Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(1) the House strongly condemns the manner in which Representative Sensenbrenner has responded to the minority party's request for an additional day of oversight hearings on the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act, and the manner in which such hearing was conducted; and

(2) the House instructs Representative Sensenbrenner, in both Representative CONVENS, to schedule a further day of hearings with witnesses requested by members of the minority party concerning the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act.
them and banged the gavel and got up from his seat. The rules require a motion to adjourn because hearings are not normally ended unilaterally by a chairman. We consulted with the House Parliamentarian who confirmed that an adjournment motion must be approved by the members of the committee unless there is unanimous consent. The fact that adjournment is not normally contested because it is not necessary because everybody agrees does not change the rules.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfair for the chairman unilaterally to adjourn the hearing, while members were seeking recognition, while he refused to recognize those members seeking to raise points of order, the committee staff, either on the chairman’s instructions or acting on their own accord, switched off members’ microphones while we were attempting to speak, instructed the stenographer to stop recording the hearing and turned off the electronic transmission of the hearing, and he adjourned the proceeding because it had not been legally adjourned because there had been no vote and no unanimous consent. Thanks to C-SPAN, the rest of the hearing was recorded and broadcast so the chairman was unable to censor the minority and hide our thoughts from the American people, although he tried.

Can any Member recall a time when a member’s microphone was turned off while he or she was speaking in a committee hearing? Mr. Speaker. It is fair to ask, why should a member of the majority or the public care about adherence to the rules in these respects or about the rights of the minority? The answer is simple. Every Member represents more than half a million American citizens. Every one of those Americans is entitled to a voice in our government. No one should ever be allowed to abuse the power of his office to silence opposing views or to disenfranchise Americans from having their views represented simply because they chose representatives of the minority party.

The greatness of our Nation is our freedom to stand up for what we believe, and to have everyone’s voice heard in the halls of government. The arrogance of power, the abuse of power, the silencing of minority voices, is a direct threat not only to our rules but to our democracy and to our freedom. The purpose of this House exists to protect our democracy. Every Member of this House, regardless of party, must stand up for this institution, for its rules, and for the democracy it represents.

That is why I urge the adoption of this resolution and why I hope such a resolution will never again be necessary in this House.

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

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

I strongly oppose this resolution because it does not state what the facts are relative to the Judiciary Committee’s consideration of the PATRIOT Act. I rise today to respond to false, misleading, and malicious allegations that have been made by Members of this House and reported in the media concerning the conduct of the Judiciary Committee’s consideration of the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act and my consideration of the PATRIOT Act as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Since becoming chairman of this committee, I have consistently demonstrated a commitment to fair and equitable consideration of issues before the committee. Perhaps no other issue better demonstrates this commitment than the committee’s response to the tragic events of September 11, 2001. Shortly following the attacks, I called a committee hearing to draft antiterrorism legislation at which the Attorney General and other top officials of the Justice Department testified. I worked with the minority to draft bipartisan legislation to help detect, deter, and defeat terrorist threats to our Nation’s security.

Since that time, the record clearly demonstrates that I have kept my word by conducting bipartisan and even-handed consideration of this critical issue.

In October of 2001, the committee unanimously approved the PATRIOT Act by a vote of 26–0. I was enormously proud of what the committee achieved. I proved that a committee comprising sharply diverging viewpoints could speak in a clear and united voice on an issue of overwhelming importance to the security, safety, and liberty of all Americans. When drafting this legislation, I also insisted that provisions expanding the scope of Federal authority be subject to congressional reauthorization. I included sunsets in these provisions because I strongly believe that Congress, not an executive body, be given the role in ensuring that the PATRIOT Act protects the safety and security of all Americans while preserving the freedom and liberty that distinguish us as Americans.

To ensure that the PATRIOT Act is being implemented in a manner that reflects the priorities of Congress, on multiple occasions Ranking Member CONYERS and I have sent detailed, extensive, and bipartisan inquiries to the Department of Justice concerning the implementation of the legislation.

When the Justice Department did not fully respond to such inquiries, I forcefully asserted the committee’s prerogatives by raising the possibility of a committee subpoena to obtain the requested information.

The committee has conducted several hearings on matters related to the PATRIOT Act, and Federal Administration officials have testified. At my request committee members have also received briefings on the implementation of the PATRIOT Act from senior law enforcement officials.

