United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2006 No. 24

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PORTER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 1, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JON C. PORTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Bishop Steven E. Wright, National Chaplain, the American Legion, offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we thank Thee for countless blessings poured out upon the people of this great Nation. From our earliest beginnings we have placed our trust in Thy power to guide and defend us. We reaffirm that trust as we seek Thy strength, Thy wisdom, Thy inspiration and Thy love to be upon our Representatives here in this House in their deliberations and efforts and decisions this day.

We thank Thee for the valiant men and women of our Armed Forces and for our veterans and ask Thee to bless them and their families with safety and with Thy comforting love. We pray likewise for each individual and family unit and ask Thee to particularly bless fathers and mothers with the ability to instill virtue in its many forms in their children.

We express our love and gratitude for Thy tender mercies in all our trials and challenges, and do so with a concluding moment of silence, allowing each here to offer the personal benediction of his or her own heart and faith.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation among the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his right and left will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the Chair feels the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, February 16, 2006, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1055

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE SILVIO BERLUSCONI, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mrs. Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA);

The gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY);

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI);

Printed on recycled paper.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL);

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN); and

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS);

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM);

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY);

The Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON); and

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Roble Olhaye, Ambassador from the Republic of Djibouti.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m., the Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy.

The Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and a personal pleasure to present to you the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE SILVIO BERLUSCONI, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

[Spoken in English:]

Prime Minister BERLUSCONI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, it is an extraordinary honor to be invited to speak before you in the Capitol building, one of the great temples of democracy. I speak in representation and in the name of a country that has a deep friendship with the United States and is bound to your country by ties which go back many centuries.

Many American citizens have Italian roots. For them, the United States was a land of opportunity that welcomed them generously, and they contributed their intelligence and their labor to help make America great. And I am proud to see that so many Italian-Americans are today Members of the Congress of the greatest democracy in the world.

For my generation of Italians, the United States is the beacon of liberty, of civil and economic progress.

I will always be grateful to the United States for having saved my country from fascism and Nazism at the cost of so many young American lives. I will always be grateful to the United States for defending Europe from the Soviet threat in the long decades of the Cold War. By devoting so much to this victorious struggle against communism, the United States enabled us Europeans to employ our precious resources in the recovery and development of our economies.

I will always be grateful to the United States for having helped my country to climb out of poverty and achieve growth and prosperity after the Second World War thanks to the generosity of the Marshall Plan.

And today I am still grateful to the United States for the high price in lives you continue to pay in the fight against terrorism to assure our common security and defend human rights around the world.

As I will never tire of repeating, when I see your flag, I do not merely see the flag of a great country. Above all, I see a symbol, a universal symbol of freedom and democracy.

[Spoken in Italian:]

Mr. Speaker, these sentiments have inspired all of my political activity and the action of the governments that I have had the honor of leading.

The United States has always been able to count on a steadfast, loyal ally of the United States, ready to stand by you in defending liberty. We have demonstrated this wherever Italy's tangible help has been required, and we are deeply proud of this contribution.

Some 40,000 of our troops are assigned exclusively to peacekeeping operations.

In Afghanistan, we are now commanding NATO's ISAF mission.

In Iraq, we are involved in bringing peace and building democracy.

In the Balkans, Italy is now commanding the missions in Kosovo and Bosnia Herzegovina.

We are also present in the Middle East, in Sudan and other parts of the world, and in every other place where gaping wounds must be healed.

Mr. Speaker, before the barbaric attacks of September 11, Western countries basked in the certainty of their security. They basked in the certainty that, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, nothing could interfere with their civil and democratic life.

In 2001, in the early days of my second government, I was called to chair the G8 summit in Genoa. After the conclusion of the summit's official program, the final dinner became a dinner among friends. At one point that evening, I sat back slightly from the table, almost an external observer, in order to enjoy the cordial discussion among the leaders of the largest industrial countries of the world.

President Bush was chatting amiably with Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi of Japan. Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima were but a distant memory. Prime Minister Blair was joking with Chancellor Schroeder. And the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, was also talking with President Bush. The tragedy of the Second World War and the Cold War, which had lasted for so many years, was forgotten. I felt great pleasure inside. I thought that the world had in fact changed, and how different and peaceful it was the world we were handing to our children. An age of lasting peace beckoned.

But just a few short months afterwards, the unthinkable occurred.

September 11 marked the beginning of an entirely different type of war from those that spilled the blood of humankind in centuries past. It is not a conflict between states, nor a clash of civilizations, because it is not an attack by Islam on the West. The moderate Islam that is allied with Western democracies is itself a target of terrorists. Rather, this is an attack by radical fundamentalism, which uses terrorism against the advance of democracy in the world and dialogue among civilizations.

Western democracies find themselves facing an assault by extremist organizations that strike at the innocent and threaten the basic values on which our civilization is founded.

Democratic governments have a daunting task. They must ensure the security of their citizens and guarantee that they can live free from fear.

This is the new frontier of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that in addition to the generous effort by your great country, a grand alliance of all democracies is needed to defend this frontier. It is only by joining the efforts of all the democracies on all continents that we will be able to free the world from the threat of international terrorism, from the fear of aggression by the forces of evil.

The battle to free ourselves from fear is by no means a battle to the exclusive benefit of the citizens who live in a democratic system. It is a battle that benefits above all those who today languish under authoritarian, repressive regimes.

History has shown that the aspiration to democracy is universal and that liberty and democracy are contagious. When people are exposed to the winds of democracy, they inevitably demand respect for their right to freedom from their governments. You are well aware of that because your country is the leading force behind this wind of freedom.

But there is another, equally important reason to forge a common strategy among all democracies.

The United Nations forecasts that over the next 25 years the world's population will increase by another 2 billion people, but a large part of those 2 billion people will be born and will live in countries that today are on the fringes of affluence.

So on the one hand, we will have 6 billion human beings living in destitution; and on the other, fewer than 2 billion living in wealth. Migratory pressures will inevitably soar.

In order to prevent this from happening, and even more, to prevent hunger and desperation from generating hatred and being exploited by fundamentalists, we must raise those countries out of poverty and start them down the road to well-being. It is our moral duty, but it is also in our vital interest. This will only be possible if democracy is allowed to spread and strengthen. All of our efforts must therefore be directed at fostering the development of institutions that ensure good governance, the rule of law, respect for human rights, and free market economies in those countries.

Only democracy can provide liberty, and only liberty can guarantee that individuals will be able to develop their talents, channel their energies, achieve their dreams, and conquer prosperity. The only possible road is to work together to spread democracy.

My government has relentlessly sought to forge a grand alliance of all of the world's democracies. It is for this reason that I lent my vigorous support to President Bush's initiative to establish a U.N. Democracy Fund.

It is for these reasons that I am convinced that the task that lies ahead of us is to promote a culture of respect for human rights and its fundamental freedoms in all countries.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to complete this mission successfully, it is essential that the bonds linking the United States and the European Union remain strong and sound.

It is this belief that prompted me to start a decisive, continuing diplomatic and political initiative with my European colleagues to ensure that the European Union did not weaken its ties to the United States in reaction to the events in Iraq.

For the same reason, we cannot ignore the danger that a united Europe might seek to define its identity in contrast to America. The necessary political and institutional integration of Europe must not mean the creation of a ''Fortress Europe,'' closed to the rest of the world in the belief that in doing so it can preserve its prosperity and liberty.

A conception of European unity founded on a fanciful wish for self-sufficiency would be morally suspect and politically dangerous. Disagreement or, worse, opposition between the United States and Europe would be entirely unjustified and would jeopardize the security and prosperity of the entire world.

The West is and shall remain one. We cannot have two Wests. Europe needs America and America needs Europe. This holds equally true on the political, economic, and military planes.

It is therefore absolutely necessary, indeed fundamental, to sustain and reinvigorate the Atlantic Alliance, the alliance that for more than half a century has guaranteed peace in liberty.

From defense alliance, NATO is gradually becoming a security organization. While defensive alliances are exclusive, created to protect against the threat of other blocs, organizations that protect security must be inclusive, because they become even more effective as the number of member countries increases.

This is why I strongly supported the establishment of the NATO-Russia Council, bringing the Russian Federation into the security architecture of the free world.

I am proud to have worked together with President Bush and President Putin to ensure that this came to pass, and that this momentous decision, which confirmed the Russian Federation's decision to join the West and embrace its values, would be consecrated in Italy, at the historic summit at Pratica di Mare, near Rome.

That day in 2002 marked the end of the nightmare of mutual annihilation by two blocs in arms against each other that had lasted for more than half a century.

NATO must remain the fundamental instrument to guarantee our security. The new European defense capability must therefore be complementary to NATO's. Together, NATO and the European Union shall be democracy's instruments for guaranteeing security in a globalizing world. I have always worked to achieve this objective, which I consider strategic, and will continue to do so.

In this context, the United Nations through a process of reform will have to recover their central role to become more efficient and to be able to tackle the challenges of the new millennium.

Mr. Speaker, our values of democracy and liberty allowed the West to ensure that their peoples enjoy a degree of prosperity unparalleled in the history of humankind. History has shown that only democracy permits a sound market economy to flourish, because political freedom and economic freedom are but two sides of the same coin.

Nonetheless, we are aware that there are countries that are opening to the market economy, but where authentic democracy does yet not reign and human rights are not adequately respected. The more developed and democratic countries must therefore work with determination to ensure that everywhere the opening to the free market is accompanied by the strengthening of democratic institutions and respect for human rights.

The market economy has always been a powerful drive for countries to transform from autocratic or authoritarian regimes into genuine democracies.

Action to expand the market economy in the world is therefore a key part of our efforts to affirm our values, to affirm liberty for a safer, more prosperous and secure world.

[Spoken in English:]

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, the bonds between Americans and Italians are strong and enduring. I am convinced that they will continue to strengthen and that the United States will always find in Italy a partner nation with which it can share the same vision of the world.

Allow me to conclude by sharing with you a brief story. It is the story of a young man, one who had just graduated from high school. His father took him to a cemetery that was the final resting place for brave young soldiers, young people who had crossed an ocean to restore dignity and liberty to an oppressed people. In showing him those crosses, that father made his son vow never to forget the ultimate sacrifice those young American soldiers had made for his freedom. That father made his son vow eternal gratitude to that country.

That father was my father, and that young man was me.

I have never forgotten that sacrifice and that vow, and I never will.

Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet;

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1245

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

THE NEED FOR SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KELLY. Madam Speaker, small businesses are the local engines that drive our national economy, so we must always keep their needs as a centerpiece in our budget priorities in Congress. As we analyze our future budget outlook in the weeks ahead, we need to work together to protect our small businesses.

Yesterday, I met with a group of small business owners from the Warwick Valley Chamber of Commerce back in my district. Hearing them talk about the myriad challenges facing them and their businesses served as a reminder of how critical it is for us to continue providing them the tax relief that they need to continue to create new jobs across our country. We need to extend and make permanent small business tax relief provisions that are critical to our continued economic growth.

We need to continue the increased expensing rules for small businesses, and we should increase the deduction this year to an amount of greater than $100,000. This Congress has many concerns where it needs to focus on budgetary concerns, but let us not forget the needs of America's small businesses.

The more we do to help small businesses, the more jobs they create for local residents in New York and across the country. Small businesses in America create almost seven out of 10 new jobs. We need to keep those small businesses and the people working.

