

a time when 9/11 gave us an opportunity to start a whole new national discussion about who we are and how we can reconnect with the world, decisions were made which further separated us. We went down a blind alley, and in that blind alley we remain, unaware of the truth behind 9/11, not with respect to who did it, but with respect to what is our role in the world, what is America's position in the world.

This, the 230th year of our experience of declaring independence, is a perfect time for us to recommit ourselves to perhaps call for a declaration of interdependence, accompanied by a vision which sees the world as one, which sees the world as being interconnected and interdependent, which understands that when we build nuclear weapons, we, the United States, threaten the world; that we have a responsibility to lead with nuclear non-proliferation; that we have the responsibility to lead with the biological weapons convention, fully participating in that, and the chemical weapons convention and the small arms treaty and the land mine treaty, to join the International Criminal Court, to sign the Kyoto climate change treaty, to truly participate the entire world.

We are independent, but we are also interdependent, and there is no paradox there. It is a fact that both of those modalities can and must exist simultaneously in order for our Nation to be healthy, in order for us to grow.

□ 2310

Mr. Speaker, although I didn't really agree with many of his policies, one of the President's I admired the most was Ronald Reagan, because I saw him as being connected to the optimistic nature of America. One of the casualties of 9/11 has been our optimism, our courage.

This Nation has the capacity to be much more than it is today, and whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we need to try to search for a deeper meaning of who we are. We need to reach for a deeper meaning of who we are in the world and we need to confirm that our purpose is human unity, not just the unity of 50 States.

MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for half the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. So I have 25 minutes; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would say to those who are going to speak to be aware of that so others get a chance to speak.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much. The hour is late and the time is limited. Mr. Speaker, I rise, however, to

briefly urge my colleagues to take action on raising the minimum wage. This is an action of fairness. It is the right thing to do. It is an issue of values. The American people believe it is the right thing to do. Eighty-six percent of them have said we ought to raise the minimum wage.

This issue clearly illustrates the different priorities, it seems to me, between the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle. We Democrats have been trying to get this issue on the floor for years now.

Let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. Democrats have been fighting to raise the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$7.25 an hour over 2 years. Today, if the minimum wage were at the rate it was in 1968, we would be paying \$9.05. We are not getting there, but we ought to do better than we have done.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Republican side of the aisle is fighting us tooth and nail while attempting this week to bring up legislation once again that gives the heirs of the wealthiest families in America a break on the estates tax and drive our Nation even deeper into debt. That is right, while the working people struggle to make ends meet, doing what we expect them to do, this Congress is rushing an estate tax bill, what I call the "Paris Hilton Tax Relief Act," to the floor.

Of course, as usual, the bill is not paid for and continues the majority's fiscal irresponsibility and will increase our costs of borrowing by \$280 billion over the next 10 years. We are borrowing because we have no money to give a tax cut, so we are going to have to borrow it from other nations.

Last week, in the Appropriations Committee, I offered an amendment to the fiscal year 2007 labor-health bill. That amendment passed, raising the minimum wage 70 cents on each of the next Januarys, 2007, 2008 and 2009, bringing to \$7.25 the minimum wage. Seven Republicans, Mr. Speaker, on the committee voted for that bill, several of whom have tough races. So they were listening very carefully to their people at home; and their people, again by overwhelming majorities, say this is the fair and right thing to do.

We thought we were going to consider that labor-health bill this week. It was announced it would be on the floor this week, but it was pulled. I am not sure exactly of all the reasons, but in part surely it was pulled because there was a question about the rule.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, when that bill comes to the floor, the rule vote will be a minimum-wage vote. And if you think that the minimum wage ought to be increased, if you think working Americans ought to be given a wage that gets them out of poverty, if you think that somebody who works in America ought to be able to support at least themselves, then you will vote against the rule, unless it gives a waiver for this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. MILLER and I, and the others who will speak on this floor,

believe very strongly that in an America that honors work and in an America, the richest Nation on the face of the Earth, that is an example for the rest of the world, we ought to make sure that those who work, those who get up in the morning and work hard, play by the rules, as Bill Clinton used to say, ought to get a decent, fair wage.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when this bill comes forward that every Member of this House will vote for a rule that ensures an up-or-down vote on raising the minimum wage in America for all our workers who work at that level. There are 6.6 million people, Mr. Speaker, 6.6 million Americans trying to support themselves and participating in helping to support their children and their families. It is the right thing to do.

