makes government bigger.

Empires always fail, and expenses always exceed projections. Harmful unintended consequences are the rule, not the exception. Welfare for the poor is inefficient and wasteful. The beneficiaries are rarely the poor themselves, but, instead, the politicians, the bureaucrats or the wealthy. The same is true of all foreign aid. It is nothing more than a program that steals from the poor in a rich country and gives to the rich leaders of a poorer country.

Whether it is war or welfare payments, it always means higher taxes, inflation and debt. Whether it is the extraction of wealth from the productive economy, the distortion of the market by interest rate manipulation or spending for war and welfare, it can't happen without infringing upon personal liberty.

At home the war on poverty, terrorism, drugs or foreign rulers provide an opportunity for authoritarians to rise to power, individuals who think nothing of violating the people's rights to privacy and freedom of speech. They believe their role is to protect the secrecy of government rather than protect the privacy of citizens.

Unfortunately, that is the atmosphere under which we live today with essentially no respect for the Bill of Rights. Though great economic harm comes from a government monopoly, fiat monetary system, the loss of liberty associated with it is equally troubling.

Just as empires are self-limiting in terms of money and manpower, so, too, is a monetary system based on illusion and fraud.

When the end comes, we will be given an opportunity to choose once again between honest money and liberty on one hand, chaos, poverty and authoritarianism on the other. The economic harm done by a fiat monetary system is pervasive, dangerous and unfair.

Though runaway inflation is injurious to almost everyone, it is more insidious for certain groups. Once inflation is recognized as a tax, it becomes

clear that tax is regressive in nature, penalizing the poor and the middle class more than the rich and the politically privileged. Price inflation, a consequence of inflating the money supply by the central bank, hits poor and marginal workers first and foremost. It especially penalizes savers, retirees, those on fixed incomes, and anyone who trusts government promises.

□ 2300

Small businesses and individual enterprises suffer more than the financial elite, who borrow large sums before the money loses value. Those who are on the receiving end of government contracts, especially in the military industrial complex during wartime, receive undeserved benefits.

It is a mistake to blame high gasoline and oil prices on price gouging. If we impose new taxes or fix prices while ignoring monetary inflation, corporate subsidies and excessive regulations, shortages will result. The market is the only way to determine the best price for any commodity. The law of supply and demand cannot be repealed. The real problems arise when government planners give subsidies to energy companies and favor one form of energy over another.

Energy prices are rising for many reasons: inflation, increased demand from China and India, decreased supply resulting from our invasion into Iraq, anticipated disruption of supplies as we push regime change in Iran, regulatory restrictions on gasoline production, government interference in the free market development of alternative fuels, and subsidies to Big Oil, such as free leases and grants for research and development.

Interestingly, the cost of oil and gas is actually much higher than we pay at the retail level. Much of the DOD budget is spent protecting ''our'' oil supplies; and if such spending is factored in, gasoline probably costs us more than $5 a gallon. The sad irony is that the military efforts to secure cheap oil supplies inevitably backfire and actually curtail supplies and boost prices at the pump. The waste and fraud in issuing contracts to large corporations for work in Iraq only adds to price increases.

When problems arise under conditions that exist today, it is a serious error to blame the little bit of the free market that still functions. Last summer, the market worked efficiently after Katrina. Gasoline hit $3 a gallon, but soon supplies increased, usage went down, and the price returned to $2. In the 1980s, market forces took oil from $40 a barrel down to $10 a barrel, and no one cried for the oil companies that went bankrupt. Today's increases are for the reasons mentioned above. It is natural for labor to seek its highest wage and businesses to strive for the greatest profits. That is the way the market works. When the free market is allowed to work, it is the consumer who ultimately determines price and quality, with labor and businesses accommodating consumer choices. Once this process is distorted by government, prices rise excessively, labor costs and profits are negatively affected, and problems emerge.

Instead of fixing the problem, politicians and demagogues respond by demanding windfall profits taxes and price controls, while never questioning how previous government interference caused the whole mess in the first place. Never let it be said that high oil prices and profits cause inflation. Inflation of the money supply causes higher prices.

Since keeping interest rates below market levels is synonymous with new money creation by the Fed, the resulting business cycle, higher cost of living and job losses all can be laid at the doorstep of the Fed. This burden hits the poor the most, making Fed taxation by inflation the worst of all regressive taxes. Statistics about revenues generated by the income tax are grossly misleading. In reality, much harm is done by our welfare-warfare system supposedly designed to help the poor and tax the rich. Only sound money can rectify the blatant injustice of this destructive system.

The Founders understood this great danger and voted overwhelmingly to reject ''emitting bills of credit,'' the term they used for paper money or fiat currency. It is too bad the knowledge and advice of our Founders and their mandate in the Constitution are ignored, and it is ignored at great peril. The current surge in gold prices, which reflects our dollar's devaluation, is warning us to pay closer attention to our fiscal, monetary, entitlement, and foreign policy.

A recent headline in the financial press announced that gold prices surged over concern that confrontation with Iran will further push oil prices higher. This may well reflect the current situation, but higher gold prices mainly reflect monetary expansion by the Federal Reserve. Dwelling on current events and their effect on gold prices reflects concern for symptoms rather than an understanding of the actual cause of these price increases. Without an enormous increase in the money supply over the past 35 years and a worldwide paper monetary system, this increase in the price of gold would not have occurred.

Certainly geopolitical events in the Middle East under a gold standard would not alter its price, though they could affect the supply of oil and cause oil prices to rise. Only under conditions created by excessive paper money would one expect all or most prices to rise. This is a mere reflection of the devaluation of the dollar.

Here are a few particular things that we should remember: if one endorses small government and maximum liberty, one must support commodity money.

One of the strongest restraints against unnecessary war is a gold standard.

Deficit financing by government is severely restricted by sound money.

The harmful effects of the business cycle are virtually eliminated with an honest gold standard.

Saving and thrift are encouraged by gold standard and discouraged by paper money.

Price inflation, with generally rising price levels, is characteristic of paper money. Reports that the Consumer Price Index and the Producer Price Index are rising are distractions. The real cause of inflation is the Fed's creation of new money.

Interest rate manipulation by central banks helps the rich, the banks, the government, and the politicians.

Paper money permits the regressive inflation tax to be passed off on the poor and the middle class.

Speculative financial bubbles are characteristic of paper money, not gold.

Paper money encourages economic and political chaos, which subsequently causes a search for scapegoats rather than blaming the central bank.

Dangerous protectionist measures frequently are implemented to compensate for the dislocations caused by paper money.

Paper money, inflation, and the conditions they create contribute to the problems of illegal immigration.

