

teeny, tiny little baby steps that we are encouraging when we should have these great leaps for mankind.

□ 1945

You know, if this Congress was running the space race, the quote would have been, "Another little step up the cabin of a DC-3," because that is about all we would have invented. Kennedy got us to the moon; this energy policy won't get us to Cleveland.

We believe we need a very significant ramp-up both in Federal research and development, basic R&D, tax credits to manufacturers, to help them manufacture fuel-efficient vehicles; tax credits to consumers to allow you to decide how to buy both a fuel-efficient car and build a fuel-efficient home; and use of the procurement policy.

We haven't talked about this tonight at all, but one of the great tools we have in our toolbox in energy policy is the Federal Government procurement power. The Federal Government is kind of the 800-pound gorilla when it comes to buying things in this economy. The Federal Government needs to start buying fuel-efficient cars, fuel-efficient air-conditioning units, and building green buildings. There is much more that we can do.

We are taking little baby steps there. The Pentagon is looking at a fuel-efficient battery. One of the competitors trying to develop this is in my district. It is called Neopower. They are building a fuel-celled battery that will actually power computers and radio devices using fuel cells. So as we ramp that up, hopefully we will have much more efficient batteries that can last much longer and not burn gasoline-generated electricity. But we are just starting.

I don't know how to categorize it other than to say that we need a revolution, and what we are getting is not even an evolution. It is almost a devolution, going back the wrong way.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. It is not using our imagination and our skills to move forward. And, also, I will just second the point you made. I do feel very strongly that the public buildings, for example, and our public procurement, that is what we buy, we should be setting an example. We should be practicing what we preach. We should be doing as best we can.

Again, it is not so easy for us to change our patterns, you know, what we are used to doing. Someone said, when gasoline prices were so high, one of the suggestions we were trying to make to people is if you are going to run your errands, try to be more efficient in the way you drive and do that. You could save yourself a few gallons of gasoline every week, several a month. That could make a difference. Think about carpooling.

It is hard to change our own patterns, and I think that is true in government, too. We should be setting an example that when we actually build a new building, that it is more energy-efficient; when we change light bulbs,

and I think there were just some changes made in some of the hallways and some of the office buildings, but are we encouraged to turn the lights off? We keep a lot of lights on every night. What would that save if, in fact, we had these all on timers or motion detectors?

We should be thinking about this in a way, because if each of us reduced our energy consumption by 10 percent, maybe some of us could even do better, we could have a dramatic impact on the amount of energy and fuel we would need.

So, again, this isn't picking and choosing. This isn't saying, I am going to blame individuals for not doing all they can. We are not blaming anyone. The idea is for us to really use all of our power, if I can use that word, all of our power to make it clear that we want less costly, more efficient fuel for all of our needs.

And we are going to have these needs. We are going to need this energy for our needs. They are not going to get fewer. There are more of us, more people, more densely populated, and we need to figure this out and do so in a way that doesn't just say let us just give a little more subsidy to the oil industry. If we just took the subsidies, \$8 billion, \$9 billion from the oil industry, maybe collected those royalties for offshore drilling from the oil industry, and said let us take that money and invest it in these new technologies and invest it in renewables, use the incentives so people will build buildings that will be more fuel-efficient and energy-efficient, what would that do for us?

In fact, what we know is that that is really significant. The amount of reduction in energy needs would be really significant and would have an impact. And at the same time, we would be learning better what, in fact, works best for us so we would be able to move ahead.

I just want to say one more thing, and then I want to reflect on some of this, too. I think we also have to say to people that we have done this. I think you are right to use the example of the man on the moon, but we have even done smaller things; for instance, when we found out that lead in paint was extremely harmful to kids in this country. We didn't always know that. There was lead in paint, and we all painted with that, used that paint, but, in fact, those paint chips actually caused brain damage for our kids. Well, we did something about it. It didn't happen immediately. People finally had to get outraged by it. Members of Congress finally had to stand up and say, you know what we are going to do, we are going to take lead out of paint.

Now, originally people said, I don't think we can do that. I don't think we have the technology to do that; how do we do that? Well, some smart people got together and figured out how to do it, and they did. We don't allow lead to be put in our paint anymore. We don't have chlorofluorocarbons anymore, be-

cause we realized it was causing a big hole in the ozone layer. It took a while for us to agree to do something about that, and some people said, oh, it is not really a problem, but it turns out it was a problem, and the fact is we could fix it, and we did.

So I just want to reflect on that because people sometimes think this is just too big. I can't do it, you can't do it, how are we going to do it? But the fact is we can if we get serious about it. If we understand the different roles of the private and public sector, we can actually do something really dramatic about creating less expensive, more home-based energy.

Mr. INSLEE. I just want to point out the history of our own country is that we will succeed on this because we have succeeded.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, because of what Congress did, and President Carter, we increased our fuel efficiency at least 50 percent. And if we had simply continued on that path, we would be free of Persian Gulf oil today. We could have solved this problem if we had simply continued with that success.