THE REPUBLICAN-DUBAI PORT DEAL

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, the United Arab Emirates port deal is nothing new from the Bush administration. Over the past 5 years, President Bush has mastered back-room deals and secrecy, but now his administration's actions are threatening our homeland security. The United Arab Emirates deal was approved by the Bush administration despite national security concerns raised by both the Department of Homeland Security and the United States Coast Guard.

The bipartisan 9/11 Commission has identified America's seaports as particularly vulnerable to attacks because only 6 percent of all cargo containers are screened. The world's busiest port, Hong Kong, can screen 100 percent of their containers. Why can we not do it here at home?

The Bush administration shares responsibility with Republicans here in Congress for the vulnerabilities that now exist at our ports. Democrats listened to the Coast Guard and we listened to the 9/11 Commission, and we tried to increase funding for port security.

House Republicans have opposed these efforts despite the fact the Coast Guard says they need $4.6 billion over the next 10 years to properly secure our ports.

Madam Speaker, Republican rhetoric on homeland security is not enough. It is time for action. Put Democrats in charge, and we will get 100 percent container inspection, and we will have real port security in this country.

AMERICA'S ECONOMY IS BOOMING

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, our economy is booming. I know that may come as a surprise to some of our colleagues across the aisle, and certainly to some of the mainstream media. But our unemployment rate is now at 4.7 percent, and that is lower than the average unemployment rate in the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s. Yes, lower than each of those decades.

And where are the headlines that would praise the smart tax plan that helped to get us there? In January, America created 193,000 new jobs. That is 2 million new jobs in just over the past year.

4.7 million new jobs in the past 30 months. Republicans are not going to play I-told-you-so, but it is pretty obvious that the tax reductions passed in 2003 helped Americans dig out of a recession and get back to work. We will keep on pushing that sort of fair, flatter, simpler tax code that Main Street America needs to keep creating great jobs.

CELEBRATING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

(Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, 45 years ago today, President Kennedy created the Peace Corps, saying: ''It will not be easy. None of the men or women will be paid a salary. They will live at the same level as the citizens of the country to which they are sent, doing the same work, eating the same food, speaking the same language.''

On this anniversary, let us celebrate the service of the more than 180,000 brave Americans who have answered President Kennedy's call to service and served our Nation and the world as Peace Corps volunteers.

In 1961, President Kennedy made peace a priority, and peace must remain a priority for our Nation. So for their commitment of hope, friendship and peace, I applaud the nearly 7,800 Americans, including almost 200 Minnesotans who are currently proudly serving as Peace Corps volunteers.

The service of these volunteers and all of the returned Peace Corps volunteers make America proud.

Happy Birthday Peace Corps.

AN EASY MATH EQUATION

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the positive economic news that continues to pour in. These new numbers demonstrate that Republicans' pro-growth economic policies are working.

January's unemployment rate fell to 4.7 percent, which is the lowest monthly rate since 2001, and lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. There have been 29 consecutive months of job gains. The economy has created over 2 million jobs over the past 12 months.

Real household net worth is at $51.1 trillion, an all-time high. And finally the Commerce Department just reported that the GDP grew at a 1.6 percent rate in the fourth quarter, up from an original estimate of 1.1 percent.

This encouraging economic news is proof that lower taxes, plus restrained Federal spending, equals economic growth. However, this is a math equation that Democrats just cannot seem to grasp. Perhaps it is because they keep trying to substitute new variables: taxing plus spending will never equal economic growth and prosperity.

However, the Republican formula of lower taxes plus restrained Federal spending will always come out in favor of the American taxpayers and their checkbooks.

HSA'S WILL CAUSE MORE PROBLEMS THAN THEY SOLVE

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, for 5 years there was a silence at the White House about the issue of health care and how it is deteriorating in this country. The access has gotten worse and worse and worse under this administration.

The other night, in the State of the Union, the President, apparently the polling told him there is a problem out there. So he came out here with another one of his Band-Aids: Let's give everybody a health savings account. A more ridiculous proposal could not have been made on the floor to deal with the problems of average Americans.

To expect average Americans to be able to put aside enough money to pay a $10,000 deductible and then buy a catastrophic plan is simply not from the real world. The average American in this country is fighting day to day, paycheck to paycheck, and our President comes up with another one of his tax giveaways to the rich.

The only people who benefit from this are wealthy people who can take 10,000 bucks out of their pocket and pay it when it comes due. We ought to stop that and start a debate in this House between the Democrats and Republicans. That is the only way we will get sensible health care coverage for all Americans. They deserve it.

THE IMPACT OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION ON RANCHERS

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to discuss the impact that illegal immigration has on the ranchers along the Mexican border. I recently spent a week along the Mexican-California border to see firsthand how bad the problem was and what Congress could do to fix it.

I sat down in the living rooms of four different families who own ranches along the border. One couple, Ed and Donna Tisdale, documented on home video 13,000 illegal aliens crossing their property in one year alone.

The Tisdales had their barbed wire fences cut by illegals running off the family's cattle. When their dogs barked to scare off intruders, the dogs were poisoned.

Another rancher told me about numerous break-ins at his home while his family slept, as illegal aliens tried to find food and clothing. One morning his daughters had gone out to feed their pet bunny rabbits, only to find them skinned and taken for food by illegal aliens trying to escape to a nearby highway.

Madam Speaker, the House has recently passed a tough border security bill. I urge the Senate to act now to address this problem.

VIEW FROM THE COUNTRY CLUB

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the view from the country club is great. We have heard a few Republicans waxing poetic about how good the economy is. Jobs, prosperity, happy days are here again. All due to the tax cuts.

There is a real result to the tax cuts. Last year we had the largest deficit in the history of the United States. We borrowed hundreds of billions of dollars and we are going to hand the bill only to people who work for wages and salary, who generally earn less than $100,000 a year, and to their kids and grandkids.

The wealthy should not pay any portion of that in their version of America because they are the wealth generators. The fourth increase in the national debt since George Bush took office; 60 percent increase in the national debt. That is the result of their tax cut policies.

And wages, they have not budged: 99 percent of the people in America working for wages and salaries saw their real incomes decline last year. One percent did well, those $300,000 and up, and $1.3 million and up, they did great. And those are the folks they were having lunch with when they heard how great the economy is in America. I wonder who picked up the tab.

WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER BERLUSCONI TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the Italian Government has transformed into a vibrant democracy that delivers liberty and opportunity.

While Italy has historically been recognized for its extraordinary beauty and rich culture, today it is respected internationally as a champion of freedom.

Today, Congress is honored to be joined by Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, a man who has furthered democracy in his country and throughout the world. As an ally in the global war on terrorism, he has led thousands of Italian troops to join American soldiers in stopping the spread of terror in Afghanistan and Iraq, protecting Italian and American families.

As President Bush said yesterday, Prime Minister Berlusconi is a man who keeps his word. His steady friendship demonstrates his strong belief in persistence and international cooperation.

I join my colleagues in welcoming him to the United States Congress.

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

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY PEACE CORPS

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today for some very good news. It is news the history of this country's anniversary of the Peace Corps. When I was a college student, I was really impressed that the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, had asked the people of this country to ask what they could do for their country, not what the country could do for them.

And since then, people have been joining the Peace Corps. In fact, 182,000 people have served in the Peace Corps, serving in over 138 countries. Now, why is it so important to celebrate the 45th anniversary of the Peace Corps? Well, in the first case, we just recently heard from General Abizaid, who is the supreme commander in the Middle East, that peace can never be obtained until Americans learn to cross the cultural divide. A very profound statement from a warrior.

I ask those persons in the United States who want to help sustain the peace in this world to join the Peace Corps. It will be the greatest job, hardest job you have ever enjoyed. I did it when I was a young college student. I invite others at any age to join today.

Americans have served as a testament to this country. I hope they will continue for many years.

PEACE CORPS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I salute Mr. FARR on his work with the Peace Corps, and I rise too as well to salute that 45th anniversary.

President Kennedy, as was mentioned, started the Peace Corps and asked his brother-in-law, R. Sargent Shriver to command, and appointed him as the first director. As the year progressed, the program continued to grow, sending volunteers to Ghana, Tanzania, Colombia, the Philippines, Chile, and St. Lucia. More than 5,000 applicants took the first exams to enter the Peace Corps. It has grown significantly in numbers.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with a number of volunteers who were currently working in Guatemala and appreciate the hard work that they are doing in the destitute regions of that country. I would also like to salute and commend the following constituents from my district who have been serving in the Peace Corps in those various countries: Benjamin Andrews in South Africa, Megan Chodora

in Moldova, Pat Koester in Thailand, Michael Kreidler in the Ukraine, Merril Miceli in Kazakhstan, and Patrina Ngo in Kyrgyztan.

Thanks to those volunteers and the others in our Nation who help make the Peace Corps fulfill its international humanitarian mission. My hat is off to President Kennedy on its 45th anniversary and all of those who have served.

□ 1300

HONORING OUR BRAVE VETERANS

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, last week when we were home I had the occasion to present various medals and awards to veterans in my district. The Fifth Congressional District is home to the highest number of veterans of any Member of Congress. There were medals and awards for those who served in World War II, the Korean War and Vietnam.

We need to stop and pause and certainly thank our veterans from all of those wars, thank them for the freedoms that we, as Americans, enjoy today. Without a doubt, these people came home from being at war, started their lives, built our country into the great country that it is today, and never really asked for anything back from their country. They did not get a lot of the medals that they deserved.

Now that they are getting a little bit older, they are getting perhaps a little sentimental and they wanted to have those medals. We worked with the veterans and got the medals and presented those awards in the majority of the eight counties that I represent.

My hat is off to the veterans of all of the wars and those young men and women currently serving today. We thank them for their bravery.

MORATORIUM ON PRIVATE TRAVEL

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, millions of Americans are troubled by recent revelations concerning privately funded travel, and Congress, in my judgment, should ban privately funded travel until a system of prior approval can be established within the framework of the House Ethics Committee.

While private travel permits Members of Congress to expand their knowledge of issues affecting the Nation and the world without burdening taxpayers, recent revelations have served to undermine public confidence about this practice, and I believe it should be suspended until new safeguards can be put in place to ensure accountability and transparency. Congress must take bold action to restore the confidence of the American people in the integrity of our national legislature.

I commend Speaker HASTERT and Chairman DAVID DREIER for offering a bold vision of ethics reform and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting their efforts today.

PEACE IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, in the State of the Union, the President focused on the need to not only beat the terrorists on their own soil, but to take the offensive in bringing the hope of political freedom and peaceful change to hopeless lands.

I recently had the honor of meeting with our soldiers who are serving in Kosovo and are doing just that. I was glad to be able to thank them for their service and to hear their concerns.

American troops have been keeping the peace in Kosovo, along with our NATO allies, since 1999. We have about 1,700 troops participating in peacekeeping operations in Kosovo, and we must let them know that their service is not forgotten. Their presence brings stability to a troubled region and supports the development of a functioning legal system, the respect for property rights, and the growth of a robust economy.