The value of gold is remarkably stable.

The dollar price of gold reflects dollar depreciation.

Holding gold helps preserve and store wealth; but technically, gold is not a true investment.

Since 2001, the dollar has been devalued by over 60 percent. In 1934, FDR devalued the dollar by 41 percent. In 1971, Nixon devalued the dollar by 7.9 percent. In 1973, Nixon devalued the dollar by 10 percent.

These were momentous monetary events, and every knowledgeable person worldwide paid close attention. Major changes were endured in 1979 and 1980 to save the dollar from disintegration. This involved a severe recession, interest rates over 21 percent, and general price inflation of 15 percent.

Today, we face a 60 percent devaluation and counting, yet no one seems to care. It is of greater significance than the three events mentioned above, and yet the one measurement that best reflects the degree of inflation, the Fed and our government denies us. Since March, M3 reporting has been discontinued. For starters, I would like to see Congress demand that this report be resumed. I fully believe the American people and Congress are entitled to this information.

Will we one day complain about false intelligence, as we have with the Iraq war? Will we complain about not having enough information to address monetary policy after it is too late?

If ever there was a time to get a handle on what sound money is and what it means, that time is today. Inflation, as exposed by high gold prices, transfers

wealth from the middle class to the rich, as real wages decline while the salaries of CEOs, movie stars, and athletes skyrocket, along with the profits of the military industrial complex, the oil industry, and other special interests.

A sharply rising gold price is a vote of no confidence in the Congress' ability to control the budget, the Fed's ability to control the money supply, and the administration's ability to bring stability to the Middle East.

Ultimately, the gold price is a measurement of trust in the currency and the politicians who run the country. It has been that way for a long time, and it is not about to change.

If we care about the financial system, the tax system, and the monumental debt we are accumulating, we must start talking about the benefits and discipline that come only with a commodity standard of money: money the government and central banks absolutely cannot create out of thin air.

Economic law dictates reform at some point, but should we wait until the dollar is 1/1000 of an ounce of gold or 1/2000 of an ounce of gold? The longer we wait, the more people will suffer and the more difficult reforms become. Runaway inflation inevitably leads to political chaos, something numerous countries have suffered throughout the 20th century. The worst example, of course, was the German inflation of the 1920s that led to the rise of Hitler.

□ 2310

Even the Communist takeover of China was associated with runaway inflation brought on by the Chinese nationalists.

The time for action is now, and it is up to the American people and the U.S. Congress to demand it.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again. The 30-something Working Group, we come to the floor to share with the American people some of the issues that are going on here in the Capitol dome, and hopefully bring about solutions that they can all feel good about, and hopefully we can work in a bipartisan way.

We want to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour on the floor: The Democratic Leader, Ms. Nancy Pelosi; and Mr. HOYER, our Democratic whip; and also our Democratic caucus chair Mr. CLYBURN; and also the vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus Mr. LARSON.

We have been on break for about 2 weeks. It seems like the American people have taken a deep breath to really take a step back and look at the way this government is being operated. It is almost self-explanatory.

I am so glad Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from the State of Florida is here. We served together as public policymakers for more than a decade, and I think it is important that we look at this time in the history of our country, at how our government is functioning at this particular time, and we point out how it can be different. I think it is important that we continue to hammer on that.

With that, I would like to welcome my good friend here tonight as we are going to hold down this 30-something special hour. We know that Mr. RYAN is not going to be with us tonight, and I do not believe Mr. DELAHUNT is going to be with us tonight.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I, too, want to express my thanks to the Democratic leader and the Democratic whip.

Wow, the 2 weeks we had at home, I am sure that you experienced just like I did, I went home and heard an earful from folks in my district who just really are at the end of their rope. They are fed up. They are sick and tired of being sick and tired. I think one woman said it best. She has just reached the end of her last nerve, whether it is the culture of corruption and the daily revelation that comes out of this capital with either an indictment or an accusation or an ethical cloud or an example of cronyism, or just one more example of the incompetence that has really permeated government as led by the Republican leadership.

People are sick of it. They really are. They are sick of the gas prices. They are sick of the issues coming up again repeatedly and not being dealt with and not being addressed and their concerns not being addressed until it becomes such an immense political issue that the Republican leadership realizes it is unavoidable. They are over it, and I can understand why they are over it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to share with the gentlewoman that it is sad because we have had an opportunity to come to this floor and talk about the issues that are facing this country and that will face this country based on the legislation that the Republican majority has pushed through that the Bush White House wanted, that the majority in the Senate wanted that happened to be Republican. We talked about these things. We stood out as Democrats on the floor to try to come up with alternative fuels. We tried to get questions answered as it relates to the war in Iraq.

Now we have eight, nine, and if we continue to count, it will be in double digits, not just individuals within the military, but we are talking about generals, flag officers saying on behalf of their country we have to make a change.

Tonight, Madam Speaker, just like when we last year and the year before that talked about the K Street Project, which was a project, and I am so glad we are joined by Mr. DELAHUNT. I take back my words. I did not think you were going to be with us tonight. As usual, you came through.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This was a test.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We talked about the K Street Project and special influence here in this House of Representatives. We talked about how certain lobbyists could not go into certain offices of Members of the majority. This came out of the mouths of Members if they were not a part of this activity. And then later after a lobbyist admitted, and, hey, you do not even have to call a jury, we do not have to call a trial. He admits, I admit I am wrong, I was a part of this operation here in Washington, DC. It was encouraged by Members of Congress. Then all of a sudden the majority comes out and says, we denounce this. It is wrong. It will no longer be tolerated on Capitol Hill.

It sounds like what we are hearing now. We are hearing the President respond to, Mr. President, can you talk about the oil prices?

The President says, America is addicted to oil.

We have to chuckle about it because it is so in the face of the American people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is insulting. In January, the three of us, along with our colleagues, sat in this Chamber and listened to the President deliver the State of the Union and the line he had in the State of the Union about America's addiction to oil and that we needed to end it. You know, it is insulting. It is insulting on so many levels.

Number one, it is insulting that just last year, and I have made this reference before. I have only been here 14 months now, and in the last 14 months just while I was here, we have voted on two different energy bills that gave away the store to the energy companies, to the oil companies.

So it was just so obnoxious when in the President's State of the Union he is talking about us, the United States, needing to end, Americans needing to end our addiction to oil. Where have his proposals been? Where has his agenda been? Suddenly today or yesterday he comes up with his five points that we need to move on to address the energy crisis that we are in? I mean, give me a break.