But I want to close by thanking you for your leadership on this and by saying that the Democrats are optimistic on energy, Democrats believe in innovation, and Democrats believe in paying for it and not having a deficit. And we are going to do that by closing some of these giveaways to the oil and gas industry.

Thank you for your leadership.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. And I'll just also end by saying thank you very much, Mr. INSLEE, for joining me and for helping, I hope, being able to talk about what is such an important issue for every American, and that is how to create less expensive, more available, more home-grown energy.

So thank you very much for joining me this evening, and I look forward to getting this done with you.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here to open up for another discussion with the 30-something Working Group. We will be joined later by our friends from Florida who have been rooting on the Miami Heat in the last few days and are very excited about some key victories. So Mr. MEEK and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ will be here soon.

The issue tonight, Mr. Speaker, for all of us as Americans, I believe, is one of the most pressing issues our country has faced in a long time, and that is the issue of our national debt and our annual deficits that we are running here in the United States of America. We have always prided ourselves in the United States of being able to balance

our budgets and pay our bills, and making sure that we were like the average family in the United States that had to deal with paying bills, making sure at the end of the month we at least broke even, maybe even had a little bit to save.

Throughout the course of the 1990s, under the leadership of President Clinton, and in 1993 with a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate, we passed a budget resolution, as Democrats, that balanced the budget and led to one of the greatest economic expansions in the history of the world, which lifted up millions of people, created 20 million new jobs, and led to prosperity for everybody in the country.

We put in place PAYGO rules, which said that you can't spend any money that you don't either raise taxes to spend it or you cut spending somewhere, but what you don't do is you don't go out and borrow it. You don't go to China or Japan or OPEC and borrow the money. You make sure we have the money that we generated ourselves, and we pay our bills and meet our obligations: Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits, education, Pell Grants, health care, children's health care, or whatever the priorities may be, we would have the money to pay for it.

So the discussion tonight, Mr. Speaker, is of an issue that is pressing not only to the 30-something generation, because we are going to be around to pay the bills for the reckless spending, and our kids and our grandkids, the next couple of generations coming, but you can't get something for nothing. And right now the Republican House and Senate and President Bush are basically living on a credit card at the expense of the next generation of Americans who are going to be forced to pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know you have seen this chart before, but it is indicative of the situation we are in in the United States of America. In 224 years, from 1776 to the year 2000, all of the Presidents and all of the Congresses borrowed a total of \$1.01 trillion from foreign sources, foreign interests, in 224 years. The current President and the current Republican House and the current Republican Senate have managed, from 2001 to 2005, to borrow more money from foreign interests than all the previous Presidents in the previous 224 years. This is staggering.

And you may ask, Mr. Speaker, well, what are the 30-somethings talking about this for? We are supposed to talk about issues, Mr. Speaker, that affect kids and 20-somethings and 30-somethings, and young families. This is the most pressing issue for the next generation of Americans because we are going to be the ones left footing the bill.

When tax rates go up for the 30-somethings or the 20-somethings, or the kids that are in college or in grade school now, because of this reckless borrowing, it is irresponsible. It is not

in the public interest. It is not in the interest of the next generation, Mr. Speaker. And, therefore, it is an issue for the 30-something Democratic Working Group to talk about.

So it may be \$1 trillion. Where are we getting it from, Mr. Speaker? Look at this picture of America, and it shows exactly where we are getting it: \$682 billion from Japan; \$249 billion from China, the U.K., the Caribbean, Taiwan, Germany, Korea, Canada; and \$67.8 billion we have borrowed from OPEC countries. OPEC countries.

Can you imagine, in this day and age, with the cost of gas and with the price of a barrel of oil, that the United States has been so reckless and so irresponsible that we would go out and put ourselves in the position where we have to borrow money from OPEC and borrow money from China? This has a lot of different effects. This is just like when you get a loan for your house. You look at your house, and your house costs \$110,000, and then when you take out a loan, you look at what you are going to end up paying to actually get your \$110,000 house, and it is thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars more.

This is what we are doing here. We may borrow \$682 billion from Japan, we may borrow \$250 billion from China, but how much more do we have to pay on interest, Mr. Speaker? That money is not going to be going to other priorities here in the United States of America. So China, who has been wiping out the middle class of the United States of America, especially in Ohio and Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin, Indiana and Connecticut, and a lot of the other areas of the country, China is loaning us money. We pay them the interest on it, they take the interest, make some money off the Americans, and invest that back into their state-owned companies that will compete directly with American manufacturers here in the United States of America.

Now, I know we are in a global economy, and nobody wants to say that we are not going to trade. We all know that is ridiculous. We all know it is going to happen. But to borrow money from a country that is going to take the interest that you pay them on it and invest it back in to compete against you makes it even more unfair than the situation already is. You are putting yourself at a competitive disadvantage. It is irresponsible, and it is reckless because we have to pay the interest, but you are also aiding and abetting your competition every day.