These pillars will form the foundation of a free and democratic Kosovo, ensuring that our soldiers and their sacrifices will not be in vain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

HONORING JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 357) honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 357

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was born on March 26, 1930, in El Paso, Texas, and grew up in both El Paso and southeastern Arizona on her family's ranch;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor graduated magna cum laude from Stanford University in 1950 with a baccalaureate degree in economics;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor graduated from Stanford Law School and was ranked third in a class of 102 graduates;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor completed law school in 2 years, instead of the customary 3, and served on the Stanford Law Review;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor entered the public sector after her graduation from Stanford Law School as a deputy county attorney for San Mateo County in California, after she was unable to secure a position in a number of private law firms that employed very few, if any, women as attorneys;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor served as Assistant Attorney General of Arizona from 1965 to 1969;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was appointed to the Arizona State Senate in 1969 and was subsequently reelected to 2 2-year terms;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor became the State Senate Majority Leader in Arizona in 1973, the first woman to serve in that position in any State;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was elected in 1975 as a judge on the Maricopa County Superior Court in Arizona, and served in that position until 1979;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals in 1979 and served in that position until her confirmation as an Associate Supreme Court Justice;

Whereas in 1981, President Ronald Reagan nominated Sandra Day O'Connor to be the 102d Supreme Court justice and the first female member of the Supreme Court;

Whereas Sandra Day O'Connor was confirmed by the United States Senate unanimously on September 21, 1981, and took her seat on the Supreme Court on September 25, 1981;

Whereas the elevation of Sandra Day O'Connor as the first female justice of the Supreme Court helped pave the way for more women to enter into the legal profession;

Whereas in 2004, women accounted for approximately half of all students enrolled in law school, compared to 35 percent of law students in 1981 and just 4 percent of law students when Justice O'Connor graduated from Stanford Law School in 1952;

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor has left a thoughtful and enduring mark on American jurisprudence, which has been molded through her wisdom and strong character; and

Whereas Justice Sandra Day O'Connor blazed new trails for her gender and is a role model for all Americans; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the occasion of her retirement from the United States Supreme Court;

(2) commends Justice Sandra Day O'Connor for her hard work and dedication to the law; and

(3) recognizes Justice Sandra Day O'Connor as a pioneer for women in law, helping women become a permanent and integral part of the legal profession.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 357 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which commemorates the life and career of former Justice Sandra Day O'Connor upon her retirement from the United States Supreme Court.

Justice O'Connor's 24 years on the Supreme Court capped a distinguished four-decade career of public service. Born in El Paso, Texas, on March 26, 1930, and raised in rural Arizona, O'Connor served on the Law Review at Stanford Law School and took just 2 years to finish the normal 3-year curriculum. She graduated third in a class of 102, which included former Chief Justice of the United States William H. Rehnquist.

Unable to find work at law firms that at the time refused to hire female attorneys, she became a deputy county attorney in San Mateo County, California. This was the first of many public sector jobs Justice O'Connor held throughout her career. She served as the assistant attorney general of Arizona from 1965 to 1969, and then in the Arizona State senate from 1969 to 1975. In 1973, Justice O'Connor became the first woman in any State to become the majority leader of a State senate.

She began her career as a jurist in 1975 when she was elected to become a judge in the Maricopa County Superior Court. She was subsequently appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals in 1979 and served in that capacity until President Ronald Reagan nominated her to fill the seat of former Justice Potter Stewart on August 19, 1981. The U.S. Senate unanimously confirmed Justice O'Connor on September 21, 1981, and she was sworn in 4 days later, making her the 102nd, and first female, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

She served a decisive role in crafting the majority opinion in many important cases, but perhaps her greatest accomplishment was in serving as a role model to countless women. Indeed, at the time Justice O'Connor graduated from Stanford Law School, women comprised just 4 percent of all law school students. By 2004, women accounted for approximately half of all students enrolled in law schools.

Throughout her entire career, Justice O'Connor put public service first. Even as she announced her retirement on July 1, 2005, she agreed to serve until the President could nominate and the Senate confirm her replacement.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) for introducing this resolution. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it, and in wishing Justice O'Connor a happy and relaxing retirement with her husband, John.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am very proud to join my colleagues today to honor a woman who not only contributed immensely to American jurisprudence, but also showed tremendous courage and perseverance in finding her way to the top of the legal field at a time when the legal field was virtually closed to women.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor graduated magna cum laude in 1950 with a bachelor's degree in economics from Stanford University, my alma mater. In just 2 years, instead of the usual 3 years, Justice O'Connor graduated third in her class at Stanford Law School in 1952 at a time, as the chairman has said, when only 4 percent of law school graduates were women.

Despite her impressive law school record and obvious talent, Justice O'Connor could not find a single law firm that would give her a job after graduation, but that did not deter her. She heard that San Mateo County in California, the county just to the north of my home, had once hired a female attorney and so she decided to go there in search of her first legal job, but she learned that there was not enough funding in place or a place in the office for her to work.

That did not deter her. She wrote a long letter explaining why she should be hired and offered to start work for free. She placed her desk in the same area where the secretaries sat. She got the job and before long a paid position opened up and she took it.

Justice O'Connor's perseverance did not end there. She went on to become an assistant attorney general for Arizona. She was appointed and later elected to the Arizona State senate, elected as a county judge, and appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals.

Justice O'Connor has been a leader for women in many ways. She became the first woman to serve as the majority leader of the Arizona State senate and the first woman to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court, paving the way and opening the door for the next generation of women to substantively participate in the field of law. In fact, I feel, as a lawyer myself, a debt of gratitude to Justice O'Connor for the groundbreaking path that she laid for all of us who followed.

But let us not forget that she was not only a symbol of hope for aspiring women lawyers all around the Nation, but she has also been a powerful contributor to our American jurisprudence, often the pivotal fifth vote on some of the most important issues in modern American history that came before the U.S. Supreme Court.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to unanimously approve this resolution honoring this extraordinary woman, and I look forward to a unanimous vote of support by the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN-WAITE), the author of the resolution.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today is the first day in which our Nation celebrates the achievements of American women during Women's History Month. Honoring the service of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor is an excellent way to kick off this celebration.

When Justice O'Connor first set out on her journey, the dream of attending law school was not something a woman commonly achieved. Women in her day were encouraged to stay in the home, supporting the men who ran the country. Justice O'Connor's success to find work in the law profession exemplifies the determination that she had to achieve greatness. By defying society restrictions, today she offers great hope to the women of every generation.

Justice O'Connor is an inspiration to women across the Nation. She won acclaim as the first woman to be appointed to the United States Supreme Court and her retirement marks the end of an era.

During her service of 25 years on the Court, Justice O'Connor established a reputation as a key decision maker. By sticking to her philosophy of drawing practical conclusions when determining her final decision, she would often cast the deciding vote. Widely known as one of the most influential women in the United States, this title is often attributed to the dynamic Justice O'Connor brought to the United States Supreme Court.

Madam Speaker, little girls and young women take for granted today what women such as Justice O'Connor accomplished in earlier generations. As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I am honored to have offered this resolution today to remind us all, both men and women, to remain true to our beliefs and question the obstacles that others have put in place.

I am privileged to have witnessed the work of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, and I look forward to supporting House Resolution 357 this afternoon. I certainly appreciate the Judiciary Committee and our awesome chairman for allowing this to be put on the agenda and that we have it on the floor before us today.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 357, honoring former United States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and commend my colleague from Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE, for her

work on this legislation and Chairman SENSENBRENNER for allowing this to go through.

□ 1315

In 1981, when Sandra Day O'Connor was unanimously confirmed to the seat previously held by my fellow Cincinnatian, Justice Potter Stewart, as the first woman Justice, it was a very different time in America. After 24 years serving our Nation, it can be said that her legacy is multifaceted: one of the most influential Justices in history; certainly one of the most powerful women in America; and a pioneer in every sense of the word.

We know she was born in El Paso to parents who owned a 198,000-acre cattle ranch in southeastern Arizona. There she learned roping and riding but also the self-reliance and determination that influenced her life. Despite her many achievements at Stanford and Stanford Law School, law review, graduating in 2 years instead of three, and third in her class of 120, no law firm would hire her because she was a woman. She turned to public service and was Arizona's assistant attorney general, the first woman majority leader of the State senate, a trial judge and an Arizona court of appeals judge before being named to the United States Supreme Court. Maybe it is good no law firm would hire her.

Although I have not always agreed with her on every decision, Justice O'Connor stood for federalism, pragmatism, compromise and interpreting, not legislating, the law. She considered each case individually on its own merits. Her hallmarks of integrity, diligence, and fairness have been woven through every task she has undertaken.

Balancing the demands of a career and family, Justice O'Connor set a positive example for women, especially young women. She once said, ''Society as a whole benefits immeasurably from a climate in which all persons, regardless of race or gender, may have the opportunity to earn respect, responsibility, advancement and remuneration based on ability.''

During Women's History Month, it is especially fitting that we honor her.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill introduced by the gentlelady from Florida. As a member of the Congressional Women's Caucus, I applaud Justice Sandra Day O'Connor for her leadership as the first woman to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Appointment of Justice O'Connor added life to the women's movement, and when Justice Ginsburg was appointed, we had 2 very strong allies when these matters came before the high court. Her judicious leadership stood out when she joined Justices Souter and Kennedy in crafting a compromise to uphold Roe v. Wade in the Planned Parenthood v. Casey decision—that included the standard of limiting state regulation of abortions to the threshold of causing an ''undue burden'' on a woman's right to choose.

Justice O'Connor helped to protect affirmative action by making the swing vote in the 5-to-4 decision of Grutter v. Bollinger. This decision was a landmark that still has precedential value in terms of preserving the notion that there is not only the right to due process in the law at stake but the value of racial diversity in education.

Most recently, though, many of us on both sides of the aisle commend Justice O'Connor for her dissent in the recent Supreme Court decision of Kelo v. City of New London et. al (No. 04–108. Argued February 22, 2005—Decided June 23, 2005), in which she stated that

> [a]ny property may now be taken for the benefit of another private party, but the fallout from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process, including large corporations and development firms . . . [t]he Founders cannot have intended this perverse result. '[T]hat alone is a just government,' wrote James Madison, 'which impartially secures to every man, whatever is his own.'

I hope that the Court will continue this kind of sound judgment and leadership on matters of such great significance to our disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I thank Justice O'Connor for her service to our Highest Court.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, which honors the career of one of this Nation's most respected jurists, Associate Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. Not only did Justice O'Connor leave an indelible impression on the law but also on the legal profession itself.

As an Associate Justice, Mrs. O'Connor had a well-deserved reputation for being the swing vote on seminal cases. From campaign finance laws to affirmative action and sexual orientation discrimination, many Supreme Court lawyers tailored their arguments to her because of her ability and willingness to see the complexity of the issues that came before the court.

She also left her mark on the diversity of the legal profession. When she graduated from law school in 1952, ranked no less than 3rd in her class of 102 students, gender discrimination kept her from jobs at law firms. This was a time when women comprised only 4 percent of law graduates. Instead, she turned to public service and embarked upon a stellar career as a State prosecutor, State legislator, and State judge.

It was in her capacity as an Arizona Court of Appeals judge in 1981 that Justice O'Connor came to the attention of the White House. President Reagan nominated her to fill the seat of Justice Potter Stewart. On September 21, 1981, the Senate unanimously confirmed her to be the 102d Justice of the Supreme Court and the 1st female justice in history.

With Justice O'Connor as an example, the ranks of female lawyers have grown tremendously in this country. In 1981, the year of her appointment, women made up 35 percent of law students. In 2004, they made up approximately 50 percent. It would be impossible to overstate Justice O'Connor's role in that achievement. I thank her for her service to our country and wish her the best.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

Justice O'Connor served as a role model at a time when very few women were pursuing legal careers. Even before she was appointed to the United States Supreme Court, Justice O'Connor's career was one to follow. She served as a government lawyer, general practitioner, agency attorney, state legislator, and a judge at both the trial and appellate levels.