On March 28 of this year, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), ranking member, and I jointly announced a series of hearings on the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act. We made this announcement in the same spirit of bipartisanship that has typified the committee’s consideration of this issue since the committee’s first hearing on this subject following September 11. While the primary focus of these committees is to examine provisions in the PATRIOT Act that are set to expire at the end of this year, the scope of these hearings has been broadened to include provisions of the PATRIOT Act that will not sunset, and issues that are only tangentially related to PATRIOT Act have also received formal committee consideration at the request of the minority.

The record clearly proves that I have worked in a bipartisan manner to ensure that the committee has received testimony from all knowledgeable witnesses of diverging viewpoints, and that members had the opportunity to address questions to each of them. And at this time I include in the RECORD a listing of the oversight activities and a chronology of the hearing record that has been held since April before the Committee on the Judiciary and its subcommittees.

OVERSIGHT: HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

OVERSIGHT THROUGH LETTERS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

House Judiciary Committee sent the Attorney General, John Ashcroft, a letter on June 13, 2002, with 50 detailed questions on the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act. The questions were a result of extensive consultation between the majority and minority Committee counsel. Assistant Attorney General, Daniel Bryant, responded to Chairman Sensenbrenner and Ranking Member Mr. Conyers on July 26, 2002, providing lengthy responses to 28 out of the 50 questions. Mr. Bryant sent additional questions regarding the Department of Justice’s responses to the remaining questions, after sending responses to six of the questions to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. On September 20, 2002, Mr. Bryant sent the minority additional information regarding the Department of Justice’s responses to these questions.

On April 11, 2003, Chairman Sensenbrenner and Ranking Member Mr. Conyers sent a second letter to the Department of Justice with an additional question on the use of pre-existing authorities and the new authorities conferred by the USA PATRIOT Act. Once again, the questions were the product of bipartisan Committee counsel. Acting Assistant Attorney General, Jamie E. Brown, responded with a March 15, 2003, letter that answered the questions she deemed relevant to the Department of Justice and forwarded the remaining questions to the appropriate officials at the Department of Homeland Security on June 13, 2003, the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs at the Department of Homeland Security, Pamela J. Turner, sent responses to the forwarded questions.

November 20, 2003, Chairman Sensenbrenner and Congressman Hostettler, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration,
Border Security, and Claims, sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) requesting a GAO study of the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act and the authorities and oversight provisions. This report was released on June 6, 2005.

OVERSIGHT THROUGH HEARINGS

On May 16, the Committee’s Subcommittee on the Committee held an oversight hearing entitled, “Anti-Terrorism Investigations and the Fourth Amendment After September 11th: Where and When Can Government Go To Prevent Terrorist Attacks.” On June 5, 2003, the Attorney General testified before the full Committee on the Justice Department hearings on the United States Department of Justice. Both the hearing on May 20 and the hearing on June 5, 2005 discussed oversight aspects of the USA PATRIOT Act.

OVERSIGHT THROUGH BRIEFINGS

The Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security of this Committee requested that officials from the Department of Justice appear and answer questions regarding the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act. In response to our request, the Deputy Attorney General gave two classified briefings to Members, counsel, and staff:

During the briefings held on August 7, 2003, Deputy Attorney General gave the long-standing authority for law enforcement to conduct delayed searches and collect business records, as well as the effect of the USA PATRIOT Act.

The Department of Justice has also provided three classified briefings on the use of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) under the USA PATRIOT Act for Members of the Judiciary Committee:

On June 16, 2005. 

HEARING CHRONOLOGY: HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

FULL COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

June 10, 2005: Oversight Hearing on the Reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT ACT: Carla Tapia-Ruano, First Vice-President of the American Immigration Lawyers Association (Minority witness); Dr. James Z. Ogboy, President of the Arab American Institute (Minority witness); Deborah Pearlstein, Director of Human Rights First (Minority witness); and Chip Pitts, Chair of the Board of Amnesty International USA; Minority Members Present: Delahunt, Jackson-Lee, Nadler, Scott, Wasserman Schultz, Waters. 


SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

May 26, 2005: Oversight Hearing on Material Witness Provisions of the Criminal Code and the Implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act: Section 505 that Addresses National Security Letters and Section 804 that Addresses Jurisdiction over CrimesCommitted on United States Territories; Chairman: Conyers; Chief of Staff to the Deputy Attorney General for the Department of Justice (Majority witness); Matthew Berry, Counsel to the Deputy Attorney General for the Department of Justice (Majority witness); Gregory Nojeim, Acting Director of the Washington Legislative Office of the American Civil Liberties Union (Minority witness); and Shayana Kadid, Staff Attorney, Center for Constitutional Rights (Minority witness); Minority Members Present: Conyers, Delahunt, Nadler, Scott, Waters.