Over 86 percent of Americans think it is the right thing to do and the House of Representatives ought to do the right thing.

And, five of those seven Republicans who voted with Democrats last week flip-flopped. The other two failed to vote.

And, the amendment failed.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of this Congress to act on the minimum wage is a national embarrassment.

It has been 9 years since we last raised the Federal minimum wage—the second longest period without an increase since a minimum wage was first enacted.

Today, the minimum wage is at its lowest level in 50 years, when adjusted for inflation.

Had the minimum wage been indexed for inflation since 1968, it would be \$9.05 an hour today—not \$5.15.

People who work full-time in the United States of America—the richest nation on earth—should not be poor.

But in 2003 there were 3.7 million workers who worked full-time, year-round, and still lived in poverty.

And, let's disabuse ourselves of this notion that "no one" really makes the minimum wage any more.

Not true.

In fact, a minimum wage increase would directly benefit 6.6 million low-wage workers—most of whom are adults who work to support themselves and their families.

An increase would specifically benefit 760,000 single mothers who toil day in and day out, sometimes at 2 or 3 jobs to provide just the basic necessities for themselves and their children.

Let's also dispense with the Republicans' favorite argument—that raising the minimum wage will somehow cost us jobs.

Again, not true.

We know that this argument is false because 20 States and the District of Columbia have raised their minimum wage above the federal rate.

And, a study conducted by the Center for American Progress and Policy Matters Ohio shows the following:

Employment in small businesses grew more (9.4 percent) in states with higher minimum wages than Federal minimum wage states (6.6 percent).

And, inflation-adjusted small business payroll growth was stronger in high minimum

wage states (19 percent) than in Federal minimum wage states (13.6 percent).

Raising the minimum wage is an issue of fairness and an issue of values.

A PEW research poll in December 2005 found that 86 percent of Americans support raising the minimum wage.

The time to increase the minimum wage is long overdue, and Democrats are going to keep fighting for a fair wage for America's working families.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have not had a minimum wage increase over such a long period of time, over \$5.15 an hour, when we should be at \$9 an hour, is reflective of the fact that our government, the decision-makers, this Congress, this administration are hostile towards poor people. We are hostile towards poor people. We have contempt for poor people.

I have reams of statistics here which show the validity of increasing the minimum wage and how we are holding people in poverty, but I don't want to address those statistics except to say just one blunt fact: minimum-wage employees, working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, earn \$10,000. That is \$10,700 per year. That is \$6,000 below the Federal poverty guidelines of \$16,600 for a family of three. If you work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, you come in at that level.

Now, we have, as a government and as an administration, we have had Alan Greenspan for ages, under Democratic administrations and Republican administrations, Alan Greenspan has come to Congress several times and testified he doesn't believe in a minimum wage. We shouldn't have a minimum wage. He's a disciple of Ayn Rand, who says government should not get involved in anything except defense. Only defense.

Roll out the troops to defend the rich. Roll out the troops to defend our property. What happens is that the people who are from the working families, those that we have most contempt for and refuse to adjust our economic society so that they have a way to earn a decent living, those are the people who go off to fight. And I have statistics that in war after war, World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the largest number of the casualties came out of the big cities of America, the slums, the people who were poorest, the working families. The same thing is true in Iraq.

Let the rich go first in times of war. They are the ones that have the most to defend. Ayn Rand and Greenspan feel we should do nothing to help to force our government to protect the welfare of the poor. But those poor are to go off and defend the wealthy. The New York Stock Exchange has the most to lose if the government were to collapse. If we didn't have soldiers

fighting and protecting the Nation, the rich and those who have contempt for the poor would have the most to lose.

So I want the moral issue here to come forward, and let us look at it in the face and let the American people out there ask their Congressman, ask their President, Why do you want to hold people in a state of near chattel slavery? Why are you looking at the rest of the world and saying, well, they have low wages and China is way down there and we have to compete with China. If you compete with China, you end up having prisoners, prisoners manufacturing goods, and prisoners will be the basic labor force. We don't want to go in that direction.