Again, here is what we borrowed. The increase in the national debt, \$1.18 trillion; and of that, \$1.16 was borrowed from foreign interests, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and only \$.02 trillion borrowed from domestic interests.

And let me make one more point before the Miami Heat takes the floor again.

This is the kicker, Mr. Speaker. All of that money that we borrow and that

we have to pay interest on, here is what it looks like in the 2007 budget authority. This is billions of dollars. The big red bar on the left is what we have to pay in interest, interest on the money that we are borrowing.

So this money that the American people send down here and we spend it on education and health care and this and that, the biggest portion goes to just paying interest on the debt; and China and these other countries will take that money and reinvest it back into their state-owned, Communist-run facilities.

But look how it compares to what we are spending on education or on homeland security or on veterans. This is really the icing on the cake. This is what makes it so irresponsible. Not only are we putting the burden on our kids, but there are current investments that we cannot make because we are forced to spend all this money on just the interest on the debt.

□ 2000

I yield to the Miami Heat.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I am going to wait on that little celebration until our good friend from Florida joins us and we can do the happy dance together on the Heat's amazing victory last night, and I am sure the Speaker enjoyed that fantastic victory last night as well. So we will regale you with the success of the Heat when the gentleman from Florida joins us.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I could interrupt my friend, it was very reminiscent of the glory days of the Boston Celtics. In the old Boston Garden and in the new Garden they hang, I think, 16 flags representing world championships won by the Boston Celtics, and I hope at some point in time the Miami Heat does as well.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, do the Celtics still have a team?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Of course. They are in the rebuilding mode.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I was a Larry Bird fan from way back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We have begun a proud tradition in south Florida, and we are looking forward to equaling over time the amazing success of the Boston Celtics. Having already experienced the joy of a national championship by the University of Florida Fighting Gators basketball team, basketball is alive and well in Florida. As you can see, we have some pretty good players down our way.

But I want to jump off because Mr. RYAN did refer to the billions in debt, and you went through very eloquently, and I don't think people in America have a real idea, that is why I love that chart of the percentage of debt that each of those countries has of the United States.

And when you graphically depict it across the entire country, it really, really drives the point home. But what I found, and I have a shorter tenure in

Congress than you and Mr. MEEK and Mr. DELAHUNT do, going from the State legislature where we were dealing with millions more often than billions with a “b,” people would tell me it is hard to get their mind around what a billion is. It is such a big number; it is hard to grasp.

So I came up, along with my staff's help, with this chart to graphically illustrate what a billion is. When we are talking about billions in debt and the interest payments are in the billions and they dwarf other priorities like homeland security and funding for our veterans and education, how much is a billion?

A billion hours ago, for example, humans were making their first tools in the Stone Age. A billion seconds ago it was 1975, and the last American troops had pulled out of Vietnam.

A billion minutes ago, it was 104 A.D. and the Chinese had first invented paper.

If you take the definitions that the Republicans use when it comes to a billion, a billion dollars ago under the Republican leadership was only 3 hours and 32 minutes ago at the rate our government is currently spending money.

So a billion used to be a really significant number that if you translate it into time was a very long time ago. But translated into time under Republican leadership, it was just a few hours ago.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The issue here, and I love that chart because it does put everything into perspective, is that this outfit is leaving America worse off than they found it, and that is really upsetting. When you think about long term what we are going to have to deal with, what the 30-somethings and people with kids in college and grade school, what kind of country are you leaving these kids, that is what frustrates me. We have an obligation to make sure that we leave the garden patch a little nicer than we found it. And the debt, the war, you are strapping this next generation for generations. We are going to spend our entire life in public life or our generation's service to the country is going to be fixing the war in Iraq, balancing the budget, and trying to make ourselves competitive in a brutal global economy.

It is frustrating, but it is the overarching theme that the Republican Senate and House and White House are leaving the country worse off than they found it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You are absolutely right, and a little more reality to translate what we are talking about here into everyday economics, if you look at the 2006 tax reconciliation bill and compare it to benefit by income for the benefit that was given or the equivalent of the benefit to the amount of income that an American taxpayer brings in, for example under the 2006 tax cut legislation that passed out of this House overwhelmingly with Republican votes, an aver-

age American taxpayer that makes between \$10,000 and \$20,000 a year would get back enough to buy a Slurpee. But if you make between \$40,000 and \$50,000, you will get from the 2006 Republican tax cut bill about as much money to buy a gallon of gas.

Now, if we are talking real benefits here, the real benefits and who got the most out of the Republican tax cut bill this year, the reality is if you made more than \$1 million, you get the equivalent of a Hummer.