As the first woman ever to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice O'Connor was a steady—albeit unpredictable—presence on the bench. She was incredibly thoughtful and deliberate with her decisions, evaluating every case on its merits.

Justice O'Connor earned her place in history, making a permanent mark on the judicial system that will forever inspire girls and women throughout America. She will be greatly missed.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 357, honoring fellow Texan and former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. As the first woman inducted into the Supreme Court, Sandra Day O'Connor broke through gender barriers and a glass ceiling that had existed for almost two centuries.

Her outstanding service to America and the Supreme Court serves as a role model not only to women, but to anyone who was told they couldn't do a job based on bias and negative perception. Throughout her life, Justice O'Connor continually rose above prejudice—forming her own law firm when no one would hire her, and becoming the first woman to hold the position of majority leader in the Arizona State Senate.

Sandra Day O'Connor became one of the most powerful women in U.S. History. Instead of rebelling against a male-dominated society, Justice O'Connor sought to change the world by working within the system. Her decisions on controversial cases such as abortion, affirmative action, the death penalty, and religious freedom have changed the American landscape and will continue to impact us far into the future.

I commend Justice O'Connor for her years of service and for serving as a role model for so many Americans.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 357, Honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. Honoring Justice O'Connor's career as a jurist with this resolution is significant as she was a pioneer for women in the legal profession.

Nominated for the Supreme Court by President Reagan and confirmed by the U.S. Senate in 1981, Justice O'Connor became the 102nd Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and its first woman member. Justice O'Connor served honorably until her retirement on January 31, 2006. Justice O'Connor retired from the bench and from public service with the same grace and dignity with which she served. Her commitment to the Constitution, to public service, and to the United States will serve as inspiration for young Americans for years to come. Her work while on the Court will continue to provide needed guidance as American law continues to evolve. Her legacy of attacking bias not only against women but against all groups through jurisprudence benefits us all.

Justice O'Connor is the product of humble beginnings. In school, Justice O'Connor worked hard, earning numerous achievements while overcoming many obstacles in her path

to success. Upon graduation, Justice O'Connor found it difficult to obtain a position with any law firm due to her gender despite having earned honors as an undergraduate and a law student at Stanford University. Undaunted, she created her own opportunities, partnering with a colleague and beginning her own firm. Shortly thereafter, Justice O'Connor placed her career on hold to become a mother. During this time, Justice O'Connor devoted herself to volunteer activities with the Arizona State Hospital, the Arizona State Bar, the Salvation Army and several local schools.

Justice O'Connor returned to practicing law after 5 years as a full-time mother and assumed a position with the Arizona Attorney General's office. In 1969, she was appointed to fill a vacancy in the Arizona State Senate and 4 years later was the first woman to serve as the chamber's majority leader. This leadership role, however, only marked the beginning of her groundbreaking professional accomplishments.

In 1974, Justice O'Connor was nominated for a judgeship position in the Maricopa County Superior Court and nominated to the Arizona Court of Appeals 5 years later. As a result of her work on the Arizona Court of Appeals President Reagan nominated her to serve on the Supreme Court. Justice O'Connor's career proves that there is no barrier to large, no challenge to great, and no position to lofty to attain for a woman of integrity, conviction and intelligence.

Justice O'Connor is among the pioneering women of our time. She stands as a testament to what a fearless spirit, a determined heart and a sharp mind can achieve in the face of bias and tradition. Today, only one woman now serves on the Supreme Court, but we now that more will follow in the footsteps of Justice O'Connor.

Although Justice O'Connor is most widely recognized for her 24 years as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, she deserves to be recognized for leading of life of humanity, of dedication to public service, and one of commitment to making our country more fair, tolerant, and a better place to live. Her lifetime of achievements in the field of law and public service will always be remembered. Our country thanks her for the example she has set.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 357.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HONORING AND PRAISING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 97TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 335) honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 335

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), originally known as the National Negro Committee, was founded in New York City on February 12, 1909, the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, by a multiracial group of activists who answered ''The Call'' for a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African Americans;

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was founded by a distinguished group of leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, including Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling;

Whereas the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States;

Whereas the mission of the NAACP is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination;

Whereas the NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence;

Whereas the NAACP advances its mission through reliance upon the press, the petition, the ballot, and the courts, and has been persistent in the use of legal and moral persuasion, even in the face of overt and violent racial hostility;

Whereas the NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to serve the voice, as well as the shield, for minority Americans;

Whereas after years of fighting segregation in public schools, the NAACP, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, won one of its greatest legal victories in the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in Brown v. Board of Education;

Whereas in 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama—an act of courage that would serve as the catalyst for the largest grassroots civil rights movement in the history of the United States;

Whereas the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act, laws which ensured Government protection for legal victories achieved; and

Whereas in 2005, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama to rebuild their lives: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes the 97th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and

(2) honors and praises the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 335 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 335, a resolution honoring the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary.

This resolution recognizes that the NAACP has played an important role in helping to ensure that our constitutional guarantees are extended to all citizens.

Founded on the centennial of Republican President and Great Emancipator Abraham Lincoln's birthday in 1909, the NAACP represents America's oldest civil rights organization. Through members such as Rosa Parks, who ignited the national civil rights movement, and former Justice Thurgood Marshall, whose leadership led to the landmark legal victory in Brown v. Board of Education, the NAACP has helped galvanize efforts to promote the promise of equality that our Constitution envisioned.

Through nonviolent means, the NAACP led the Nation's effort to seek passage of the 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1968 civil rights acts. Challenging Federal, State, and local officials and governments to accord equal legal treatment to all citizens, the NAACP has sought to promote racial equality in areas such as education, employment, housing, and public facilities.

In 1965, the NAACP led the movement to seek passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, one of the most significant pieces of legislation passed during the 20th century. Committed to extending the protections of the 15th amendment and the Voting Rights Act to all African Americans, the NAACP worked tirelessly to register tens of thousands of new voters despite threats of violence. The NAACP has helped advance each reauthorization effort, including in 1982, when I was privileged to lead that bipartisan effort with my Democratic colleagues. I will lead that bipartisan effort with my Democratic colleagues again this spring when the Voting Rights Act is once again renewed.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to recognize the NAACP for

their contributions toward equality in America.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. I especially thank him for his kind words with reference to the NAACP and his indication that he will lead the charge, in fact be a part of the avant garde, with reference to extending the Voting Rights Act. I thank you for this.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored that the House leadership has chosen to bring House Concurrent Resolution 335 before this august body. This resolution honors the 97th anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and as I rise to the occasion, I would like to thank those who have made the occasion possible.

First, I would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER, chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee. He has spoken eloquently. I thank you for your kind words again; and I also want to, for the record, say you did what you did not have to do, and for this, I thank you.

I would like to thank ranking member JOHN CONYERS, who is now the dean of the conscience of the Congress. I thank you for helping us to bring this piece of legislation to the floor of the House.

I would also like to take an opportunity and thank my good friend Congressman HENRY HYDE, who was the first to sign on to this resolution. He gave his word, and I have learned that HENRY HYDE's word is his bond; and I thank Mr. HYDE.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go out to all 67 of my colleagues who cosponsored this resolution, as well as all who will support it, both Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. Speaker, because I do not know where we would be but for the NAACP, I cannot help but say thank God for the NAACP and the many other persons of goodwill who have fought racial injustice, because, Mr. Speaker, in our lifetime we can recall a time when racial injustice, as someone has said, was accepted by the masses and expected by the classes.

It was commonplace. It was every place. Politicians campaigned on it; judges decreed it; lawyers practiced it; policemen enforced it; preachers preached it; parents believed it; teachers taught it; and children learned it. We were all consumed by it.

However, the NAACP and others of goodwill helped to change this, and I am honored to say that this change has brought about significant progress in this country for African Americans and other minorities.

Hence, it is desired that this resolution not only honor the NAACP as an entity, but also the entire NAACP family and extended family, including the many people of goodwill who were not black, who put themselves in harm's way to end racial injustice.

We should never forget that the NAACP has not been, is not now, and never shall be a black-only organization. The NAACP has always been a multiracial organization. Yes, in remembering some of the great names associated with the organization, we should remember that Dr. Louis T. Wright became the first black board chair of the NAACP in 1935. However, as we remember Dr. Wright, we ought not forget Oswald Garrison Villiard who was not black, who in 1911 became the first chair of the board of the NAACP. Before the NAACP had its first black board chair, it had two that were not black.

We should remember James Weldon Johnson, who became the first black executive secretary director of the NAACP. However, we should not forget Francis Blascon, Mary White Ovington, Mary Nurney, Royall Nash. All of these persons we might remember were not black and served before James Weldon Johnson.

We should remember the brilliant black lawyer and Supreme Court Justice, as the chairman has mentioned, Thurgood Marshall. However, we should never forget Arthur Singarn who was not black. Arthur Singarn donated money, he raised money, and he headed the NAACP Legal Redress Committee. It has been said that Thurgood was a great litigator in part because Singarn was a great donator. The NAACP annually awards its highest honor in the name of Singarn.

We should remember Medgar Evers, the black NAACP field representative who was assassinated in his front yard in 1963; but, please, let us not forget John R. Shillady, the NAACP executive secretary who never recovered from a mob beating in Austin, Texas, in 1919. He gave his life in the fight for justice for all, and he was not black.

The point is, we did not get here by ourselves; and we thank God for the many who were not black who helped us in our quest for justice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman who I have announced earlier is the conscience of the Congress and that, of course, is Congressman CONYERS. We thank you for being with us, Congressman.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Mr. GREEN, for yielding just briefly to add to your remarks. I am pleased to join with you and with the chairman of Judiciary, JAMES SENSENBRENNER, in this 97th anniversary remembrance of the greatest civil rights organization that we have in this country. I can say to Congressman GREEN that your initiation of this resolution recognizing the 97th anniversary of the NAACP could not be more timely.

I just want to add one name. We are all mentioning all of these names in the course of 97 years. We are dealing with the most serious social problem in America that has never yet been resolved that we have been working on. We have a voter rights extension bill in the Committee on the Judiciary about to come forward.

□ 1330

We are bringing people together. We are working as hard as we can.

And I was just at a meeting yesterday in which I was reminded that we have the likes of Ted Shaw of the Legal Defense Fund; Greg Moore, the executive director of the National Voter Fund; and in Detroit we have the largest branch in the United States, with a current membership of more than 45,000 people, led by Reverend Wendell Anthony of Fellowship Chapel. So all of this makes such a rich history.

And I am glad, now that we have done Black History Month, that we have come along with this 97th anniversary resolution, because this issue has to be studied every month. We have to examine where we are and where we are going. And I am so pleased at all the Members on the floor here and many others that will be submitting statements which recognize the depth, the importance and the significance of a resolution recognizing nearly 100 years of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in this long struggle, hard-fought struggle that has promoted goodwill and tried to make America live up to the promise of our constitutional democracy.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership and for the leadership of Chairman SENSENBRENNER, and to all who celebrate the 97th anniversary of the NAACP.

Mr. GREEN earlier said that there were so many people who gave their lives, gave their blood, sweat and tears, and he mentioned Medgar Evers. But I just want to talk about another member of the NAACP, and his name was Harry Moore. He was a devoted husband, father, educator, and one of the first civil rights martyrs of our time. His tireless efforts and unselfish sacrifice in the name of social justice continues to inspire and empower Americans of all stripes, even now, over 50 years after his death.