May 10, 2005: Oversight Hearing on the Prohibition of Material Support to Terrorist Organizations and Hearings held on the DOJ Inspector General’s report on Civil Liberty Violations under the USA PATRIOT ACT: Honorable Glenn Fine, Inspector General of the Department of Justice (Majority witness); Honorable Gregory G. Katas, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division of the Department of Justice (Majority witness); Robert E. Herman, Chief of the Counterterrorism Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice (Majority witness); and Ahilian Arulanantham, Staff Attorney, Civil Division of the Department of Justice (Minority witness); Minority Members Present: Delahunt, Jackson-Lee, Scott.

May 5, 2005: Oversight Hearing on section 212 of the USA PATRIOT Act that Allows Emergency Disclosure of Electronic Communications to Protect Life and Limb: Honorable William Moschella, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of Justice (Majority witness); William G. Engel, Director of the Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation (Minority witness); Professor Orrin Kerr, Professor of Law at the George Washington University Law School (Majority witness); and James X. Dempsey, Executive Director of the Center for Democracy and Technology (Minority witness); Minority Members Present: Conyers, Delahunt, Jackson-Lee, Scott.

May 3, 2005: Oversight Hearing on Sections 201, 202, 213, and 223 of the USA PATRIOT Act related to the FBI’s Law Enforcement Surveillance: Honorable Michael J. Sullivan, U.S. Attorney for the District of Massachusetts (Majority witness); Chuck Rosenberg, Chief of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (Majority witness); Heather Mac Donald, former Associate Deputy Attorney General for the Department of Justice (Majority witness); and John M. Olin fellow at the Manhattan Institute (Minority witness); and the Honorable Bob Barr, former Representative of Georgias Seventh District (Minority witness); Minority Members Present: Delahunt, Scott, Wasserman Schultz, Waters.

April 26, 2005: Oversight Hearing—-Have sections 206 and 215 improved FISA Inves-

The record clearly demonstrates that this committee has engaged in a thorough, comprehensive, and bipartisan review of the PATRIOT Act since its passage. Assertions to the contrary are not only unfounded, but are, in my view, plainly false, misleading, and malicious. On June 8, 2005, the committee held a hearing on the “Reauthorization of the
PATRIOT Act," at which Deputy Attorney General Comey testified. At the commencement of this hearing and without previous notice or consultation, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), ranking member, and other members of the committee requested additional witnesses to testify before the committee on the "Reauthorization of USA PATRIOT Act" pursuant to House Rules.

Mr. CONYERS stated: "Whenever a hearing is conducted by a committee on a measure or matter, the minority members of the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of them before the commencement of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least 1 day of hearing thereon." I complied with that request and set the additional hearing on June 10.

At the outset of this hearing, I reminded members and witnesses of the permissible scope of the hearing requested by the minority under House Rule XI by stating: "It is the Chair's intention to limit the scope of the hearing to the topic that was chosen by the Democratic minority that called this hearing and chose the witnesses, which is the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act. Members and witnesses are advised that questions and testimony not falling within the subject matter of the hearing chosen by the Democrats will not be included in the hearing record pursuant to House Rule XI." After reviewing the testimony of the witnesses, I again expressed my concern stating that, "I am disturbed that some of the testimony that has been presented in written form by the witnesses today are far outside the scope of the hearing, which the Democratic minority called and which they set in their letter."

Notwithstanding repeated reminders and admonitions concerning the permissible scope of the hearing under House Rule XI, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), ranking member, and members of the minority invited witnesses to provide testimony and make statements clearly outside of the scope of the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act.

For example, in his opening remarks, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) stated: "For many of us, this process of hearings is not merely about the extension of the 10 expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act. It is about the manner in which our government uses its legal authority to prosecute the war against terror both domestically and abroad. As we hear from our witnesses today, I think we will demonstrate that much of this authority has been abused."

My repeated reminders and admonitions about House Rules concerning the permissible scope of the hearing were ignored by witnesses and members of the committee.

In the face of this refusal by the witnesses and members to appropriately conform their testimony to the subject matter of the hearing requested by the minority, I exercised great patience in permitting witnesses and members to weigh in on issues totally unrelated to that subject. I recognized all four witnesses and minority member present at the hearing for 5 minutes. The record clearly shows that I evinced no favoritism in providing time either to witnesses or members.