In America, everybody should have a chance to share in the prosperity that is possible here. Certainly those men and women who go off to fight our wars and who are very much a part of our society deserve to be recognized and protected and regulated, their economic lives, regulated in a way which gives them a chance to make it. All they want is a chance to survive and prosper like all other Americans. A minimum wage increase will allow us to do that.

□ 2320

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for holding this Special Order tonight on the minimum wage.

We are not the only ones that are up at this hour and doing our work. There are millions of Americans around the country who are working. Some of them are working in all-night diners serving people food, maybe taking care of a crying baby right now for someone else, maybe cleaning up after some elderly person, and many of them are doing that just to try and make ends meet and really aren't because they make the minimum wage, about 7 million hard-working people, and anybody who thinks a minimum wage worker doesn't work hard hasn't done a minimum-wage job. Sixty percent are women; many are the heads of households and have children themselves that they have a hard time buying food for or providing health care for.

In fact, a lot of those people who often are held in some contempt when they go to the store with food stamps, and who feel some embarrassment they have to come to get help from the government, put their hand out for assistance, and who are we really helping? We are helping the employers. We are subsidizing those employers with taxpayer dollars who don't pay a living wage or even close to a living wage to many of those workers.

Today the Economic Policy Institute and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities released a study entitled "Buying Power of Minimum Wage at 51-Year Low." The title tells it all. It

has been 10 years since the Congress voted to raise the minimum wage and nearly 9 years since its implementation. If we don't act this year, it will be the longest period of inaction and stagnation since the minimum wage was created.

I know we have limited time, but I wanted to make a couple of points about what it really means to be on the minimum wage.

According to a New York Times article reporting on a recent study by the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, last year was the first year on record that a full-time worker making minimum wage could not afford a one-bedroom apartment anywhere in the country. Anywhere in the country. Over the past 9 years, the minimum wage has not increased, but average rents have gone up more than 28 percent. In Illinois where I live, you need to make \$15.44 an hour. In Chicago, you need to make \$17.44 an hour in order to pay a two-bedroom apartment at fair market rent. That is three times the minimum wage.

In the 9 years that minimum wage hasn't increased, average health care premiums have risen over 75 percent. What hasn't risen? Everything has risen. All of the basics have risen, but the minimum wage has not. It is just shameful. Here we are talking about tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, talking about eliminating the estate tax for the Paris Hiltons of our country, and minimum-wage workers, people working right now at this late hour, make \$5.15 an hour. We should all be ashamed.

We can do that right away. We could do it tomorrow. We could raise the minimum wage and provide some level of dignity and relief for hard-working Americans, and we should do that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on this.

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight also to add my voice to this important issue of the need to raise the minimum wage. The fact that the Federal minimum wage remains \$5.15 an hour is a disgrace.

I think it was stated earlier by Mr. OWENS that someone who works 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year at minimum wage, they will still be \$2,000 below the poverty level for a family of two and \$5,000 below the poverty level for a family of three. There are several million Americans who fall into that category working full time year around and living in poverty. We should be able to do better in America. It is a matter of fairness. The American people do not want this kind of situation to continue.

We can pass legislation to raise minimum wage any time we wish, except that the Republican majority does not wish to bring forward the bill that could do just that. It has been 9 years since we last raised the minimum

wage. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the real value of minimum wage is lower today than at any time since 1968. To have the purchasing power it had in 1968, the minimum wage would have to be increased to \$7.54 an hour. If it were just to equal 50 percent of the average wage, as it did in the 1950s and 1960s, it would need to be increased to \$8.20 an hour.

If the minimum wage had grown at the same rate as chief executive officers' pay since 1990, the lowest paid worker in the United States would be earning \$25 an hour. But since 1997, Congress has failed to raise that amount, relegating millions of hard-working Americans to poverty by freezing that rate at \$5.15.

Even *The Economist*, a notably conservative publication, is concerned about the fact that the gap in rich and poor exists. They are not concerned so much that the gap exists, but they are concerned that the way of bridging that gap is disappearing, and people no longer feel there are the rungs up on the ladder to get from one status in life to another.