I don't know, if I am talking to the folks in my district, and I know the folks in Youngstown, Ohio, and the people on the Cape and in the Boston area, they probably are not that interested in getting enough money back to buy a Slurpee. Something tells me, and at least when I go home, and I have a district that includes a lot of areas that have people of means, and I can tell you when I go to community events and bring my kids to the soccer game and drive my kids around in our minivan, the people in the wealthiest parts of my district are coming up and saying keep the money because the needs we have in America are overwhelming. They are saying, you know what, I don't need the Slurpee, I can buy my own Hummer. If you are making more than a million dollars, you can buy your own Hummer.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And it is not like we have the money to give the person making a million dollars.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We don't. We have an \$8 trillion deficit.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And where do we get the money to give the money to the millionaire to go buy a Hummer? We have to go borrow it. That makes no sense.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Yet the rank and file Republicans and the Republican leadership continue to try to profess that they are the party of fiscal responsibility. It is hilarious. It really is.

In the legislature in Florida, we used to talk about statements like that not being able to pass the straight-face test. It doesn't pass the straight-face test. How do they say it without smirking? How do they say it without crossing their fingers and putting their fingers behind their back? We should check behind the backs of all of the Members when they are speaking on the floor here about how fiscally responsible they are because I am sure they are all like this. They can't cross themselves enough. It is really over the top.

I was taught to tell the truth by my parents. I'm incredulous how some of these Members get away with claiming fiscal responsibility.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me give a very concrete example that was reported Saturday in my hometown newspaper, one of them, the Boston Globe. The headline read: “Cost of college piling debt on Massachusetts families.”

“Massachusetts families fell a total of \$562 million short of being able to

pay for college in the State last year, according to State officials, highlighting the struggle for families to afford higher education in Massachusetts.”

Now that \$562 million represented the portion of college costs a family cannot afford to pay that is not covered by Federal, State or institutional grants or loans. And when aid falls short, many students make up the difference with private loans they have trouble repaying.

Here is a quote from a young student: “My dad had to take money out of his 401(k) twice because during the semester we weren't given enough in grants and student loans to meet the amount we had to pay.”

The article goes on to say that students are covering the funding gap with higher-interest private loans, credit card debt, and too many hours of work outside of school.

Now I sat on the Administrative Law Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary where for 5 or 6 years we reviewed the proposal for the so-called bankruptcy law. I was always struck by the number of solicitations that were going to students to utilize their credit cards. Some would send a check.

I remember in the debate bringing a blown-up posterboard of a check that my daughter received for \$2,500. And as part of the solicitation, there was an opening salutation that said: “Have a good spring break.”

Well, the truth is that those credit card solicitations were putting in the hands of students credit cards that carried with them 18 percent, 22 percent, 26 percent, 30 percent interest rates. So what we are doing is not only creating a culture where credit card debt is an acceptable norm for paying significant loans, but we are graduating our students with average debts of about \$10,000 on which they are paying these exorbitant credit card rates.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. In the Democratic proposal to take the country in a new direction, one of the key components, and I am glad you brought this up, two basic provisions, cutting interest rates in half for the borrowers in most needs on subsidized student loans from a fixed rate of 6.8 percent to a fixed percent rate of 3.4 percent, and cutting rates on parent loans for undergraduate students from a fixed rate of 8.5 percent to a fixed rate of 4.25 percent.

This is about running the government and what are your priorities. Now it amazes me, Mr. DELAHUNT, it amazes me how this Republican-led Congress can go to great lengths to make sure that the oil industry gets their corporate subsidies to the tune of \$13 billion, how the health care industry will get \$20 billion in corporate welfare, and how tax cuts go predominantly to the people who make more than \$1 million a year, as we have seen tonight.

□ 2015

But yet, they refuse to try to enact proposals that the Democrats have

tried to get in place over the past several years, time and time again, in the Education Committee, in the Ways and Means Committee, in the Appropriations Committee, in the Judiciary Committee, whatever it takes to try to get these proposals enacted. And we run up against the stone wall of Republican ideology that is hellbent on making sure the wealthiest people in the world, in the United States, get their corporate welfare at the expense of average citizens.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I would suggest that this particular study illustrates exactly what you said. Rather than cap loans that students can take out, or that parents can take out in their behalf, what we are doing is forcing these young people, our future, to go to private sources such as credit cards, and private lenders at rates that would make the Mafia blush. They ought not to be called interest rates. They ought to be called the vig. That's what the Mafia charges for a loan.

So what happens? We graduate young people, and for years they are carrying around this debt that is impossible if they are going to go on and get married and have a family of their own. It is like graduating from college and having a mortgage that you are paying off at some ridiculous rate of interest. And forget about owning a home, forget about taking a chance and initiating your own small business if that be your choice.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Welcome to the race of life, and let the Federal Government hook a piano on your back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Look at this. To illustrate what you are talking about here, you have got interest rates that are bad enough in terms of interest people have to pay in order to get on top of their college loans.

But college tuition itself has gone up. This is under the President, since President Bush has taken office. College tuition itself has gone up 40 percent.