The American people understand when their leaders are genuine and when they are scrambling because politically they know there is no other choice.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I was listening to the President today, and I thought it was interesting that for the first time that I can remember, this President indicated that maybe it was time to take away those tax breaks for big oil. I mean, that is just a desperate response to falling polling numbers, because those tax breaks and

subsidies for big oil, Madam Speaker, were the product of his energy policy combined with the rubber-stamp Republican Congress that has run this country for the last 6 years.

□ 2320

Whose policy is it, Madam Speaker? It is not a Democratic policy that is responsible for a gallon of gas going from $1.45 on January 20, 2001, to $2.91 today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. This is something that I think the Members who are hearing us should really be able to see while we are talking about it. And following, I mean, the comparison on the heels of what we have just been talking about with two pieces of Republican-led energy legislation giving away the store last year to the oil companies, forgiving taxes, allowing for drilling rights tax free, with taxes being forgiven. In the time that President Bush has been in office, when he took office January 20 of 2001, gas prices, Americans paid $1.45 a gallon. Now, fast forward to today, and we now pay an average price of $2.91 a gallon. Now, in 5 years, a little more than 5 years.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I know, Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, that the American people see this and say wait a minute, they must have a typo on this. It is like $3.06 last I saw. But this is on average. I just want to make sure because, Madam Speaker, I think it is important. I am glad you are spelling this out, and I am glad you have this chart because we want to make sure the Republican majority knows exactly what their policies have brought on the American people, Democrat and Republican. I'm sorry, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is okay. So people understand what we are talking about, those two bills last year cost taxpayers more than $12 billion, with a B, billion dollars in giveaways to big oil companies. That was in the legislation where essentially taxes they were required to pay they did not have to pay because those pieces of legislation forgave those taxes

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentlewoman would just yield for a minute.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think it is important to review that for every year that this House of Representatives has been controlled by the Republican majority, during the summer months, from April 1 to September 30, the price of gasoline has dramatically escalated.

Mr. MEEK, in 2002, if you went to your local gas station, you paid $1.39. The majority, in 2002, in this House of Representatives, Madam Speaker, was Republican.

In 2003, Madam Speaker, the majority in this House was Republican. And if you examine that chart, there was about another 20 cent plus-up for a gallon of gas.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, can I ask you a question?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In the evolution of gas prices that you have on that chart, 2002, $1.39; 2003, $1.57; and $1.90 in 2004; $2.37 in 2005; and now an average of $2.91 in 2006, in between that time, because I have not been in Congress all those years, and you have, have the Republicans who have controlled Congress all of this time, and President Bush who has been President all of this time, have they put forward any proposals to fund, significantly fund, alternative energy sources? Has there been anything that has been initiated by the Republican leadership here, by this White House maybe that I didn't see since I was still in the State legislature to fend this off, to make it less likely that the situation we are in now we wouldn't find ourselves in? Because the President did say in his remarks and commentary in the last several days about what control he did or didn't have over gas prices, that he really wasn't able to control market forces. I mean, I heard him say that.

Well, no, he probably can't control market forces, but there are certainly things that they could have put forward. But I haven't seen it. Did they?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, they did, but it didn't help. What they did is they put forth a welfare program for Big Oil. I mean, that is truly what they did.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What do you mean by a welfare program for Big Oil?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, how about $16 billion worth of subsidies for Big Oil? And this, of course, this is not for poor folk, because the big oil companies, Madam Speaker, they are doing remarkably well in this country. They are showing profits that only can be described as embarrassing in a free enterprise system.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Should we illuminate that a little bit?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to my friend.

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Some people might be concerned about our commentary here and you referring to profits as being obscene, because, obviously, in a capitalistic society we understand and think profit is a good thing. So I think it is important that people understand what we mean. While giving away the store, while giving away $12 billion in tax breaks.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Sixteen billion all together.

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sixteen billion all together. Forgive me.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Subsidies and tax breaks. Let's just call it welfare for Big Oil.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right, the oil welfare that we have given away.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is the oil welfare program.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. My experience with tax breaks as a State legislator and now a Member of Congress is that you generally give those kinds of breaks to help a business get back on its feet, thrive, to maybe bridge them through a difficult time. In 2002, the oil companies made a combined profit of $34 billion. In 2003 it was $59 billion.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Could I interrupt for a minute?

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Could I ask my friend from Florida just to repeat that. $34 billion, and that was all of the major oil companies?

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Would you, for the sake of our conversation here, would you identify them, if you can read them from the chart?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sure. As you can see, BP, Chevron, Shell, Conoco, and Exxon-Mobil.

Mr. DELAHUNT. So the five of them, Madam Speaker, in the year 2002?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yes, 2002.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In the year 2002 had a combined profit of $34 billion. And then, of course, that was just the beginning.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That was only the tip of the iceberg, because if you continue down the road, and remember, I just got here, and so we will get to 2005 in a minute. But it was 2005 that the $16 billion was granted that we have been talking about. But you go to 2003: $59 billion in profits. Also the same oil companies.

Mr. DELAHUNT. So, in one year, you are telling me that it almost doubled, or did it?

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Not quite, not quite doubled. No. About a third more in profits.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Okay.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Then you go to 2004, and we are at $84 billion in profits.

Mr. DELAHUNT. $84 billion.

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. $84 billion.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In 2 years. I guess that is productivity.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Not bad if you can do it. And then you go to 2005. In a year where we passed two major energy bills that gave away $16 billion in tax breaks and subsidies to the oil companies, they made, last year, $113 billion; and one of those companies made more money in one quarter than any company in U.S. history.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And that company is?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That was Exxon-Mobil.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And my memory is that Exxon-Mobil, for the year, had a profit of $39 billion, that one company.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. More than all of the companies combined profited in 2002.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Three years ago. Now, that is why I use the word ''obscene,'' because something is wrong with our free market system.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And we don't begrudge profit.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I encourage profit. Clearly profit is important. And it is what made this country unique in terms of our ability to have a high standard of living. But this is not free market. This is not free market. This is something different. This is either price gouging or some sort of market.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. This is doing what the Republican leadership is allowing them to do.