We should take notice that in States that have raised the minimum wage above the Federal level, jobs have been created faster than in States that have not raised that level. A case in point is Oregon. In 1998, when it raised its minimum wage above the Federal level, wages and job opportunities increased. We should get the message.

I would like to hear what Mr. MILLER has to say, but please add my voice to the fact that we need to act immediately to raise the minimum wage.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and thank you for your legislation, the Fair Minimum Wage Act.

In 2004, 37 million Americans lived below the poverty line, a 1.1 million increase from the year before. In 2004, 13 million children in America lived below the poverty line, and one in six children was poor. Yet here in the richest country on Earth, there is no guarantee that a full-time job will lift a family out of a situation of dire poverty and need.

That is because the full-time minimum wage earnings of \$5.15 an hour leaves a family of three 31 percent below the poverty line. As a matter of fact, Mr. MILLER, if the minimum wage growth had kept pace with the increase in the pay levels of CEOs, the minimum wage today would be closer to \$16. So this is a major issue of social and economic justice.

I am pleased to stand here with my colleagues in support of Congressman MILLER's legislation, the Fair Minimum Wage Act. It is time that we raise the minimum wage for 7 million Americans. It is time that we recognize their right to fully participate in the economic life of this Nation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my

colleagues for joining me in this Special Order to try to bring to the attention of this Nation the unwillingness of the Republican Congress to raise the minimum wage for these workers that my colleagues have described.

We are talking about the dignity of millions of workers. We are talking about millions of workers who must rely on the Congress of the United States to give them a raise, and this Congress has refused to do so and has refused to do so for the past 9 years.

These are people who work very hard. They get up and go to work every day, just like we tell them we want them to do. We don't want them to get on public assistance. We want them to take responsibility, and they do. They work at some of the most difficult jobs in the Nation, and they do it every day, and at the end of the year they simply end up poor. They end up poor not because they are not tough people, not because they are not diligent, not because they are not competent; they end up poor because they simply do not get paid enough, and this Congress is unwilling to lend a hand to them.

When we refuse to pay these workers, we refuse them the dignity of that work and the recognition that we all understand. This country could not survive without their effort. They cook our food. They take care of our families and clean our offices. They do so many things for us without asking the question, and we come to expect it. It is just that way when we show up in the morning, it is just that way when we go home because of their hard work.

□ 2330

I dare say most Members of Congress couldn't toil at these jobs for a day, a week, or a month. And yet these people do it all year long. And they are now working for a wage that has its lowest value in 50 years. That is what we tell them that they are worth, that they are not entitled to that increase. And yet, do we see in just one week's time the Congress voted to give itself a COLA, turned around and we thought vote to raise the minimum wage in the Labor-HHS bill after 9 years, finally voting to raise the wage.

But the Republican leadership interceded. When the amendment was offered today, this Republican Congress changed their vote and voted against the minimum wage. And the majority leader, Mr. BOEHNER of the Republican Party, is quoted as saying he is against it. It is not going to happen. It is not coming to the floor and he hasn't voted for minimum wage in 25 years of his public service, a boast of pride. I think it is a boast of shame.

It is a shame this Congress doesn't understand its obligation to these workers who are in such desperate need. These are people who are trying to hold their family together. Again we ask them to take care of their children to keep them safe, to provide for the care for these children. Do you know how difficult it is to put a family to-

gether on \$10,000 a year? At a time, as Ms. SCHAKOWSKY says, what is it that isn't going up? You have to pay the utility bills. You have to pay increased prices. These people have to work all week to fill the gas tank. All week. \$5.15 an hour. How do you do this? How do you do this? You have got to fill the gas tank; you have got to drive the car. You have got to take care of your kids. You have got to buy groceries. You can't afford the rent.

How is it they do this? How do they do it? One day is for gas; one day is for food. It doesn't work out. It simply doesn't work out. So what happens to these people? They become dependent on the taxpayer. Because the employers won't pay them the wages, the taxpayers come in and subsidize the jobs. They subsidize the jobs in terms of housing, in terms of free and reduced-price lunches, in terms of health care.

So the employer simply decides that he won't pay this wage. We don't know whether or not he can afford to. That is the claim. But they end up just handing them off to the taxpayers. And even that voice of an industry that was doing the same thing at a different level, Wal-Mart, now has come out and asked for an increase in the minimum wage. Why? Because they realize that people who are shopping and earning at the minimum wage simply don't have enough to buy the necessities of life. Even at Wal-Mart with everyday low prices, as they advertise, people cannot do this.