Harry Tyson Moore was born in Houston, Florida, on November 18, 1905. After his father's death, his mother sent her only son to live with his three aunts in Jacksonville, Florida. In the prosperous and intellectual community of Jacksonville, Mr. Moore cultivated his intelligence and excelled. After graduating from Florida Memorial College in 1925, he moved to Cocoa, Florida. He settled in Brevard County teaching fourth grade at the only African American elementary school in the area.

While there, he went on to meet his future wife, Hariette Simms. In time,

Mr. Moore became principal of the Titusville Colored School, which taught children from the fourth to ninth grade. In March 1928 and September 1930, the Moores welcomed two daughters into the world. With his family and professional life in place, Mr. Moore began an additional career in political activism.

In 1934, Mr. Moore founded the Brevard County branch of the NAACP. In 1937, by working with the Black Florida State Teachers Association and NAACP attorney Thurgood Marshall, he was a catalyst towards the movement of equalizing salaries of black and white teachers. Although he lost the court battle, he would ultimately win the war. Make no mistake, his actions inspired many others, and ultimately Mr. Moore helped achieve pay parity among teachers of color with their white counterparts.

I wish I had time to tell the entire story, but on one Christmas Eve Mr. Moore and his family were blown to pieces because of his work in the NAACP.

So many people never hear the name Harry Moore, but he was another tireless fighter, lifting up the rights for all people, and he is one of the people who make it possible for the Congressional Black Caucus today to number some 43.

I thank the NAACP on its 97th anniversary and I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for one final statement.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to restate to a certain extent some of what the chairman has said: that the NAACP has accomplished great things for this country. The NAACP was involved in passing the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. The NAACP was there to fight and help pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Fair Housing Act of 1968, and the NAACP filed and won Shelly v. Cramer, as well as Barrows v. Jackson, outlawing restrictive covenants. The NAACP filed and won Brown v. Board of Education, integrating schools and, to a certain extent, integrating society.

And, Mr. Speaker, if truth be told, we are schooled where we are schooled, we work where we work, we sleep where we sleep, we eat where we eat, and we live where we live in great measure due to the NAACP.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, last summer, I was honored to be invited to address the NAACP convention, which was held in Milwaukee, and I got a very good reception in talking about reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act, which my committee will be dealing with shortly, as well as overturning the Supreme Court's erroneous decision in the case of Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut, which basically said that there were no constitutional protections against a municipality using eminent domain to take a person's private property simply because the city fathers and mothers decided that there would be a way to get more tax revenue out of that piece of land.

That bill has passed the House of Representatives and is currently pending in the other body, and I hope we can have eminent domain reform passed during this session of Congress, as well as the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD the speech that I gave to the NAACP convention in Milwaukee on July 10, 2005.

Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity to talk briefly about two important issues facing us right now: an extension of the Voting Rights Act and the Supreme Court's recent 5–4 decision in the Kelo case, which held that the government can use ''economic development'' as a reason for taking private property.

Among my proudest moments was accompanying members of the NAACP and Dr. Marsha Coleman-Adebayo for the signing of the No FEAR Act, legislation that aims to stamp out discrimination in federal agencies. The bipartisan passage of No FEAR, the first civil rights legislation of the 21st century, should serve as a model for future civil rights bills.

On August 5,2005, the United States will celebrate the 40th anniversary of one of the most significant pieces of legislation enacted during the 20th Century—the Voting Rights Act. This profound legislation pushed back against those unwilling to treat all citizens as equals and restored the dignity and equality that our Constitution is intended to preserve for all citizens.

Our democratic system of government has as its most fundamental right the right of its citizens to participate in the political process. Adopted 135 years ago, the 15th Amendment ensures that no American citizen's right to vote can be denied or abridged by the United States or a State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. As far too many here know and have experienced, some government entities have not only been unfaithful to the rights and protections afforded by the Constitution, but have aggressively—and sometimes violently—tried to disenfranchise African-American and other minority voters.

In his momentous speech delivered to Congress on March 15, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated, ''[e]xperience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic and ingenious discrimination. No law that we now have on the books—and I have helped to put three of them there—can ensure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it. In such a case our duty must be clear to all of us. The Constitution says that no person shall be kept from voting because of his race or color. We have all sworn an oath before God to support and to defend that Constitution. We must now act in obedience to that oath.''

Seeing the Voting Rights Act's impact compelled me in 1982 to lead the House Republican effort to extend it for 25 years. This effort wasn't easy—but then again, very important things never are. While I proudly display in my Washington office one of the pens President Ronald Reagan used to sign this extension, the fruits of this effort can best be seen on the faces of those not only participating in the political process but actively leading it.

In the 1960s, all major civil rights legislation was passed with strong bipartisan support. Lately, this has not been the case as some have tried to use the issue of civil rights to obtain a partisan advantage. This is both wrong and shortsighted. The stakes have not been higher in the past 20 years.

In 2007, several key protections contained in the Voting Rights Act will expire, including the federal oversight protections provided by Section 5. I am here to tell you publicly what I have told others privately, including the head of the Congressional Black Caucus, Representative Mel Watt—during this Congress we are going to extend the Voting Rights Act. I am not alone in the Congress in supporting an extension; indeed, House Speaker Dennis Hastert last week stated that reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act is high on his list of issues the House will address this Congress.

Soon I will be introducing legislation to extend the Voting Rights Act. Just like its enactment and its 1982 extension, this bipartisan effort will succeed. Ladies and gentlemen, while we have made progress and curtailed injustices thanks to the Voting Rights Act, our work is not yet complete. We cannot let discriminatory practices of the past resurface to threaten future gains. The Voting Rights Act must continue to exist—and exist in its current form.

I also want to mention my strong opposition to the Supreme Court's recent 5–4 decision in the Kelo case, which held that the government can use ''economic development'' as a reason for taking private property from one small homeowner and giving it to a large corporation simply because the corporation's greater wealth will bring the government more tax revenue.

As the NAACP so correctly noted in its brief filed with the Supreme Court in the Kelo case, ''The takings that result [from the Court's decision] will disproportionately affect and harm the economically disadvantaged and, in particular, racial and ethnic minorities and the elderly.''

The noxious practice endorsed by the Court's Kelo decision has generated bipartisan opposition. Last week, I introduced H.R. 3135, the ''Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2005,'' with the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Conyers, as the lead Democratic cosponsor, and Representatives Maxine Waters, Sheila Jackson-Lee, and 87 additional Members as original cosponsors.

This legislation would prevent the Federal government from using economic development as a justification for taking privately-owned property. It would also prohibit any State or municipality from doing so whenever Federal funds are involved with the project for which the government's takings power is exercised.

American taxpayers should not be forced to contribute in any way to the abuse of government power. One man's home must not become a hotel or strip mall solely because the government seeks more tax revenue. I am looking forward to working with you and all organizations opposed to the Supreme Court's Kelo decision. We must ensure that churches, homes, farms, and other private property cannot be bulldozed in abusive land grabs that benefit other private individuals, who claim that their use of the land will increase tax revenues.

Last week, America celebrated the 229th anniversary of her independence. Let us all work towards the day—envisioned by our Founders and affirmed by Frederick Douglass—in which the rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity, and independence bequeathed by our Founders is shared by all Americans.

Ladies and gentlemen, I look forward to continuing to work together and thank you for this opportunity to address you.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation recognizes and celebrates the 97th Anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, I rise today to pay homage to the momentous contributions of the organization to our nation. In so doing, I would like to highlight the life and legacy of one of its most impressive, but relatively unknown leaders, Harry T. Moore.

Harry T. Moore was one of the first civil rights martyrs of our time. A devoted husband, father, educator, his tireless efforts and unselfish sacrifice in the name of social justice continue to inspire and empower Americans of all stripes, even now, over 50 years after his death.

Harry Tyson Moore was born in Houston, Florida on November 18, 1905. After his father's death his mother sent her only son to live with his three aunts in Jacksonville, Florida. In the prosperous and intellectual community of Jacksonville, Mr. Moore cultivated his intelligence and excelled. After graduating from Florida Memorial College in 1925, he moved to Cocoa, Florida. He settled in Brevard County teaching fourth grade at the only African-American elementary school in the area.

While there, he went on to meet his future wife, Hariette Vyda Simms. In time, Mr. Moore became principal of the Titusville Colored School, which taught children from the fourth to ninth grade. In March 1928 and September 1930, the Moore's welcomed two daughters into the world. With his family and professional life in place, Mr. Moore began an additional career in political activism.

In 1934, Mr. Moore founded the Brevard County NAACP chapter. In 1937, by working with the Black Florida State Teacher's Association and NAACP attorney Thurgood Marshall, he catalyzed a movement to equalize the salaries of Black and White teachers. Although he lost the court battle, he would ultimately win the war. Make no mistake, his actions inspired many others and ultimately, Mr. Moore helped achieve pay parity among teachers of color and their White counterparts.

In 1941, he organized the Florida State Conference of the NAACP and worked as an executive secretary without compensation. His platform also broadened as he began to add his voice to issues such as Black voting disenfranchisement, segregated education, and later in 1943, lynchings and police brutality. He began to organize protests, and write and circulate letters voicing his concerns about the issues.

He also organized the Progressive Voter's League and with his persistence and diligence, in 1948, helped over 116,000 Black voters register, which represented 31 percent of the African-American voting population in the Florida Democratic Party. In 1946, due to his role in the League, Mr. Moore and his wife were terminated from their jobs. Mr. Moore then took on a full-time paid position as an organizer for the NAACP. However, in 1949, over Mr. Moore's objection, the national NAACP office raised the dues from $1 to $2, causing a substantial amount of members to revoke their membership. This marked only the beginning of a strained relationship between Mr. Moore and the national NAACP office.

During that same year, the landmark Groveland rape case occurred, in which four African-American men were falsely accused of raping a White woman. Although the men were brutally beaten and no evidence suggested that the woman was raped, one of the men was killed, one was given a life sentence, and the other two were sentenced to death.

With Mr. Moore's assistance in conjunction with the legal counsel of the NAACP, the case went to the U.S. Supreme Court and the conviction for the two sentenced to death was overturned. However, Sheriff Willis McCall, a known White supremacist, shot the two men to death as he was driving them to their pretrial hearing. Recognizing this tragic injustice, Mr. Moore vigorously advocated for the indictment of Sheriff McCall.

Sadly, Mr. Moore never lived to see the outcome of his work in this case. On the eve of his 25th wedding anniversary and Christmas Day 1951, Mr. Moore and his wife were killed when a bomb placed underneath their bed in the floor detonated. Mr. Moore died in his mother's arms on the way to the hospital while Harriet died only nine days later.

Following the Moores' murder, there was a public outcry in the African-American community. Despite massive amounts of mail sent to President Truman and the Florida Governor in protest and the many protests and memorials organized demanding justice, no arrests were made in relation to the horrendous crime.

In no uncertain terms, Harry T. Moore led without permission, without acknowledgment, and without fear. What made his vision so tangible was the fact that he believed he could achieve what he set before himself. In a speech his daughter gave in 2002, she stated, ''Daddy started the movement. He had absolutely nobody but us, and yet he accomplished all of those things—the voting, the teacher salaries all of the lynchings that he investigated. That's a very important part of history.''

Mr. Speaker, Harry T. Moore's story is one of such importance as we celebrate the 97th anniversary of the NAACP and reflect on the success of its past and present leaders. Although the victories achieved by the organization are historic, it should be understood that ordinary people by the tens of thousands won our freedom.