□ 2330

Mr. DELAHUNT. This is oligopoly or a tendency towards monopoly, and this House has done nothing, Madam Speaker. There has not been any antitrust hearing as far as the oil companies are concerned, Madam Speaker. We have not had any hearings at all in the committee of jurisdiction, which is the Judiciary Committee, that would shed some light on why in 3 years they went from $34 billion to $113 billion. And we wonder why, Madam Speaker, we wonder why the American people are losing confidence in the House of Representatives, the people's House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Can I ask you a question, Mr. DELAHUNT, again because you have more direct experience with this than I do? My understanding is that the oil companies, they do not own the areas of the gulf and the other places that they drill for oil. The Federal Government sells them essentially, through payment of taxes, the rights to drill; that these are essentially public lands, whether they are in the Gulf of Mexico or wherever they are drilling, I mean whether it is Texas or any portion. I do not believe any of the area is private land, any of the significant area. So when we forgive the oil companies taxes, we are basically giving away the ownership rights to a private company that the government owns and just saying, here, take our oil stores for free. Is that right?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, there is such a thing as royalty payments, but in this administration there is a rule that has created a situation where even though the dollar value, as we can see from these various charts, has exploded in terms of revenue to the oil companies, the royalty payments that they make, Madam Speaker, have declined by $7 billion. And this is the energy policy of the Bush administration and the Bush Republican Congress. And yet we hear on this floor complaints about the Democratic proposals.

You cannot run against Washington, Madam Speaker, when you are Washington. You just cannot do it. You cannot argue with yourself. This is your mess. This energy policy, you own it, Madam Speaker. The leadership in this House, the leadership in this Republican Senate, and the leadership of the Bush administration own this reality today, which is over the past 3 years big oil profits have more than tripled. And we here in this Congress, in collusion with that White House, have provided welfare to Big Oil on top of that. That is truly, Mr. MEEK, obscene.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I just have been quiet for about maybe 8 or 10 minutes, which is not common when we are having this kind of discussion.

Madam Speaker, like I said before we went on break, it is not even fair. I mean, you would think that someone would wake up 1 day, especially the minority party would wake up, and say, wow, if we had a tool box that dealt with a war that is not being managed appropriately; an energy crisis within the country; containers as it relates to coming into this country going unchecked; families that are not able to provide health care, and neither are small businesses able to provide health care; States that are suing the Federal Government, Leave No Child Behind legislation, Democratic and Republican Governors are suing the Federal Government because of a lack of funding to the Federal Government's own initiative; that environmentally we have a number of issues going on on top of a natural disaster where the response and recovery were not managed well; CIA leaks at the White House; Members of this body in question of ethical violations and a culture of corruption and cronyism under the Capitol Dome. And better yet, Madam Speaker, the reason why we do not have a Democratic Member serving as Speaker or serving as the majority leader is the fact that we are in the minority. But the only good thing about that whole thing that I pointed out, because as an American it turns my stomach that that is even the environment in the United States of America as we speak, partisanship has nothing to do with my being an American and my responsibility as a Member of Congress.

So, Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, maybe for the next 4 minutes let us just talk about if Democrats were in control of this House and hopefully in control of the Senate to be able to say no to the administration when they want to put the country in this posture. Democrats, Independents, Republicans, what have you are all concerned about what is going on. The polling has indicated that.

Now, I just want to take out this document that we have held up several times, our innovation agenda. Wow, here is a plan. The Democrats' energy plan. Here is a plan. I want to say this to my Republican colleagues because they have the audacity to come down to the floor saying, They do not have any solutions; so how can they criticize our inability to carry out the energy policy?

Well, here is the solution right here. It has been on our Web site, and I encourage everyone to go to www.housedemocrats.gov and pull up the innovation agenda. We did not just put it on there before we came to the floor. It has been there for months. Months. They are talking about it. We want to do it.

Energy independence in 10 years. Energy independence in 10 years, to change the investment from counting on the Middle East and counting on the Midwest. Ethanol, making sure that we promote petroleum-based ideas of rapidly expanding the production of synthetic bio-based fuels. It is right there. It is just an investment.

But what is stopping the Republican majority from taking our plan, as I am going to point out here as we talk about price gouging, and running with it? Well, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ just had the chart up with all the oil companies. It has to be the relationship with the oil companies. The American people, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, are paying through the nose as we speak. Some folks are putting a quarter of gas in their tank because they cannot afford it. These are the constituents, unfortunately, of individuals of power and influence in Washington, D.C. I did not get a vote from any of these companies. Maybe the folks that work for the companies say maybe I want to vote on behalf of education and good representation in Washington, but they did not say, hey, you know, these are my constituents, and I am going to stand in the way and make sure that they have what they need.

Let me just talk fact, not fiction here, because I think it is important. Oil companies, record profits. RECORD profits. Folks want to talk about Wal-Mart? Goodness gracious, these oil companies make Wal-Mart look like a five and dime store.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In my day that was called penny candy.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just say this, Mr. DELAHUNT. Folks want to go knocking companies and start talking about who is making what, and folks are upset about it. And there are some folks out there. But the bottom line is, like you said, ''profits'' is not a bad word, and we believe in profits. It is the American way, and capitalism rules. And I am the first one in line when it comes down to that, and I am not faulting those oil companies. I am not mad at Exxon Mobil or any of those oil companies that are out there. I am upset with the Members that are allowing them to get away with literally a crime of ripping dollars out of everyday working Americans' pockets and then the majority leadership in both Chambers having the audacity to send a letter over to the White House, saying, ''We would like for you to investigate this issue of price gouging,'' when they set the playing field for it to happen.

□ 2340

They set the playing field for it to happen.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman would yield for 15 seconds.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You can have 20, if you want it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you for your generosity. What we are

saying, I want to underscore what we are saying when we say we are not opposed to profit, because that profit we had up there a minute ago, if it happened and the oil companies were being asked to pay their fair share, if they were paying the royalties and the taxes that they are supposed to be under the law to the Federal Government for the rights to drill, you know what? You can't begrudge them the profits, because that is the free market system.

But they are not. They are being given these oil rights for free, for no remuneration or very little remuneration whatsoever. And they don't need it. They are not struggling. Far from it. The people who are struggling now are Americans who need to go to work, who need to get their kids to school.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But stop for a minute and just see what the values are. We hear a lot about values. Here we are providing a wealthy program for big oil, and at the same time we are not adequately funding the so-called LIHEAP program, which provides assistance to low-income families, working families, so that they can get through the winter, so that they are not forced to make a decision between having food on the table and staying warm.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, given that I am from Florida and have a particular sensitivity to not using much heat, can you explain what the LIHEAP program is?

Mr. DELAHUNT. The LIHEAP program has been around for some time now, and it has been a program that was introduced in a Democratic Congress, supported by Democratic presidents and adequately funded. Today, only 20 percent of those who are eligible based on income, who would qualify if the funding were available, only 20 percent of those receive that assistance.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What does LIHEAP do for folks?