Then you take a look at gas prices which have gone up 47 percent. You take a look at health care costs, gone up 55 percent. This is the reality for Americans today. But median household income has dropped by 4 percent. I mean, dropped. So how are Americans supposed to make up this difference? What are they supposed to do when it comes to the income that they are bringing in and the everyday costs that are a part of their life? This is, like, for a mom who has got a bunch of kids, and she is trying to figure out how many of them she is going to be able to actually feed, which one do you let go? Which one is not important? Higher education? Putting gas in your car? How are you going to get to work? How are you going to get to the grocery store? How are you going to help your family day to day?

How about health care? What happens, we all know, because everyone's heard the story. I have constituents who don't even think about this stuff

every day who can tell me, you know, most of the people that they know who don't have health insurance have to wait 'til they are so sick that they have to take their family member or themselves to the emergency room so that they can get primary health care. I mean, which one do you eliminate? Which one is not important if your income is plummeting?

Now, let's take a couple of other things that have happened under the Bush administration. You have got the typical family paying \$1,200 more a year for health insurance. You have housing that is the least affordable that it has been in 14 years. I mean, just to give you an example, in the community that I live in, I represent south Florida, the average price of a house in the two counties that I represent is over \$300,000. That is not affordable. I mean, that just puts home ownership completely out of bounds for, never mind the average person, even somebody making a decent living.

Mr. DELAHUNT. One can only imagine that young person graduating from college with this debt.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. But this is the 30-something Working Group, Mr. DELAHUNT. We identify, we are not, well, some of us are not, that far from having been through exactly the situation.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But being 30-something, things were better.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Of course.

Mr. DELAHUNT. For you when you were 20-something than your 30-something.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, let me just tell you. When my husband and I got married, we got married in 1991. And I was 24 and my husband was 26. Within several months of getting married, we were able to buy our first home. We both had health insurance. We were not worried about how to put gas in our car, and neither one of us had college tuition debt.

Fast forward to 15 years later, because I just celebrated my 15th wedding anniversary, and someone starting out just like we did can't afford a house in the community that I live in and represent. Literally they are driving their car around and have to pay more than \$50 every single time. We couldn't have afforded that on the incomes that we made. We could back in 1991, but not, back in 1991 we could afford gas prices because they were in the \$1 range, a little over a dollar. How are they supposed to do it? It is unfathomable.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But the point that you are speaking to, I think everybody understands, is that the country is heading in the wrong direction. In the space of 15 years, people that were in your situation, as you just described it with your husband, newly married, in a short period of time being able to afford a down payment, no tuition debt, and prospects for a bright future. That is not happening today. And a lot of

our friends can understand it because they continue to talk about, well, the economy is growing. I guess the question is who is it growing for? It is not growing for the middle class. It certainly isn't. It isn't growing for low income. In fact, it is not even growing for those who are affluent. It is growing for the superwealthy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What plan have you heard of from the other side of the aisle, from our good friends on the other side? Where is their economic plan? Where is their plan to fix it? What bills have they passed that reduce the deficit, that help Americans struggling to pay for gas, that help them pay for higher education? I mean, is it all you are on your own? It is all about you, and we are from the Government, and we are not here to help.

We have a plan. We have a new direction for America which is laid out right there. I hear a lot of the Republicans on the other side of the aisle accusing us of not having a plan. We have got one. Where is theirs? Because if we keep going in this direction, we are headed for more deficit and more of our citizens twisting in the wind.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Their plan, Mr. Speaker, has been implemented. We are now experiencing the results of their plan, cause and effect. They issued, they administered, they proposed, they passed year after year after year. Democrats, we couldn't stop anything if we wanted to. Went through the House, went through the Senate, the President had the signing ceremony, brought everybody behind him, had 50 pens and was passing them out to all the leadership. And the end result is that chart that you just had up: higher gas prices, higher college tuition costs, higher health care costs, lower median income, \$9 billion lost in Iraq, nobody knows where it is. We are building roads and hospitals and schools in Iraq while we are cutting funding here. Katrina, we are paying people's divorce lawyer bills. I mean, come on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are paying for funerals for people who didn't die as a result of the hurricane.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And yet we have not begun to even address the real issues of rebuilding the Gulf States, of taking care of the people in Mississippi and Louisiana, and allowing the insurance companies in those States to tell people that, sorry, you are not covered, despite the fact that they were told early on. Thankfully, we have leaders, and I am particularly proud of someone like a GENE TAYLOR and others from the Gulf States that stand up and speak to these issues, and Members on the other side of the aisle, for that matter. I was listening to Senator LOTT just recently speaking about this issue.

But the truth is, you are right. The consequences of the plan of the Bush administration and the Bush Congress has resulted in \$3 per gallon of gas, a deficit that is a Hall of Fame record, a dependence on China and Japan and

the United Kingdom and OPEC countries to finance our debt, a decline of the median income for a middle-class family in this country, and housing that is not affordable today for most Americans, and as you suggested, TIM, a health care system that is, to call it a system is hyperbole. It just is not a system. And this is what we have.