For 97 years, the multi-racial membership of the NAACP—ordinary people called to an extraordinary mission—have marched, demonstrated and lobbied for justice in a movement for peaceful change felt in every aspect of American life.

That is why we must celebrate and praise the NAACP and recall these stories. For these stories are not only told to recall the achievements of African-American trailblazers, but to offer the next Harry T. Moore, W.E.B. Dubois, Ida Wells-Barnett, and Lena K. Lee the hope, promise, direction, and purpose needed to rise from the ordinary to achieve the extraordinary.

I shall conclude with an excerpt of the heartfelt words written by Langston Hughes in memory of Harry T. Moore: In his heart is only love For all the human race, And all he wants is for every man To have his rightful place. And this he says, our Harry Moore, As from the grave he cries: No bomb can kill the dreams I hold For freedom never dies!

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 335 and to thank my colleague, Mr. GREEN, for introducing this resolution. It is important for all of us to honor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary for the many achievements that highlight their long and distinguished history.

As a native of Baltimore and a lifetime member of the NAACP, this resolution holds special importance for me. The NAACP has been headquartered in Baltimore since 1986, continuing a long tradition of civil rights prominence for the city. Thurgood Marshall, also a son of Baltimore, was one of the NAACP's premier advocates and later our nation's first African American Justice.

Founded in February 1909 by members of the Niagara Movement, the NAACP has been a catalyst for America's evolution. Its founding members included Ida Wells-Barnett, Henry Moscowitz, and William Edward Burghardt DuBois. Their heroic efforts formed the foundation that helped spark the Civil Rights Movement. They and future generations confronted daily the evils of Jim Crow, and challenged more subtle but equally pernicious forms of racial discrimination. The NAACP has led efforts to construct a society based on equality, respect, and understanding between all citizens. Its legislative accomplishments are legendary—the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1960 and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the 1968 Fair Housing Rights Act among them.

Over the years, the list of NAACP pioneers has included Walter White, Charles Hamilton Houston, Rosa Parks, Medgar Evers, Elaine Jones, and many thousands of other brave freedom fighters. The NAACP challenged school segregation in Brown v. Board of Education, and residential segregation in Buchanan v. Warley. It fought segregation in government institutions, resulting in its eventual repeal. It defeated Supreme Court nominations of those who would deny equal rights. It mobilized voters in the South at a time when the very lives of their volunteers were threatened. And it continues to shine a beacon of light for equal justice.

But the NAACP represents so much more than these landmark laws and court decisions; it represents a voice for change, a clarion call to end the vicious and destructive stereotypes that too often still divide rather than unite our country; and a vehicle for raising of the collective consciousness of America.

Current President and CEO Bruce Gordon leads a strong and vibrant association of more than half a million members, with seven regional offices and hundreds of local branches, united in purpose.

For nearly a century, the NAACP has set the standard for effecting meaningful social change. I am proud to congratulate the NAACP on this 97th anniversary, I look forward to its centennial, and I urge my colleagues to unanimously support this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 97th anniversary. The NAACP holds a very special meaning to me. One honor I especially treasure is being named Virginia's first individual Golden Heritage Life Member. That honor was a great addition to the honor of having served as president of the Newport News chapter. The NAACP also holds a special place in the collective memory of all of our people.

The NAACP is an organization that has made a difference from the very beginning. In 1909, 60 prominent Americans, including Ida B. Wells-Barnett and W.E.B. DuBois, met on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the

birth of Abraham Lincoln to discuss racial violence and social justice. Out of that meeting, the NAACP was born—with the goal of securing rights, liberties and protections for all Americans, as guaranteed by the Constitution.

The NAACP has always fought against injustices by using nonviolent protests, the press, the ballot, and the courts. The NAACP took on the President of the United States in 1918 and President Wilson finally publicly condemned lynching. During World War I, the NAACP successfully campaigned for African Americans to be commissioned as officers in the army. And in World War II, the NAACP pressured Roosevelt into ordering a non-discriminatory policy in war-related industries and Federal employment.

In 1946, the NAACP won the Morgan v. Virginia case where the Supreme Court banned states from having segregated facilities on buses and trains that crossed state borders. And in 1948, the NAACP pressured President Truman into signing the Executive Order that banned discrimination in the armed forces. In 1954, the NAACP won its landmark legal case—Brown v. the Board of Education—declaring ''separate and equal'' unconstitutional.

Through the 50s and 60s protests made a lot of difference. In 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama. This led to the Montgomery bus boycott, which led to the emergence of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. All of these events led to the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, President Johnson's 1965 Executive Order banning employment discrimination in Federal contracts, the 1968 Fair Housing Act, and other landmark civil rights reforms.

The NAACP is what the late Bishop Stephen Gill Spotswood, a former National Board Chairman, has called ''the oldest, largest, most effective, most consulted, most militant, most feared and most loved of all civil rights organizations in the world.'' Bishop Spotswood's statement remains true today.

In the 21st Century, the NAACP is needed as much as ever to make a difference—at all levels—National, State and local. Despite victories won long ago we are still facing challenges. In its 97th year, the NAACP needs to continue its great legacy of contribution and commitment to ensure that these hard-won civil rights will always be protected. Congratulations on your 97th anniversary.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 335, legislation that recognizes the 97th anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and acknowledges the many contributions of the NAACP in helping to create a more equitable and just society.

The NAACP is the oldest civil rights organization in the United States, and blazed the trail towards equal justice for all Americans. The organization has consistently used nonviolent means to achieve its goals, and, to this day, emphasizes dutiful civic participation as the best way to promote and protect civil rights.

Ninety-seven years ago this month, a handful of intrepid Americans, including W.E.B. DuBois, Ida Wells Barnett, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, William English Walling, and Henry Moscowitz chose to push America towards its highest ideals, forming the National Negro Committee, which would later come to be known as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In 1954, the NAACP achieved one of its greatest victories when the Supreme Court ordered in the Brown v. Board of Education the desegregation of public schools across the nation ''with all deliberate speed.'' The NAACP Special Counsel who won this battle would go on to become one of America's greatest legal minds, Justice Thurgood Marshall.

One year later, in 1955, Rosa Parks' refusal to yield her seat on a segregated bus served as the impetus for the broader Civil Rights Movement. Parks, a lifelong devotee to the Movement, was a member of the NAACP. In its fight for equality for racial minorities, the NAACP lobbied tirelessly for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These two laws served to enshrine for all the cherished constitutional rights that too many had been deprived of for too long, by redressing serious shortcomings in the morality of our nation.

The NAACP continues to fight for the rights of Americans confined to the corners of our society. As recently as last year, the NAACP created the Disaster Relief Fund to aid those who suffered tremendously in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The NAACP maintains active branches nationwide, including one in the 12th District of New Jersey, located in Trenton. I am proud of the NAACP members who live in my Congressional District for the work they do to continue to advance the struggle for civil rights in our country.

The NAACP has gracefully and tirelessly fought for the political, social, economic, and educational rights of all Americans, and has sought to ensure that our nation recognized the inalienable rights of all citizens, regardless of race, class, or ethnicity. The enormity of the NAACP's contributions is immeasurable, and I am proud to join with my colleagues in supporting this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the 97th Anniversary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Since the NAACP was founded on February 12, 1909, it has been committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence. As the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States, NAACP's mission is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights for all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination. Its half million adult and youth members throughout the United States are the premier advocates for civil rights in their communities.

This resolution allows us to acknowledge the efforts of the NAACP, including its leadership in lobbying for the passage of landmark laws such as the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the NAACP launched the Disaster Relief Fund, which has raised almost $2 million to aid the survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama. Once again, the NAACP is helping individuals, families and communities in their efforts to recover from disasters and build for the future.

We also celebrate the life, legacy and struggles of civil rights pioneers. Recently, the nation suffered a tremendous loss with the passing of Mrs. Coretta Scott King and Mrs. Rosa Parks, two phenomenal women who were advocates for civil rights and aided in the mission of the NAACP.

Today, the NAACP remains a valiant crusader for freedom and equality. This anniversary is the occasion to celebrate a heroic past and great achievements and to redouble our efforts for the future. We've come a long way but we have many miles yet to go. I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the NAACP on its 97th Anniversary.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 335 which honors the NAACP on its 97th anniversary.

I rise because of the sacrifice of Goodman, Cheney and Schwerner, Thurgood Marshall and Rosa Parks. I rise and stand on the shoulders of Daisy Bates, Emmett Till and the great Medgar Evans. I rise because the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States and has been a force to be reckoned with in every stage of this country's battle for racial equality.

They were there when four little girls died when the 16th Street Baptist Church was bombed in Montgomery, AL. They were there with the Little Rock Nine when they entered the doors of Central High in Little Rock, AR. They were there fighting for equal educational opportunities in the landmark case of Brown v. Board of Education.

And more recently, they were present during the battle to end apartheid in South Africa and they continue to fight for increased voter participation and human equality not only in this Nation, but across the world.

These battles have been waged in the face of intense adversity and widespread resistance, yet the NAACP has endured for 97 years. Throughout the civil rights movement, freedom fighters proclaimed with pride that they were ''card carrying members of the NAACP.'' They knew then, as we know now, that the NAACP not only stands for equality, it stands for justice, fairness and a better way of life.

We must not forget that the NAACP is the name but the organization is comprised of people. Everyday people that have dedicated their lives to making this world a better place.

So, in honoring the NAACP today, I also honor the people, of all races, that have united as advocates for civil rights and human equality.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 97th anniversary. Following the violent race riots in Springfield, IL, in 1909, Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling came together in New York to form one of the oldest, largest and most influential civil rights organizations in America.

These founders came together with the purpose of promoting and fully recognizing the rights and equality given under the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution. Today, the NAACP works to ensure a society in which all individuals have equal rights and there is no racial hatred or racial discrimination.

The NAACP has influenced some of the greatest civil rights victories of the last century, including: integration of schools and the Brown v. Board decision, the Voting Rights Act, striking down segregation and Jim Crow,

the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, and hundreds of community and grassroots initiatives.

Despite the advancements of the past 97 years under the leadership of the NAACP, there is still much work to be done. In the Black community we continue to see disproportionate numbers of African-Americans that experience poverty, unemployment, and economic and social inequality. The NAACP continues to promote new ideas and leadership in the fields of educational and employment opportunities, ending health care disparities, and economic empowerment.

The NAACP instilled in America a sense of consciousness, and continues to do that today through the thousands of individuals who have given not only their time, but their blood, sweat and tears, towards equality and justice.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 335, which honors the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) for their many achievements on their anniversary.

For 97 years, the NAACP has led the fight for racial equality in America. Although considerable progress has been made, there is still so much more to be done.

The NAACP has battled for decades in order to change many negative aspects of American society. They have helped people of all races, nationalities and faiths unite on one premise, that all men and women are created equal.

From W.E.B. DuBois to Thurgood Marshall to Bruce Gordon, the NAACP has played an instrumental role in helping eliminate racial prejudice and removing barriers of racial discrimination through the democratic process.

H. Con. Res. 335 underscores the importance of the NAACP and how big of a role they have played in evening the playing field for all citizens, regardless of their race. I support of this important resolution.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, this is a good resolution, I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 335.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2271. An act to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1501

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

HONORING JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 357.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 357, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—410

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

NOT VOTING—22

Burton (IN)
Costa
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, M.
English (PA)
Evans
Ford
Fortenberry
Hinchey
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kucinich
LaTourette
Lucas
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George

Myrick Roybal-Allard Smith (NJ)
Reichert Sanders Sweeney

□ 1525

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was regrettably unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall vote 17, final passage of H. Res. 357, a bill to honor Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the occasion of her retirement from the United States Supreme Court and to commend her for her hard work and dedication to the law.