Mr. DELAHUNT. It gives them basically a discount on the purchase of their energy for heating their homes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It gives them a break on their bill.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You said it better than I did. It gives them a break on their bill, and it is administered through community action programs. And, we don't fund it adequately. I think that the total is a little over $2 billion annually. Now, stop and think: $2 billion for hundreds of thousands, millions, actually, of families that would qualify in this country for some help to stay warm so they didn't have to make that choice between eating or freezing. Yet, we are giving $16 billion in subsidies to major oil.

This is Alice in Wonderland, Madam Speaker. Up is down and down is up. How does the majority justify this? How do you justify that in moral terms, Madam Speaker?

This is more than just public policy. I would suggest to you that doing that amounts to a violation of our moral code and moral responsibility as leaders in this country. That is what it is.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, can I just describe the difference between the Alice in Wonderland-like policy that is made here, where down is up and down is up, and reality? At the end of Alice in Wonderland, Alice woke up and it was a dream and she could go back to what reality really was for her.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But this is a nightmare.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is right, that the Republican leadership won't let Americans wake up from.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Can I reclaim my time from the 20 seconds?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That was a long 20 seconds.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. But that was good information. Talking about the program a little further, we have a Stupak bill, which is a Democratic bill here in this House, that is going to give relief to consumers, small businesses and farmers and provide relief from skyrocketing heating home costs that they are taking on right now. It is the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and basically it comes from the fines which I am going to go into now, Mr. DELAHUNT, of what the Republican majority blocked, Madam Speaker. And guess what? That is not what KENDRICK MEEK is saying, that is not what BILL DELAHUNT was saying or DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has said in the past or even Mr. RYAN in his absence has said in the past. This is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Republicans voted against imposing tough criminal penalties on price gouging companies and also tough civil fines up to $3 million in price gouging as it relates to protecting consumers. This is CQ vote number 500, H.R. 3402, taken September 28, 2005. The motion was rejected on a 195 to 226 vote. Republicans voted against this overwhelmingly, Democrats voted for it. 194 Democrats voted for it and I believe 226 Republicans voted against it.

Another vote, CQ vote, this is all stuff Members can look up, vote number 517, H.R. 3893, taken October 7, 2005. Again, Republicans voted overwhelmingly against this measure from being placed into legislation on price gouging, 199 to 222. The majority prevailed again.

I think it is important for us to understand, Madam Speaker, that time after time again, and I know we have another example, Republicans killed the amendment. Which one did I not share? Those are the two that were there. But they are continuing to kill these amendments.

So, Madam Speaker, it is kind of mind-boggling when we look up, open the local hometown paper, whatever it may be, it could be the one in Florida where I represent or it can be right here in the Beltway, to read that Republican leaders are thinking about going after folks as it relates to price gouging.

Now, I am just going to give the Republican majority a little. They will say okay, that is not true. We did do something.

What they did was nothing. I am not a black man with a conspiracy theory, but I am here to tell you that I am concerned, especially when I see headlines, the Washington Post, November 16, 2005, that says ''Document says oil chief met with the Vice President of the United States on his task force.'' So how in the world can folks sit down with the very people that are making record profits? This was put in motion long ago, and now folks are acting like they don't know what is going on.

You know why they are acting like they don't know what is going on? Because the American people are pulling their car and saying you know something, Mr. Congressman, madam Congresswoman, you said you were there to protect me. You are not doing a good job, because I can't even put gas in my tank to take my children to school, I can't even make it to work. We are trying to car pool. Even that is becoming a little difficult. And you have folks, they don't have enough money. Some of these pumps in some communities won't even allow them to pump all of the gas they need to pump to fill their tank.

Hello? We have also gas stations here in Washington, D.C. that are out of gas, and South Florida. Maybe those small businesses, independent businesses within these oil companies, can't even afford the gas.

And we are going to find out. You know what is going to happen again? We are going to find in this time, and let me just say, Johnny Carson used to have the envelope he would put to his head.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Carnack the Magnificent.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. He would say something like ''high prices, backroom deals.'' He would open the envelope and later we would see oh, wow, and they made record profits while this was going on.

□ 2350

I am going to go ahead and crystal-ball this thing, because that is what is going to happen, and folks are going to say, well, we really need to do something about it.

If I was in the Republican majority right now, that is very hypothetical, I must add, I would be concerned. If I am home in the bed right now, Madam Speaker, and I was a Member of the majority, I would sit up in my bed and say, you know, maybe, just maybe, we need to go see the wizard, get some courage, get some leadership, and say, you know something, enough is enough, because I am going to be in the minority, not because of the fact that folks did such a great job as it relates to raising money, because you know we cannot raise more money than the other side, not the fact that, you know, our ties are better or our dresses, you

know, the dresses that the female Members on this side wear are better.

But I think it is important, Madam Speaker, that we look at the facts. It is not fair. It is not fair to the American people, and it is not even fair if I was on the Republican majority side, we tell the Republican majority, come out and defend the selling of America. All of these countries here are owning a part of America. I do not care if you are a diehard Republican, and that you are the chair of the local Republican committee, you have to have a problem with this.

You tell your Members, explain this to me. Why are we selling America away? Why are we giving tax breaks we cannot afford? We are we allowing the oil companies to do this? Why? Why? Why? Do not tell me to vote Republican because we are Republicans and that we always did it, and that my mama did it, and that my grandmother did it, and that my great-great-grandmother did it. We cannot do it because of that. We have to do it because we salute one flag. People have died for us to have this opportunity.

I am so happy that we come to this floor, Madam Speaker, every day, because history will reflect that there were Members in this body in the minority fighting with what they had, with a nub, fighting night after night, day after day, filing amendments, failing on this floor, arm-twisting happening on the other side, and we prevailed because I am going to tell you, the American people are sick and tired of it, and change is going to happen, and it is going to happen for the better.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I just want to ask you another question. As we went through last year and we debated those energy bills, and I remember when they went through the committees and then actually came, at least one of them did not even go to committee, it just came to the floor. And it came out on this Chamber. One of those bills was yet another example of the red lights changing to green lights, and the board being held open. I think the energy bill that I am referring to, I know the board was held open for at least 40 minutes, until the Republican leadership got the vote that they wanted.

Now, we have asked repeatedly, where is the outrage? Where was the outrage then when Republicans, rank-and-file Republicans, who not only needed some courage, but could have gotten some advice from the Scarecrow and the Tin Man then, too, for some heart and some brains, but where was the outrage? And what did that mean?

Essentially what did it mean when they had the opportunity, when they put their no vote up on the board, yet the leadership came to them on the floor, wrenched their arm behind their back, and what did they do? They were rubber-stamp Republicans yet again. Rubber-stamp Republicans.