At the conclusion of the hearing, when each witness and member had been provided equal time to raise questions, and the witnesses asked and received permission to submit their complete testimony, to calling record, I expressed my great disappointment that opponents of the PATRIOT Act have used it as a vehicle to assert broad, sweeping, and sometimes wildly unsubstantiated allegations concerning matters totally unrelated to the legislation.

As I concluded my remarks, at least two minority members who had been accorded their time to speak again sought recognition, and I adjourned the hearing in a manner consistent with the spirit of comity that has and should continue to inform committee deliberations. While I concede this point without qualifications, Members should also be aware that the practice of the Committee on Government Operations, was to adjourn hearings without motion and without expressly seeking the unanimous consent of committee members.

Since this hearing I have been unfairly criticized by several Members of this body. In a press release dated June 10, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), minority leader, said, "Chairman Sensenbrenner proved again that he is the master of incoherent ideas. He told the Democrats that Republicans will stop at nothing to silence Democrats and the voice of the minority, to deny millions of Americans a voice in Congress. Republicans are unwilling and unable to compete in the marketplace of ideas; so they have chosen to arbitrarily and capriciously abuse their power simply because they can."

In a similar statement, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EGYER), minority rank member, said that the committee's June 10 hearing represented a "quintessential example of shutting up, shutting down opposition, dissenting views, and democracy."

Both these statements are a grossly unfair and distorted depiction of my conduct and demand correction. I am not afraid of diverse ideas. I welcome that, and the chronology of the hearing record shows that. I have never attempted to stifle democracy, and I never will.

This committee's bipartisan consideration of the PATRIOT Act under my leadership underscores the malice that motivates these accusations. There is a difference between spirited debate and partisan vitriol that transgresses the bounds of decency and maligns the integrity of a Member of this House. This committee was begun by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who is the newest member of the committee, issued a press release stating that I had acted in an illegal manner under headlines stating: "Democracy Thwarted at Judiciary Committee Hearing on the PATRIOT Act."

In the course of this hearing, I did nothing that remotely resembles conduct that can be described as illegal. And as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I take particular umbrage at this mischaracterization.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) has also contended that I chaired the hearing in a manner that was "with an attitude of total hostility." Based on these remarks, it has been inaccurately reported that I "abruptly pulled the plug... when a hearing on the PATRIOT Act turned to prisoners and anti-immigration militia on the Mexican border." These statements clearly showed that I permitted each witness an opportunity to complete his or her oral remarks, and the hearing was only concluded after 2 hours' duration only when each member had been provided an equal opportunity to speak.

Following the hearing, I have met with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), ranking member, to discuss ways in which the committee could respond to concerns expressed by some members of the minority, and we reached a resolution that might have averted this impasse. However, some in the minority have preferred a political issue to a workable solution. I trust that by fully and fairly examining the record of the June 10 hearing, as well as the demonstrated bipartisan consideration of matters relating to the PATRIOT Act and other matters before the committee, Members of this House and the public at large will reject the false, malevolent, and derogatory allegations leveled against me by certain minority Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect and deserve Members of Congress to approach terrorism prevention in a thoughtful, factual, and responsible manner. All too often opponents of the PATRIOT Act have constructed unfounded and totally unrelated conspiracy theories, erected strawmen that bear no relation to reality, engaged in irresponsible and totally unfounded hyperbole, or unjustly impugned the law enforcement officials entrusted with protecting the security of America's citizens. While the PATRIOT Act was drafted and passed by both Houses with wide bipartisan majorities, it has been hijacked by some into a political weapon of choice to allege a broad range of violations which have nothing to do with that
I think that we as Members recognize that we represent the American people, and whether or not witnesses come and take an oath and offer to this Congress words that you agree or disagree with, that we represent the American people, who elect us to represent them expect and deserve no less.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of my colleagues would think it the premise that justice is not outside of the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, nor is the concept of justice outside of the concept of this august body.

Judgment is cited to have stated that the spirit of liberty is a spirit which is not too sure that it is right. So sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that those of us who believe in liberty should step back for a moment and question whether everything we have done or anything that we think is right.

I think it is well to remind my colleagues that our Founding Fathers, who came freely to this Nation, fled because they fled from persecution. And they fled to have the opportunity and the right to speak. We have always abhorred the tyranny of the majority. So it is important that those of us who stand today welcome, we welcome the opportunity for any witness to make their views known and not to defend a witness that we can sit down and resolve questions and these disputes.