Had I been here I would have unquestionably voted "yea" on rollcall vote 17.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at the United States Supreme Court, which is hearing the Texas redistricting case. Had I been present, I would have voted an enthusiastic ''yea'' on the Sandra Day O'Connor resolution.

U.N. HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge other nations to join us in the United States in voting against the proposed United Nations Human Rights Council. This council is by no means true reform. Some may argue that we have actually gone from bad to worse; that it is easier for the likes of China or Syria, Iran, Burma and Cuba to get on this council than it would be for the United States.

That is what we are dealing with in the current proposal. All countries on the U.N. General Assembly are eligible to become members no matter what their human rights record. This is the same General Assembly that in November of last year, amidst the horrible genocide taking place in Darfur, could not agree that Sudan was guilty of human rights violations.

For the sake of the victims of human rights abuses, we must take immediate action to prevent this travesty. Let us support our ambassador, John Bolton, in rejecting this so-called reform package which is nothing but a sham.

PORT SECURITY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think there are many issues we can be addressing; but as I recently came back from my district, it is amazing how the idea of selling our ports has caught the hearts and minds of the American people. So I think it is important that we owe them both an explanation and also we owe them the responsibility of oversight.

It is important to note that in the 2007 budget we have cut resources for port security, and as well it is important to note that our largest ports in America are suffering under either no appropriations from the Federal Government of America or minimal support.

And so I offer legislation, one, to have a 2-year moratorium on the sale, leasing or operating of any of America's ports by foreign entities. And then I would ask for a major study by the Office of the Comptroller and Homeland Security to be able to determine the status of security in the Nation's ports.

It would be shocking to note that in Hong Kong, every cargo is surveyed, every cargo container. In the United States we do not do that. I believe we owe the American people secure ports, and we are prepared to do so.

□ 1530

HONORING PFC DANIEL WILSON

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor a true American hero and to recognize the thousands of brave men and women that are currently serving our country both at home and abroad.

In December of last year, PFC Daniel Wilson of Cherokee County, Georgia, was on patrol in Baghdad; and like so many of his fellow soldiers, Wilson understood that these patrols are part of his everyday life and that it is a risk that they assume selflessly. On this particular day, Wilson's HUMVEE struck a land mine, throwing both Wilson and fellow soldier out of their vehicle. The wounds that PFC Wilson suffered were thankfully not fatal.

In February of this year, the Army awarded PFC Wilson a Purple Heart, and I rise today to say thank you to this young man. We send our deepest gratitude and respect to all of those serving in our Armed Forces. We here at home often do not take the time to truly appreciate how blessed we are.

The members of the United States military stand on the front lines of a great struggle to preserve freedom and democracy, and we could not ask for a more capable and professional group of men and women protecting our way of life.

HALLIBURTON REIMBURSEMENT

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Pentagon announced that it is returning $288 out of $300 million it was holding while investigating Halliburton for overcharging, even though Halliburton was previously caught overcharging the Pentagon by $27 million for meals for our troops.

Mr. Speaker, even as tens of thousands of Hurricane Katrina survivors face eviction due to FEMA, the United States Government is handing hundreds of millions of dollars to a company which has been plagued by allegations and admissions of fraud, waste, abuse, bribery and kickbacks.

The Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq was itself unable to account for $9 billion, with over a billion of this reportedly having been lost to Halliburton.

Today, I urge Congress to establish a permanent war profiteering committee modeled after the Truman Commission after the Second World War.

Before this Congress writes the President another blank check, we need to investigate the gross incompetence and even corruption that exists with this administration.

DEAL, ORDEAL AND NO DEAL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the fiasco of allowing a foreign-owned corporation, foreign-country-owned company to come into our port situation, have information about our manifests, about ports, the shipping information, has gone through three parts.

First of all, it was the part of the deal. It was a deal that nobody knew about here in this House of Representatives. Once we found out about the deal, it has now gone through the ordeal, where we are bringing transparency to this deal that was bad for America. And soon hopefully, Mr. Speaker, it will be no deal because it is not a deal that is good for the United States, and it is certainly not good for Homeland Security.

Allowing a foreign country to own a corporation that goes into our ports and has access to information is a bad deal, no deal for the United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). The Chair will recognize Members for special order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks wil appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 2-month anniversary of the Medicare prescription drug benefit, and it would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that, so far, the Part D, D stands for disaster.

The benefit is so complicated and convoluted that even beneficiaries with Ph.D.s have said they could not figure it out.

Why is this program so flawed? Because it was designed, or we like to say in the private sector, the first operation is take care of the customer first. I have yet to find a single pharmaceutical executive or an HMO executive who is complaining about this program, but I have found a heck of a lot of senior citizens who are complaining about this program. This program was never designed with our senior citizens in mind. If it was, you would not have the complexities that are happening for our senior citizens.

The executives of the drug companies will earn $139 billion of additional profits that they would not have earned any other way; insurance companies, $130 billion of additional profits over the next 10 years.

The complexity of the benefit shows, in my view, what was wrong and what we should have done right. Three simple steps:

One, with the May 15 penalty that will kick in, the tax, the senior Medicare tax, postpone that until HHS and CMS figure out what they should be doing, rather than what they should not be doing. No senior should be forced into a program where even the people running it do not know what they are doing.

Second, directly negotiate for prices. That is what the Veterans' Administration does. That is what Sam's Club does. That is what Target does. That is what Costco does. Anybody in the private sector, literally, bulk purchases get a better price than anybody buying individually.

And third, allow people competitive choices by reimportation, allowing them to buy drugs in Canada, England, France, where they can get competitive pricing which is 50 percent cheaper.

I have a Costco in Chicago. There is also a Costco in Toronto. We have up on our Web site the two Costcos, one in Toronto, one in Chicago. Same 10 drugs, same milligram, same dosage; and the Costco in Toronto is constantly $1,000 cheaper for the same drugs over the same period of time than the one in Chicago. And yet both of them are stores that are supposed to be discount.

And lastly, allow generics to market quicker. If you had direct negotiations, reimportation, generics to market quicker, three free market principles where competition and choice rule, we would actually have cheaper pharmaceutical prices, things that seniors can afford, and save money for taxpayers as well.

And yet what we do not have are those programs. And we are forcing in the middle of May, May 15, senior citizens will literally pay a Medicare privatization tax.

On April 15, all Americans will pay a tax. On May 15, because of the complexity of this program, seniors will begin to pay a tax for the complexities.

Seniors that do not want to join this program, that are confused because of the way that they have been forced into plans, had plans drop their drugs, not offer all the drugs they need at a better price than they can get otherwise, will literally start to be taxed by the Federal Government.

Tens of thousands of beneficiaries, today in the New York Times an article highlighted that the beneficiaries are automatically assigned to plans and deciding to switch plans are finding that they are actively enrolled in two drug plans at the same time.

When you read a report on what is going on, you would think you were reading an after-action report on Katrina. What has happened over at HHS and Health and Human Services on Medicare is literally one more example of the disaster the Federal Government has had in running this plan. The situation leaves patients at risk, being charged two premiums or incorrect copayments.

In my hometown of Chicago, seniors have 62 separate drug plans to pick from. And I hear constantly from my constituents every day that the choices are causing confusion and problems. Pharmacists are not sure what is happening. The people administering the plans are not sure what is happening, and it is leaving seniors absolutely in total confusion.

Seniors need clearly more time to figure this out. They should not be penalized with a complexity tax, a privatization tax for taking the time to get the facts. Facts, I remind you, that even HHS and Medicare are not sure of what the facts are as it relates to what is the best plan.

Just to give you an idea of the tax we are talking about, if a senior decided to wait for 2 years before enrolling, there will be a 24 percent higher premium to pay. That is an additional $7.73 per month on top of the monthly premium. If a senior waits longer, it can go as high as $456 a year. For seniors on a fixed income, this is a tremendous financial burden.

Even before the drug benefit went into effect on January 1, there were problems. And the Republican colleagues who wrote the plan know what the problems are.

In fact, the drug manufacturers, again, I would like to repeat and I will be done: $139 billion in profits over the next 8 years and insurers, $130 million.

THE THIEVES OF KATRINA AND RITA

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, in the disturbing days following Hurricane Katrina there was much confusion and chaos and catastrophe. Isaac Carloss and his wife, Debbie Anderson, used this tragedy to take advantage of innocent victims of this hurricane. Their deceptive and lawless journey was only recently halted by the Department of Justice.

According to the DOJ, Carloss' wife, Debbie, met an evacuee at a rescue shelter following the hurricane. Since the evacuee was unable to return to his home, Debbie gave the individual permission to use her address and receive mail. The evacuee then applied for FEMA assistance, and an express mail package addressed to the evacuee was sent to Debbie's residence. Debbie signed for the package with a fictitious name, opened the mail, and started her illegal spending spree across Louisiana.

The package included two FEMA disaster assistance checks totaling over $4,000 intended for the evacuee. But Diane, Isaac and Debbie took these checks and went directly to the local car dealership where they used one of the checks to purchase a car. She then took the other check to a bank in Louisiana where she persuaded the teller to cash the check because they were victims, or she was a victim of the hurricane.

Just last week, in Louisiana, her husband, Isaac, was found guilty of one count of conspiracy, one count of theft of mail and two counts of theft of public money. He faces a sentence up to 5 years in prison. His wife, Debbie, has already pleaded guilty in January to a count of conspiracy. This is just one of the many examples of the vagrants that cheated the government and the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Rita.

Six months ago, when the ladies of the gulf, Katrina and Rita, pounded the gulf coast, thousands of people were left dismayed. They were distressed and in desperate need of aid. In the days following the hurricanes FEMA quickly began disbursing money to suffering victims. However, amidst all the confusion and chaos, fraud started. Now, 6 months later and millions of dollars wasted later, the winds have subsided, but the deception continues and the shady scams are getting more disturbing every day.

According to a recent Government Accounting study, Federal investigators have learned 1,000 people who applied for aid used Social Security numbers of dead people; 1,000 used bogus, nonexistent numbers, and tens of thousands have used names, birth dates and Social Security numbers of people that did not match.

The report also found that up to 900,000 of the 2.5 million applicants to receive aid under FEMA's emergency assistance program were based upon duplicate or invalid Social Security numbers or false addresses. Additionally, duplicate payments were made to some people who applied first with debit cards then again by electronic bank transfer.

The GAO reported another example where one person used 15 different Social Security numbers and received payments totaling $41,000, money he has stolen from the victims and from the taxpayers.

The corruption is chilling. With FEMA debit cards an individual in Jefferson, Louisiana, spent $1,300 on a pistol. An individual in Houston, Texas spent $1,200 at a gentleman's club with his FEMA debit card. And the list goes on: diamond engagement rings, gambling, bail bondsmen, tattoos, massages, alcohol and adult erotic products.

We also have learned that hotel rooms in New York City have cost the taxpayers $500 a night, beachfront apartments being rented in the same amounts were all paid for by FEMA, which really means paid for by other taxpayers. Reports have even surfaced about emergency meals being sold on eBay.

Legitimate, law-abiding citizens are suffering because of these disgraceful and despicable delinquents that have chosen to take advantage of this tragedy.