And I just, time after time I have noticed that that is really the best way to describe the vast majority of Members of the Republican Caucus, because they have the opportunity to have some courage, they do not have any. What do they have? They have the ability to just say, uh-huh, sure, I will do it exactly the way you want it, Mr. Republican Leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The real issue here is the fact that, Madam Speaker, I am done with trying to beg the majority to lead. I am just done. I mean, there is nothing more that we can say. They have had their opportunity. They have their opportunity now. They are still not moving as a majority. We have said what we would do as Democrats.

The bottom line is Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about the rubber stamp. It is now so big, Mr. President, whatever we can do, whatever you need us to do, we are with you. Just, that is it. Done. What else do you want us to do? And that is just where it is. And we are going to make this as obvious as possible.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I think it is really interesting to note for the record, Madam Speaker, that the relationship between this rubber-stamp Congress and this White House is so close that in the 6 years of this Presidency, he has never had to veto a single piece of legislation that came from the United States Congress. Not once, Madam Speaker, not once.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Say it is not so, Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It is so. Tragically it is so.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. He has never been forced to veto any legislation or sent anything that they were afraid he would not like. And I want to know, where are our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, where is their line? Where is the line that we know we all have, that says, you know, this far and no farther? I just cannot do it. They do not have that line.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I tell you what is happening. Because we are talking about oil, and we are talking about home heating oil, and we are talking about staying warm. We are talking about heat. And the heat is coming, because, you know, we are going to hear a lot of hot air, but the American people are putting the feet to fire of those who have not supported a public policy regarding energy that makes sense for all Americans, not just Exxon Mobil that last year made $32 billion, and, by the way, whose CEO who is now retired, is earning a pension, Madam Speaker, of $150,000.

I hope you heard that, Madam Speaker, $150,000. Now, you might say that is not much money. Well, it is a lot of money when you get $150,0000 every single day of the year. It is a pension that is evaluated.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Wait. Wait. Did I hear you? Did I hear you correctly? Did you say a hundred and what a day?

Mr. DELAHUNT. One hundred fifty thousand dollars. Not every 10 years. Not every 5 years. Not every year. Not every month. But every single day as long as he lives, $150,000. The pension package, according to newspaper reports, Madam Speaker, was $600 million. That is for one person. For one person.

This is a moral issue. This is a moral issue. There are people that are having difficulty, they are working hard, but they are having difficulty making it, and yet there is a CEO who runs a corporation that earns $39 billion in a single year. And he has a pension of $600 million that provides him with $150,000 a day. Is that right, or is that wrong?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In our final minute or so, I can tell you that what I learned from my constituents when I went back home is that they know that together America can do better. It does not have to be this way. We do not have to keep going. And through our efforts and the efforts of our other Democratic colleagues, our 30-something Working Group will continue to take the floor each night.

I yield to my colleague from Florida to close us out. We do have a Website.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, thank you. With Mr. RYAN's absence here tonight, I keep saying that because I want him to read the Congressional RECORD and let him know that I did note that he was not here.

Housedemocrats.gov/30something. Members can go on there.

With that, Madam Speaker, we would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this hour.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal matters.

Mr. OSBORNE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and until 3:30 p.m. on April 26 on account of official business.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and April 26 and 27.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, April 27.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and April 26 and 27.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today and April 26 and 27.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and April 26 and 27.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WOLF of Virginia, on April 11, 2006.

H.R. 4979. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify the preference for local firms in the award of certain contracts for disaster relief activities.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reports that on April 7, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.J. Res. 81. Providing for the appointment of Phillip Frost as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 82. Providing for the reappointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reports that on April 18, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4979. To amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify the preference for local firms in the award of certain contracts for disaster relief activities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at (midnight), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday April 26, 2006, at 10:00 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6925. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for FY 2007 budget amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, and State and Other International Programs; the Federal Communications Commission; and the Smithsonian Institution; (H. Doc. No. 109–97); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6926. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting reports in accordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6927. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the status of consular training with respect to travel or identity documents, pursuant to Section 7201(d) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

6928. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for the quarter ending December 31, 2005, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on International Relations.

6929. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 06-18, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Korea for defense articles and services; to the Committee on International Relations.

6930. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 06-22, concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Australia for defense articles and services; to the Committee on International Relations.

6931. A letter from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report for FY 2005 of the Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS); to the Committee on International Relations.

6932. A letter from the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, Department of State, transmitting a report on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief: Education, as requested in House Report 109-152, accompanying H.R. 3057; to the Committee on International Relations.

6933. A letter from the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator, Department of State, transmitting a report on the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief: Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons, as requested in House Report 109-152, accompanying H.R. 3057; to the Committee on International Relations.

6934. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the intention to obligate Fiscal Year 2006 Economic Support Funds (ESF) on behalf of the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs; to the Committee on International Relations.

6935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on ''Overseas Surplus Property,'' pursuant to Public Law 105-277, section 2215; to the Committee on International Relations.

6936. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the October 15, 2005 — December 15, 2005 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq under Section 7 of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-338); to the Committee on International Relations.

6937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report for 2003 on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Activities in countries described in Section 307(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, pursuant to Public Law 105–277, section 2809(c)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

6938. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Iraq (Transmittal No. DDTC 072-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

6939. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Governments of Canada, France and the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DDTC 002-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

6940. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of the Egypt (Transmittal No. DDTC-58-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

6941. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Russia (Transmittal No. DDTC 057-05); to the Committee on International Relations.

6942. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled ''Supporting Democracy and Human Rights: The U.S. Record 2005-2006,'' pursuant to Public Law 107-228, section 665; to the Committee on International Relations.