But there is no doubt that the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) has not been refuted. Violation of Rule XVII did occur. A motion did not occur to adjourn, and it is the rule that we have accepted. The violation of Rule XVII did occur, and as much as we did have a hearing, there were witnesses who were not able to respond to accusations or allegations being made by Members of Congress.

I think that we as Members recognize that we represent the American people, and whether or not witnesses come and take an oath and offer to this Congress words that you agree or disagree with, that we take an oath and offer to this Congress that we represent the American people, who elect us to represent them expect and deserve no less.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of my colleagues would think it the premise that justice is not outside of the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, nor is the concept of justice outside of the concept of this august body.

Judgment is cited to have stated that the spirit of liberty is a spirit which is not too sure that it is right. So sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that those of us who believe in liberty should step back for a moment and question whether anything we have done or everything that we think is right.

I think it is well to remind my colleagues that our Founding Fathers, who came freely to this Nation, fled because they fled from persecution. And they fled to have the opportunity and the right to speak. We have always abhorred the tyranny of the majority. So it is important that those of us who stand today welcome, we welcome the opportunity for any witness to make their views known and not to defend a witness that we can sit down and resolve questions and these disputes.

But there is no doubt that the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) has not been refuted. Violation of Rule XVII did occur. A motion did not occur to adjourn, and it is the rule that we have accepted. The violation of Rule XVII did occur, and as much as we did have a hearing, there were witnesses who were not able to respond to accusations or allegations being made by Members of Congress.
were troubling enough to most Members that they were required to be reviewed by Congress before they could remain in law past this year. I think I share the views of many when I say that I may ultimately support all 16 provisions remaining in law. However, it did not seem too much to ask to thoroughly review those provisions, and not just hear a drastically lopsided set of witnesses called by the majority party.

If we are going to restrict civil liberties in the name of national and homeland security, it is more important than ever to shine the light on these provisions and make sure they can withstand a rigorous test.

Forfeiting civil liberties is not merely an inconvenience for our citizens. It must be a conscious decision, made with full disclosure and review and for good reason. If this forfeiture cannot withstand a review where proponents and opponents have their concerns aired, then our citizens cannot be expected to give up rights they were born with and for which our forefathers and foremothers so desperately fought.

It is my hope that, like the other committee on which I serve, the Committee on Financial Services, which operates in an spirit of bipartisanship even on the most contentious of issues, that we can withstand the test, and this should be done without the abuse of power and trampling of democracy that we experienced last week.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan to address the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an embarrassing circumstance that we again find ourselves in. There are reasons that have required that the gentleman from New York, regretfully, bring this privileged resolution to the floor. There is little question, the demeanor of the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), was very, very unusual for the meeting that was held, which he was required to hold.

Now, do not take my word for it. I want you to go look at the evidence. It was all taped. I was stunned by my friend’s continued hostility, not just toward the members of the Democratic side, but the witnesses themselves. I have never, ever experienced a witness being interrupted and mid-sentence. It was highly inappropriate. The meeting was ended incorrectly. You cannot walk out of a meeting. You cannot say the meeting is adjourned, slam the gavel down and walk out.

I had the honor of being the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I came to this committee and my staff and all my career has been spent there. I worked under Emanuel Celler, Jack Brooks and Peter Rodino.

I had wonderful times with the chairman that preceded the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

I have wonderful times with the chairman that preceded the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) and me to continue meetings trying to get this committee back on track and make it what it should be again. Join us in that request. Please.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table the resolution from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

The motion was taken; and the Speaker (Mr. DELAY) demanded a recorded vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
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Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at a recent White House news conference President Bush called on Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement this summer. A couple of weeks ago in this Chamber the most powerful Republican in the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DeLAY), promised a vote by July 4. Well, actually, last year the gentleman promised a vote on CAFTA during 2004, then a couple of months ago he promised there would be a vote by Memorial Day. Now, I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DeLAY) really means it, that there will actually be a vote on CAFTA by July 4.

The many of us who have spoken out against CAFTA, and that includes lots of Republicans and Democrats, people on both sides of the aisle have a message. Our message is dump this Central American Free Trade Agreement. Negotiate a CAFTA that largest numbers of Members of both parties can support.

Now, President Bush signed CAFTA more than a year ago. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration, Chile, Singapore, Australia, Morocco, every single trade agreement negotiated by this administration has passed Congress within 2 months.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). 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.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Spe切破碎中的提案。的该提议由该行政管理

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