We finally have seen the plan, and the plan is being rejected by most Americans because it is clear that it is taking this country in the wrong direction, and if it continues in this way, we will become a second-tier Nation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, you are absolutely right. The contrast here is that when it comes to actually improving the economy and beginning to go in a new direction, the Republicans have no plan at all. More of the same. More deficits, more tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, more people who are going to go uninsured, more of the same; as opposed to the Democrats' new direction for America, Mr. RYAN, that you have on the easel next to you.

And I think it would be useful to take, Mr. Speaker, the Members through what the Democrats' plan is if we take the majority back of this institution and the things that we would implement if we were able to actually implement an agenda.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is a comprehensive agenda, and what I love most about what the Democrats are going to do when they get in charge, our agenda is integrated into creating a government that works in the 21st century. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side are like dinosaurs. They keep trying to work and run the government like it is 1950. It is 2006. We have new technologies, new communications, a new ability to administer government, and the Republicans are caught in the stone age like dinosaurs, unable to run the government.

Look at Katrina. Look at the war. Look at all the issues that we have talked about. It is their inability to run.

So what I like about what the Democrats are doing is we are taking a very new, cutting-edge, progressive approach to administering government. And it starts with making health care more affordable. We are going to use the ability, buying power to make sure we eliminate the major influence of drug companies and HMOs, corporate welfare, basically, that the Republicans gave to the health care industry; get lower drug costs, encourage competition, and make sure that we invest in the stem cell and other medical research. We have cutting-edge technologies that we are that close to getting to, and the Republicans are cutting the budget for research.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And, Mr. RYAN, don't forget. We have a plan that would allow small businesses to pool their resources and pool their risk that, if we were allowed to implement

it, and if we were in the majority in this institution, we would pass legislation that would do that without totally eliminating the benefits that are part of these health insurance packages.

In the Republicans' legislation that they crammed through the Congress with a rubber-stamp vote that they typically do, their solution was to pass bare-bones insurance legislation that basically provides coverage for almost nothing. And you would basically dumb down any insurance policy. Some people might say, well, some insurance is better than none. But when you have the second leading cause of death for women in this country, being breast cancer, and in most States mammograms are a mandated insurance benefit, their plan would allow the elimination of that required coverage. If you implement it and their plan became law, we would ensure that fewer women would be able to get mammograms, and the incidences of breast cancer would go up.

□ 2030

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. And what I really love is what JOHN TANNER's bill is doing, and JOHN TANNER is a Democrat from Tennessee, a Blue Dog Democrat, and this is just good stuff. We are going to audit the government. When we get back in charge, we are going to throw everything on the table, and we are going to audit everything. We are just going to start over, figure out why we are wasting so much money. And Mr. TANNER and I had a great conversation, Mr. Speaker, last week. And we are going to have Mr. TANNER down here because he needs to participate in the 30-something group to explain to the House of Representatives just exactly what his bill does. But in a thumbnail sketch, it audits all of the branches of government. It audits all of the agencies of government. And we can squeeze wasteful spending out of the government right now and invest that money into things that matter.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And let us remember, Mr. Speaker, who is running the government. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that this administration for the past 6 years has been run by a Republican President, a Republican Vice President. All of the Cabinet members, with one exception, are Republican. The House has been run by the majority party, which is the Republican Party. On the Senate side, Mr. Speaker, the majority party has been Republican. So what we are seeing and what we are getting is Republicanism, but not really the traditional mainstream Republican Party that has made significant contributions to this great country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Teddy Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to know where all the Members from 1994 went when they were saying we have got to run government like a business, we need a balanced budget amendment, we cannot afford all this wasteful spending. Democrats now have a bill that we are going to put

forth before this Congress when we take over of how to run this place like a business. Now, we realize it is not a business; so there are things we are limited to do. But there is no excuse why we cannot audit this government and find the waste and invest it into math, science, education, health. We cannot keep going to the taxpayers and asking them for more and more money.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Can I just digress for one moment?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Please.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We had a 10-hour, I don't want to call it a debate because it was not a debate.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Special Order.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It was a long Special Order about Iraq. And I thought what was particularly striking was, as people spoke even on the other side, the references that were made specifically to Secretary Rumsfeld.

Now, if you had a CEO of a business that was running the business into the ground, that was being exposed by his own subordinates again and again and again, what would happen in the private sector? And just look back at what the administration had to say.

I mean, I always think of what the former Secretary of State, Colin Powell, had to say about the Vice President. He said the Vice President was so obsessed with attacking Iraq, that it was as if he had war fever. Well, you know, the problem with fever is that you become delusional and you see things or hear things that aren't necessarily there no matter how true you want them to be. I mean, it was the Vice President himself who said that we were going to be greeted as liberators. I think that lasted for maybe 1½ days. Rumsfeld himself said that the war wasn't going to last any more than 6 months. Wrong. His Deputy, Paul Wolfowitz, said that Iraq could pay for its own reconstruction from its oil revenue. Wrong. We were told that the administration had a coherent plan for reconstruction and bringing peace to a nation that had experienced the brutality of a Saddam Hussein, a coherent plan. Wrong. It just goes on and on.