6943. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

6944. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6945. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6946. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6947. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6948. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6949. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6950. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6951. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6952. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6953. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 2006 through March 31, 2006 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 109–98); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6954. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Search and Rescue Demonstration, Boston Harbor — Boston, Massachusetts [CGD01-05-093] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6955. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Virginia Beach, VA [CGD05-05-121] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6956. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Norfolk Harbor Entrance Reach Channel, Norfolk, VA [CGD05-05-132] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6957. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Severn River and College Creek, Annapolis, Maryland [CGD05-05-133] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6958. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kingsland Reach, James River, VA [CGD05-05-134] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6959. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kingsland Reach, James River, VA [CGD05-05-135] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6960. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Kingsland Reach, James River, VA [CGD05-05-136] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6961. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Snow's Cut Channel from Cape Fear River to Intracoastal Waterway, NC [CGD05-05-500] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6962. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Chicago River, North Branch, Chicago, Illinois [CGD09-05-132] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6963. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; BID 21 Fireworks display, Milwaukee River, Milwaukee, WI [CGD09-05-133] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6964. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Magnificant Mile Festival of Lights, Chicago, IL [CGD09-05-134] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6965. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Containment Concrete Blasting, Lake Michigan, Charlevoix, MI [CGD09-05-136] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6966. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, Ohio. West Third Street Bridge Trainsit [CGD09-05-138] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6967. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Event; Rio Vista Bass Derby Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay and Rio Vista, CA [CGD 11-05-029] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6968. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Jacksonville Beach, FL [COTP Jacksonville 05-121] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6969. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Ponce De Leon Inlet and Port Canaveral, FL [COTP Jacksonville 05-144] (RIN: 1625-AA97) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6970. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; West Lake Tohopekaliga, Kissimmee, FL [COTP Jacksonville 05-160] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6971. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [COTP Jacksonville 05-161] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6972. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Vilano Beach, FL [COTP Jacksonville 05-169] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6973. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Florida Bay, Money Key Channel, Monroe County, FL [COTP Key West 05-136] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6974. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Francisco Bay, California [COTP San Francisco Bay 05-010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6975. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Guayanilla Bay, Guayanilla, PR [COTP San Juan 05-157] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6976. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone for Albert Whitted Air Show, Tampa Bay, FL [COTP St. Petersburg 05-119] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6977. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Clearwater, FL [COTP St. Petersburg 05-134] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6978. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Caloosahatchee River, Cape Coral, FL [COTP St. Petersburg 05-152] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

[Omitted from the Record of April 6, 2006]

6979. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting a copy of the ''Federal Aviation Administration and National Air Traffic Controllers Association Collective Bargaining Proposal Submission to Congress,'' received April 6, 2006, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 106(l) and 40122(a); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Government Reform.

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:

[Filed on April 7, 2006]

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. House Resolution 718. Resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to the Dubai Ports World acquisition of 6 United States commercial ports leases; with amendments (Rept. 109–414). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Filed on April 7, 2006]

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. House Resolution 717. Resolution directing the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of a workforce globalization final draft report produced by the Technology Administration (Rept. 109–415). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted April 25, 2006]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 349. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 109–416). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 282. A bill to hold the current regime in Iran accountable for its threatening behavior and to support a transition to democracy in Iran; with an amendment (Rept. 109–417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3462. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Bureau of Land Management parcels known as the White Acre and Gambel Oak properties and related real property to Park City, Utah, and for other purpose; with an amendment (Rept. 109–418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2978. A bill to allow the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation to enter into a lease or other temporary conveyance of water rights recognized under the Fort Peck-Montana Compact for the purpose of meeting the water needs of the Dry Prairie Rural Water Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2563. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct feasibility studies to address certain water shortages within the Snake, Boise, and Payette River systems in Idaho, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 518. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to refine the Department of the Interior program for providing assistance for the conservation of neotropical migratory birds, with an amendment (Rept. 109–421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 374. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain tribally-owned reservation land into trust for the Puyallup Tribe; with an amendment (Rept. 109–422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 122. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Eastern Municipal Water district Recycled Water System Pressurization and Expansion Project; with an amendment (Rept. 109–423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4912. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA program for mortgage insurance for hospitals (Rept. 109–424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. House Joint Resolution 78. Resolution approving the location of the commemorative work in the District of Columbia honoring former President Dwight D. Eisenhower (Rept. 109–425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1307. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate portions of the Musconetcong River in the State of New Jersey as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. S. 1869. A Act to reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. S. 1165. An Act to provide for the expansion of the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge, Honolulu County, Hawaii (Rept. 109–429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4204. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer ownership of the American River Pump Station Project, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3967. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reallocate costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir, South Dakota, to reflect increased demands for municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes (Rept. 109–431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4080. A bill to extend the contract for the Glendo Unit of the Missouri River Basin Project in the State of Wyoming (Rept. 109–432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3682. A bill to redesignate the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia as the Elizabeth Hartwell Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. 109–433). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. 2006 Congressional Drug Control Budget and Policy Assessment: A Review of the 2007 National Drug Control Budget and 2006 National Drug Control Strategy (Rept. 109–434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. Updating Nuclear Security Standards: How Long Can the Department of Energy Afford to Wait? (Rept. 109–435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. Strengthening Disease Surveillance (Rept. 109–436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PUTNAM: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 774. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5020) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–438). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4975. A bill to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–439, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EHLERS. Committee on House Administration. H.R. 4975. A bill to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, and for other purposes; (Rept. 109–439, Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREIER. Committee on Rules. H.R. 4975. A bill to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 109–439, Pt. 3). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 4975. A bill to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 109–439, Pt. 4). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4975 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO. Committee on Resources. S. 584. A bill to act require the Secretary of the Interior to allow the continued occupancy and use of certain land and improvements within Rocky Mountain National Park (Rept. 109–426). Referred to the Private Calendar.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. POMBO. Committee on Resources. H.R. 1595. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Guam War Claims Review Commission, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Judiciary for a period ending not later than June 9, 2006, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(l), rule X (Rept. 109–437, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SODREL (for himself, Ms. CARSON, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 5169. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1310 Highway 64 NW. in Ramsey, Indiana, as the ''Wilfred Edward 'Cousin Willie' Sieg, Sr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 5170. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ethanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 5171. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for community projects that will reduce the number of individuals who are uninsured with respect to health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 5172. A bill to improve the effectiveness of Department of Defense programs for the remediation of unexploded ordnance on former defense sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 5173. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to suspend the Medicare prescription drug late enrollment penalty during 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 5174. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent veterans' contributions to education benefits from reducing Federal student financial assistance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 5175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to disclose taxpayer identity information through mass communications to notify persons entitled to tax refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMANUEL:

H.R. 5176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the Federal income tax system simpler, fairer, and more fiscally responsible, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 5177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow bonds guaranteed by the Federal home loan banks to be treated as tax exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 5178. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a study to identify best practices for the communication of information concerning a terrorist threat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. HALL:

H.R. 5179. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure adequate payment amounts for drugs and biologicals under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. RENZI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 5180. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation to carry out the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program in the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to limit the number of, and require reporting relating to, all subcontracts under contracts with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 5182. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the sponsor of a prescription drug plan or an organization offering an MA-PD plan to promptly pay claims submitted under part D, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUHL of New York:

H.R. 5183. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude benefits of adopted disabled adult children from determinations of the family maximum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 5184. A bill to require businesses to permit customers to cancel certain subscription services in the same manner and by the same means as is provided by such person to individuals to subscribe to such service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 5185. A bill to promote the empowerment of women in Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to replace the expired tax benefits for the DC Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Government Reform, 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. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 5187. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts for fiscal year 2007; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen enforcement of spousal court-ordered property distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 5189. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to any benefit thereunder shall continue through the month of his or her death (without affecting any other person's entitlement to benefits for that month) and that such individual's benefit shall be payable for such month only to the extent proportionate to the number of days in such month preceding the date of such individual's death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 5190. A bill to establish the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 5191. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to require, as a condition of receiving a homeland security grant, that a grant recipient submit reports on each expenditure made using grant funds; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 5192. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make available cost-shared grants and enter into cooperative agreements to further the goals of the Water 2025 Program by improving water conservation, efficiency, and management in the Reclamation States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 5193. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for continuity of Medicare prescription drug coverage for full-benefit dual eligible individuals, for Medicare prescription drug coverage of benzodiazepines and off-label uses of certain prescription drugs and biological products, for optional Medicaid coverage of Medicare prescription drug cost-sharing for full-benefit dual eligible individuals, for authorization to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive certain determinations denying Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for holding pharmacies harmless for certain costs incurred during implementation of Medicare part D; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 5194. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8801 Sudley Road in Manassas, Virginia, as the ''Harry J. Parrish Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 5195. A bill to establish the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H. Con. Res. 389. Concurrent resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Standing Rules of the Senate to require the full payment and disclosure of charter flights provided to Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (for himself and Mr. SODREL):

H. Res. 772. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to provide regular ethics training for Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 773. A resolution commending the American Jewish Committee for its century of leadership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Res. 775. A resolution commending the Community of Sant'Egidio for their extensive charity and generosity on behalf of the poor throughout the world; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H. Res. 776. A resolution supporting the observance of a ''National Day of the American Cowboy''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida:

H. Res. 777. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives, in recognition of the contributions of the Haitian people to the history and culture of the United States, by establishing ''Haitian-American Heritage Month''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 97: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 147: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 198: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 282: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 303: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 333: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 354: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 356: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 363: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 378: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 521: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 533: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 550: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEACH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 552: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 558: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 559: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 583: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 602: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 662: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 663: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 697: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 808: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 874: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 917: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 926: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 939: Mr. LANTOS and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 964: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 987: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 994: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 998: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1002: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 1059: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1079: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1105: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 1131: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1172: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1175: Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1188: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BACA, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1227: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. BEAN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1245: Mr. SABO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1352: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1356: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 1364: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1415: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1426: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1431: Mr. EVANS and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1432: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1433: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1462: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1498: Mr. MELANCON and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1514: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 1548: Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1554: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1578: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1582: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 1591: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1595: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. AKIN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1633: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 1671: Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 1687: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1696: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1707: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1708: Mr. PAUL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1951: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2043: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 2076: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2088: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 2177: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 2230: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2231: Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. DENT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 2238: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2328: Mr. FILNER, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2350: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 2353: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 2357: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2369: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HERGER, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 2390: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2421: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2429: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 2456: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2561: Miss MCMORRIS and Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 2567: Mrs. NORTHUP and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2568: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 2662: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2669: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2684: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2716: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2736: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2793: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2813: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2842: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2861: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 2928: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2943: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2960: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3151: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3155: Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 3164: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 3312: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3352: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 3380: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3436: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 3442: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 3476: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. REYES, Mr. FARR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 3568: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3576: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 3612: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 3614: Ms. HARRIS and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 3623: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 3628: Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3656: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3689: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 3701: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3712: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3715: Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 3753: Mr. JINDAL.
H.R. 3762: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3778: Mr. PAYNE and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 3780: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3854: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3858: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 3859: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 3861: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3883: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3933: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 3936: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut,
Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. REYES, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GORDON, Ms. WATSON, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 3949: Mr. BONNER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3957: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 4025: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4042: Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 4049: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 4062: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4063: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 4098: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4126: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 4188: Ms. CARSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 4217: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. Drake, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 4222: Ms. LEE and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4229: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 4236: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 4259: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4341: Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 4361: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4371: Mr. CUELLAR and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 4384: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 4398: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 4399: Mr. PORTER and Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 4409: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. BONO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. BONNER.
H.R. 4424: Mr. HOYER and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4463: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4474: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 4479: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OLVER; Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 4493: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 4511: Ms. HART.
H.R. 4542: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 4547: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 4550: Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHERWOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4574: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4582: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4597: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 4600: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 4606: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4619: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 4621: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 4624: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 4629: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4650: Mr. JINDAL, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 4651: Ms. LEE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4662: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 4665: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4666: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4668: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 4672: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4677: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 4695: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4696: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 4704: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 4705: Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 4710: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4727: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4730: Mr. CARTER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4739: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4740: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4747: Mr. TERRY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4749: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4753: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4755: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CASE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. REYES, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 4761: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 4769: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CASE, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4772: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
H.R. 4774: Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 4794: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4806: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 4808: Mr. HAYES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4809: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4824: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4838: Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 4843: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H.R. 4854: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4860: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 4861: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4873: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 4894: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H.R. 4897: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4902: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BOREN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 4903: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 4922: Mr. CARTER and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4937: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4948: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 4949: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 4956: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4959: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 4960: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4962: Mr. NADLER and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4963: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4974: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 4992: Mr. FILNER and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 4993: Ms. LEE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5005: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 5010: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 5013: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SODREL, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 5033: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 5036: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 5037: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CASE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GORDON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 5039: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 5050: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 5051: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 5055: Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 5056: Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 5063: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 5065: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5069: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 5075: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 5081: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. Gallegly.
H.R. 5099: Mr. FILNER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr.

LEACH, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 5113: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FARR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 5118: Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 5119: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 5129: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 5134: Mr. TANNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. REYES, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 5136: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 5137: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5150: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5159: Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FORD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 5160: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 5166: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FARR, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. BERRY.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. BERRY and Mr. CARTER.

H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Con. Res. 219: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 231: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H. Con. Res. 234: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Con. Res. 235: Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Con. Res. 306: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Con. Res. 348: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 357: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 363: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. COSTA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BASS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PICKERING, Ms. HART, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Con. Res. 378: Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 380: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Con. Res. 388: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 67: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Res. 222: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 299: Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 305: Mr. SNYDER.

H. Res. 316: Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 335: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 498: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GORDON, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H. Res. 521: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. RAHALL.

H. Res. 526: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 600: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 636: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 637: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 638: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 699: Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H. Res. 701: Mr. TERRY, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H. Res. 722: Mr. MURTHA.

H. Res. 723: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. Res. 727: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 729: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. LEE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 739: Mr. OXLEY.

H. Res. 740: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Res. 745: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 771: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.