So that power, that bastion of capitalistic spirit is saying, if the Nation doesn't do something for these workers, growth is going to go down in the retail industry. You know what it means? You know what Wal-Mart understands? They understand that this increase of the minimum wage would mean about \$4,300 to these families, to these individuals, that that is real purchasing power and that is what the communities that Mr. TIERNEY cited and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY cited. What we see is jobs were created in those communities. Retail sales are actually up in those communities because people have money to spend. They can go to the grocery store. They can go and buy their kids clothes. They can buy them things for school.

None of that is possible at the minimum wage. None of that is possible at the minimum wage. And that is why this Congress has got to understand the human dimensions of this. If the Republicans are so callous that they can't understand how hard these people work and how they toil, and they cannot figure out that these people are worth more than \$5.15 an hour, something is terribly wrong.

I heard one of the spokesmen for the Club For Growth today said there shouldn't be any minimum wage. Just let the marketplace set the price. Just let the marketplace set the price. And former Secretary Rice said, oh, you mean like it does for executive salaries? And the answer was absolutely,

just like it does for executive salaries. Are those the same executives that were backdating the stock options? They didn't let the marketplace set their compensation. They backdated the stock options so they were guaranteed a profit in those stock options. No, they didn't rely on the market. They manipulated the market. They manipulated the market.

And how is it that somehow they want to suggest that for people at the minimum wage that they are the ones that have to survive in the marketplace? The fact of the matter is the marketplace is exploiting these individuals by failing to pay them a decent wage so that they can raise their families.

And it has got to stop. And it has got to stop here because the times has come to do this, to make sure that after 9 years, after 9 years of no increases, after six times of increasing congressional salaries, somehow something is terribly wrong for these individuals, and we have got to change that. We have got to make sure that that can't happen.

The disparities are just unbelievable in terms of these people and the rest of the country. And we cannot believe that each of these children who are in these families are going to have the same kind of opportunity that other children have, and that is why we have got to raise the minimum wage.

This is an issue of moral dimensions. It is way beyond the pay for the hours worked, the pay for the week's work. It is about whether or not we really do, in fact, believe in the value of work, whether we really do believe in the human dignity of these individuals who toil at these jobs. That is what this minimum wage is about. And it is a tragedy, it is a tragedy that the Republican leadership is now vowing that it simply will not be able to be voted on.

This is a Congress. We have a bipartisan solution; clearly we have enough votes in the Congress to pass the minimum wage. But they are going to do everything they can from keeping that vote from taking place. So the democracy is not going to work its will. The House is not going to work its will. All of the jabbering that goes on about bipartisan government is not going to work its will because bipartisan government in the House of Representatives would vote to increase the minimum wage. But that apparently is not going to happen.

But we have got to continue to struggle on behalf of these families, on behalf of their children, on behalf of this Nation in terms of human dignity.

And I want to thank my colleagues for joining me in this Special Order to raise this issue with our colleagues and with people in the country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUNTER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for June 19 on account of being with his wife at the hospital.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and June 21.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 27.
Mr. OTTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

8176. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Radio Frequency Identification (DFARS Case 2006-D002) (RIN: 0750-AF31) received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8177. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contract Termination [DFARS Case 2003-D046] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8178. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Authorization for Continued Contract [DFARS Case 2003-D052] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8179. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Special Contracting Methods [DFARS Case 2003-D079] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8180. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Quality Assurance [DFARS Case 2003-D027] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8181. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Basic Agreements for Telecommunications Services [DFARS Case 2003-D056] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8182. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Describing Agency Needs [DFARS Case 2003-D073] received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8183. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2005, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8184. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's notification to Congress of any significant modifications to the auction process for issuing United States Treasury obligations, pursuant to Public Law 103-202, section 203; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8185. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's report that no such exemptions to the prohibition against favored treatment of a government securities broker or dealer were granted during the period January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005, pursuant to Public Law 103-202, section 202; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8186. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Twenty-Eighth Annual Report to Congress consistent with Section 815 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8187. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of