The truth is that the administration's incompetence, absolute rank incompetence, has set back our efforts to deal with terrorism all over this planet.

And you don't have to take our words for their incompetence. If our staffer is present, I would like to just put on some of the quotes, not coming from a partisan Member of Congress, but from people who served their country. Here is one coming now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We do not have the military one.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, this is as good, I guess.

The former House Speaker, Newt Gingrich, speaking about this Republican Congress, can you read that for me.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sure. What former House Speaker, leader of

the Republican revolution on this Republican Congress said, he cited a series of blunders. You referred to our Republican colleagues' incompetence a minute ago, Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, former Speaker Gingrich "cited a series of blunders under Republican rule from failures in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina," which we have been talking about this evening, "to mismanagement of the war in Iraq. He . . . said the government has squandered billions of dollars in Iraq."

And our good friend Mr. TANNER, whom you just talked about, and the audit he wants to accomplish once we are in the majority, he analogized that legislation to a mechanic looking under the hood because that is really what is necessary here. I think I would want to make sure I had some Purell with me after we looked under the hood when the Republicans are put aside and maybe have a mask just so that I wouldn't become infected by some of the mismanagement and gross incompetence that has clearly occurred here under Republican rule.

I mean, a deficit of more than \$8 trillion, a debt that is more in the time that President Bush has been in office than all previous 42 Presidents combined, a war in Iraq that has created a cesspool in a country that was in bad shape to start with, but that literally the situation that they are in now in Iraq with the terrorism on the rise that exists there was created by this President and the Republicans' war.

Mr. DELAHUNT. To go back to the point that Mr. RYAN was making relative to if this were a business, if this were a business, which brought me to the point of the incompetence specifically of the Secretary of Defense, and to think despite call after call for his resignation, would this have ever happened in the private sector?

And as I was saying, this is not your words, our words, my words. Here is retired Army Major General Paul Eaton. This is back in March. He is speaking about the Secretary of Defense, and these are, again, his words: "He has shown himself incompetent strategically, operationally, and tactically and is, far more than anyone, responsible for what has happened to our important mission in Iraq . . . Mr. Rumsfeld must step down."

Now, it is okay, I guess, for the President to ignore those words, but if we had a Congress that took its oversight role seriously, I would have expected that once those words appeared in print that the appropriate committee of jurisdiction, possibly the Armed Services Committee, and I know you serve on that, Mr. RYAN, would have immediately issued a request to Major General Paul Eaton to come before it to give his opinion and his views. Did we see that?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, when you look at what happened in the late 1990s with what the Republican committees were willing to investigate going on in the

executive branch, what they were willing to investigate under President Clinton, they spent \$40 million chasing him around, and now you are not even willing to provide some oversight for the war or Katrina or any of these other things? It is not a witch hunt. These guys are saying we are screwing up, let us fix it.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The silence coming from the Congress is just overwhelming. There has not been a single committee in the House of Representatives that invited General Paul Eaton to come before it and testify. Talk about a rubber stamp.

Well, now here is retired Marine Lieutenant General Gregory Newbold. He had these words to say in April: "My sincere view is that the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with the casualness and swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions or bury the results."

Has there been a request from one single committee of this House to Marine Lieutenant General Newbold to come before us to listen to what he has to say about the incompetence of the civilian leadership of Secretary Rumsfeld? Not one invitation that I am aware of.

And here is retired General John Baptiste, again, speaking about the Secretary of Defense. This was reported in *The Washington Post* on April 13: "We went to war with a flawed plan that didn't account for the hard work to build the peace after we took down the regime. We also served under a Secretary of Defense who didn't understand leadership, who was abusive, who was arrogant, who didn't build a strong team."

I know there are more posters. Now, what would have happened in the private sector? Is this a way to do business? Is this competence? I could go on and on and on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman from Ohio would yield, because the contrast to what is going on in the cesspool that has been created by the Republican leadership in Iraq is that if we were in the majority in this Congress, we would implement the real security agenda. We would focus on making sure that there was a plan in Iraq so that we can train the Iraqi troops to take care of the business at hand in Iraq on their own and begin to phase out our involvement there.

□ 2045

Yet there is no plan to do that. There is no timetable. There isn't anything coming from this President that would say when a percentage of Iraqi troops are prepared, that we are going to pull out X percentage of American troops. We have to make sure we start focusing on the terrorism here at home.

What happens instead, in the debate we had the other day, where it should have been a debate, like you said, it was not a debate, but in the basic fil-

buster, single-subject filibuster in which we were afforded no opportunity to present or talk about our alternative, instead you had bobblehead after bobblehead on the other side of the aisle just come up to the podium and shake their head up and down and say exactly what the administration wanted them to say. Then they put their votes up on the board and did exactly what was expected of them, vote to rubber-stamp the exact same stay-the-course policy that Americans clearly have indicated they do not want to continue. I don't know what hometown these people are going home to.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If I can, for just a moment, I hear all this foo-for-all about we have to stay the course, and we will stand down when they stand up.

It must have been a shock to President Bush, do you remember when he made that visit, I think it was about a week ago, to Baghdad? Well, on his way home he was discussing the visit with reporters and his conversations with Iraqi leaders and he made this statement that was reported in the *Associated Press*: "There are concerns about our commitment in keeping our troops there. They," meaning the Iraqis, "are worried almost to a person that we will leave before they are capable of defending themselves, and I assured them they didn't have to worry." That is the President.

But apparently when he said "almost to a person," he is not including the president of Iraq and the vice president of Iraq, because the *Associated Press* reported the day after that Iraq's vice president had asked President Bush for a timeline, for a timeline, for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Iraq.

Here is the quote: "Vice President Tarik al-Hashimy, a Sunni, made the request during his meeting with Bush on Tuesday when the U.S. President made a surprise visit to Iraq. President Talabani, in a statement that was released after the meeting, said 'I supported him in this,' meaning the vice president."

So when we hear that we can't give a timeline or a table for when we withdraw, Mr. Speaker, the Iraqis are asking us to do it. They are asking us, Mr. Speaker.

So, please, you know, cut the politics. Run away from the politics. Let's cut and run from the politics and talk about the truth.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. So that way we can get back to talking about what Americans' priorities are here; making sure their kids can afford college, making sure when they are sick they can go to the doctor, but right now they can't because 46 million Americans don't have health insurance; making sure that gas prices aren't over \$3 a gallon, with record profits going to the oil industry, and this Congress, led by the Republicans, passing legislation twice last summer with every single Republican voting yes and them holding the vote open at

least 40 minutes to make sure that they could twist enough arms to give away subsidies to an oil industry that is already making more money than they know what to do with.

I mean, if you were watching Meet the Press on Sunday and you saw the three CEOs of the oil industry just completely not getting that they need to be part of this solution, and no one in this Congress, that is leading this Congress, except for us, who are making every attempt, no one asking the oil industry to step up and invest their revenue from their profits into alternative energy resources. It is just absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We don't mind you making a profit. Profit is not a dirty word. Go out and make money, hire Americans, this is good news. But do it in the national interest.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Exxon-Mobil invested \$10 million, and made \$30 billion; \$10 million in alternative energy last year. That is what they talked about on Meet the Press on Sunday.

I mean, give me a break. Where is the commitment? Where are the priorities?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Who was the one gentleman, Lee Raymond, that got big time money. I don't know how many millions he made last year. I know he got a \$2 million tax break.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. \$400 million.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think he made \$390-some million. So they are paying this guy a \$398 million retirement package, \$2 million tax break, and companies like this are only investing \$10 million, when they can give them a retirement package of \$400 million.

Newt Gingrich said, just to wrap up, our good friend, Mr. Speaker, about the Republican Congress, "They are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that can't function." This is your laundry list that you just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, all of these posters are available on our web site for other Members to access at www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. All these posters are available.

We missed our good friend Mr. MEEK, and we cheer on the Miami Heat.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CLEAVER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CUELLAR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel problems.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 20 on account of family matters.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel problems.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of airline delays due to inclement weather.

Mr. THOMPSON of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of bad weather and travel delays.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for the week of June 19 on account of family obligations.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of flight delays.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a flight delay due to inclement weather.

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. DEFAZZO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and June 26.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and June 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, June 20 and 21.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today and June 20, 21, and 22.

Ms. HARRIS, for 5 minutes, June 20. (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 20, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8137. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0029] received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8138. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Transfer of Sugar Program Marketing Allocations (RIN: 0560-AH37) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8139. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments [Docket No. 1998C-0790] (formerly 98C-0790), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8140. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Food Labeling: Health Claims; Dietary Noncariogenic Carbohydrate Sweeteners and Dental Caries [Docket No. 2004P-0294] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8141. A letter from the Chief, Policy Section, Military Awards Branch, Department of Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Decorations, Medals, Ribbons, & Similar Devices (RIN: 0702-AA41) received June 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8142. A letter from the Legal Counsel, Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Terrorism Risk Insurance Program; TRIA Extension Act Implementation (RIN: 1505-AB66) received May 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8143. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Amendment to the Bank Secrecy Act Regulations — Requirement That Mutual Funds Report Suspicious Transactions (RIN: 1506-AA37) received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8144. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Share Insurance and Appendix (RIN: 3133-AD18) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8145. A letter from the General Counsel, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — AmeriCorps Grant Applications from Professional Corps (RIN: 3045-AA46) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8146. A letter from the Director, OLMS, Office of Policy, Reports & Disclosure, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standards of Conduct for