These criminals should be found and they should go to jail, and anyone in the Federal Government that has helped them should be in jail as well. These crimes took place at the detriment of real victims, and they have cheated the system and deserve to be punished. There must be a zero tolerance policy for these scam artists and it must be stopped.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we hear of the other abuses in the system where FEMA has spent millions of dollars for 10,000 brand-new, fully furnished trailers, but they are not being used for any victims of this disaster. They are being stored in Hope, Arkansas, because FEMA regulations prevent those trailers from being in flood plains. Of course, it is the flood plains that were affected by these hurricanes. And according to a Fox News report, the cost of these trailers is $367 million.

And now we learn that these 10,000 trailers sitting in Arkansas, because of the weather, are starting to sink in the mud. This is ridiculous, how FEMA has abused the system by not being prepared for this disaster.

Mr. Speaker, it has been over 6 months since Hurricane Katrina, 4 months since Hurricane Rita. There are still people that are suffering. We have got to take control of this situation. We have to remove the incompetence, and people who have committed crimes must be punished and sent to jail. There need to be no excuses because of inefficient red tape or lawlessness. These people need to be held accountable, both those in the Federal Government and others.

Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

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

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

□ 1545

CALLING FOR INVESTIGATION INTO THE DUBAI DEAL TO MANAGE U.S. PORTS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the Special Order time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, my Special Order this evening concerns the proposed acquisition of Dubai Ports World of the leasing contracts for several major U.S. ports on the east coast. And in relation to that, I have sent letters to the Treasury Inspector General and to the committee of jurisdiction here in the House, the Government Reform Committee, asking both those entities to review any conflict of interest regarding the participation of the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow, who chairs the Committee on Foreign Investment, the group which approved the recent contract with Dubai Ports World. I will place these two letters of request in the RECORD.

The letters ask the committee and the Inspector General to determine whether appropriate processes were followed, conflicts of interests explored, and whether or not American companies were solicited during that process. The Treasury agreement itself raises serious ethical questions regarding those directly responsible for this decision. In particular, given that Dubai Ports World acquired CSX World Terminals in 2004 for $1.15 billion, a company of which Secretary of the Treasury John Snow was chair prior to coming to the administration, and this should raise serious questions both about the acquisition of the CSX port operations and the recent awarding of this contract.

As chair of the U.S. Treasury Committee on Foreign Investment, Secretary Snow and the Treasury Department had the lead authority in approving the Dubai transaction. Secretary Snow holds a deferred compensation package and a special retirement pension from his days as CEO of CSX Corporation. In 2004 CSX World Terminals was acquired by Dubai Ports World, the successful bidder on this contract. But given that Secretary Snow had previously disclosed a deferred compensation package with CSX valued at between $5 million and $25 million and $33.2 million from a special retirement pension, one would expect that any financial benefit from the sale of CSX World Terminals to Dubai Ports World, including any stock holdings, would have been revealed, especially if there might be any residual from subsequent actions such as these.

The President's assertion that he had polled his Cabinet Secretaries on the Dubai deal causes concern for me that at least one, Secretary Snow, should have removed himself from the decision, given his business connections to CSX and Dubai.

On 9/11, two members of the hijack team that simultaneously downed the Twin Towers in New York City and killed hundreds of Americans at the Pentagon were from the United Arab Emirates. And as the 9/11 Commission reported, those same terrorists laundered much of the money for their operation through the United Arab Emirates-controlled banks.

We should ask instead of developing our own companies to manage our own U.S. operations, why should we settle for the revolving door that has skilled people move from one company to another, creating a pea-in-the-shell game that leaves the public wondering who is in charge and does anyone care? And, importantly, is America for sale at any price?

Secretary of the Treasury John Snow was CEO of CSX just about a year before CSX sold some of its international operations to Dubai Ports World. Was this billion-dollar deal done totally after he left, or was it already in the works while he served as CEO of that company? Why is it that no one at Treasury said that Secretary Snow recused himself from this transaction until they were called about it? Secretary Snow himself claimed not to have known about the deal. How can someone not know about a deal from which they should recuse themselves?

The White House has appointed David Sanborn as the new administrator of the Maritime Administration. He worked as Dubai Ports World director of operations in Europe and Latin America until he was appointed to the post in January, the same month the Treasury Department's Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States approved the Dubai Ports World takeover. David Sanborn also previously worked for the CSX Corporation. The revolving door brings him back to a high government position. Some Senators have vowed to block Sanborn's nomination unless he testifies before the Commerce Committee.

CNN has reported that the United Arab Emirates is a major investor in the Carlyle Group, the private equity investment firm where President Bush's father once served as senior adviser and is a who's who of former

high-level government officials. Just last year, Dubai International Capital, a government-backed buyout firm, invested $8 billion in the Carlyle fund.

Another Bush family connection, the President's brother Neil Bush, has reportedly received funding for his educational software company from the United Arab Emirates investors.

And why did George Bush, Sr. accept a $1 million donation to his library in Texas from the United Arab Emirates?

The material previously referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 23, 2006.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Government Reform, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVIS AND RANKING MEMBER WAXMAN: The recent announcement of a contract being awarded by the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to Dubai Ports World following its purchase of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. is a matter of paramount concern that should be investigated in the national interest.

It raises concerns of national security as the operator will be a foreign interest, most particularly an undemocratic nation from the Middle East that cannot assure infiltrators will not breach security. We know less than 2% of container cargo is inspected today despite Congressional efforts to upgrade the current system. Iran's growing ties with China which ships the majority of its cargo through the Dubai/CSX hub terminal in Singapore complicates the situation.

In addition, the Treasury agreement raises serious ethical questions regarding those directly responsible for this decision. In particular, given that Dubai Ports World acquired CSX World Terminals in 2004 for $1.15 billion, a company of which Secretary of the Treasury John Snow was Chairman prior to coming to the Administration should raise questions about both the acquisition of the CSX port operations and the recent awarding of the contract. Secretary Snow now chairs the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States, the very group which approved this contract with Dubai Ports World.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Government Reform Committee to conduct an investigation and a series of hearings to learn more about these matters to determine whether appropriate processes were followed, conflicts of interest explored, and whether or not American companies were solicited in this process.

This deal is not in our national interest most especially during a time of war. Foreign management of key U.S. assets endangers the public and our communities in an era where terrorists seek to infiltrate. I hope you will agree with me that a thorough investigation is warranted.

Sincerely,

MARCY KAPTUR,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 23, 2006.

Mr. HAROLD DAMELIN,
Inspector General, Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DAMELIN: The recent announcement of a contract being awarded by the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to Dubai Ports World following its purchase of London-based Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. is a matter of paramount concern that should be investigated in the national interest.

I respectfully request that your office conduct an investigation in to the deliberations by the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment with particular respect to the legislative requirements established by the Byrd Amendment that requires an investigation in cases where: (1) the acquirer is controlled by or acting on behalf of a foreign government (as is the case in this instance); and, (2) the acquisition "could result in control of a person engaged in interstate commerce in the U.S. that could affect the national security of the U.S." While the Committee's role may have been only to review this particular foreign applicant, I believe it is also important to know what specific action was taken to solicit an American contractor for the management of these several strategic ports, or if there had been consideration given to several different American contractors for each or several of these ports, and who was responsible for this solicitation. Certainly one could reasonably assume that this is an issue that should have been reviewed by the Committee in its evaluation of national security concerns.

Furthermore, it has been noted that the Secretary of the Treasury serves as Chairman of the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment. In this case, Secretary John Snow had previously served as the Chairman of CSX Corporation, which at the time of his service owned CSX World Terminals. Subsequently CSX World Terminals was acquired by Dubai Ports World, the successful bidder on this contract. Given that Sec. Snow had previously disclosed a deferred compensation package with CSX valued at between $5 and $25 million and $33.2 million from a special retirement pension, one would expect that any financial benefit from the sale of CSX World Terminals to Dubai Ports World, including any stock holdings, would have been revealed, especially if there might be any residual from subsequent actions such as these. I ask that you review this matter to determine if there may have been any conflict of interest in Secretary Snow having presided over the decision, and whether or not he should have recused himself from the proceeding.

I look forward to your response to this request.

Sincerely,

MARCY KAPTUR,
Member of Congress.

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

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

DEBT ADDICTION

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows our country is deeply in debt. Most Americans decry the rampant growth in government spending. Essentially, however, no one in Washington is concerned enough to do anything about it.

Debt is like an addiction: the political pain of withdrawal keeps politicians spending, so they do not offend any special interest groups demanding that government benefits continue. As with all addictions, long-term dependency on a dangerous substance can kill the patient. Dependency on bad policy also can destroy the goose that many believe lays the golden egg.

Our ever-increasing government expenditures, which perpetuate a runaway welfare/warfare state, simply are not sustainable. The fallacy comes from the belief that government can provide for our needs and manage a worldwide empire. In truth, government can provide benefits only by first taking resources from productive American citizens or borrowing against the future. Inevitably, government programs exceed the productive capacity of the people or their willingness to finance wasteful spending.

The authority to accumulate deficits provides a tremendous incentive to politicians to increase spending. Total spending is the real culprit. The more government taxes, borrows, or inflates, the less chance the people have to spend their resources wisely. The way government spends money also causes great harm. By their very nature, governments are inefficient and typically operate as we recently witnessed with FEMA in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas over the last 6 months. Governments are bureaucratic, inefficient, and invite fraud. This is just as true in foreign affairs as it is in domestic affairs. Throughout history, foreign military adventurism has been economically harmful for those nations bent on intervening abroad. Our Nation is no different.

Largesse at home and militarism abroad requires excessive spending and taxation, pushing deficits to a point where the whole system collapses. The biggest recent collapse was the fall of the Soviet Empire just 15 years ago. My contention is that we are not immune from a similar crisis. Today, our national debt is $8.257 trillion. Interestingly, the legal debt limit is $8.184 trillion.

This means we currently are $73 billion over the legal debt limit. Creative financing Washington-style allows this to happen, but soon Congress will be forced to increase the national debt limit by hundreds of billions of dollars. Congress will raise the limit, quietly if necessary; and the deficit spiral will continue for a while longer.

But this official debt figure barely touches the subject. Total obligations of the Federal Government, including Social Security and Medicare and prescription drugs, are now over $50 trillion, a sum younger generations will not be able to pay. This means the standard of living of a lot of Americans

who are retired will decline sharply in the near future.

Two vehicles are used to fund this wild spending. First, the Federal Reserve creates dollars out of thin air and purchases Treasury bills without limit, a very nice convenience.

Second, foreign entities, mostly central banks, own $1.5 trillion of our debt. They purchased over $200 billion in just the last 12 months, increasing their holdings by 15 percent. This is a consequence of our current account deficit and the outsourcing of more and more American manufacturing jobs. Few economists argue that this arrangement can continue much longer.

Excessive spending, a rapidly growing national debt, the Federal Reserve inflation machine, and foreign borrowing all put pressure on the dollar. Unless we treat our addiction to debt, it will play havoc with the dollar, undermine our economic well-being, and destroy our liberties. It is time for us to get our house in order.

EVALUATING HEALTH AND SAFETY REGULATIONS IN THE AMERICAN MINING INDUSTRY

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Education and the Workforce Committee had a subcommittee hearing dealing with the mine safety issues around the recent tragedies that happened in the Sago mine disaster in January of this year. Unfortunately, that hearing was arbitrarily gaveled to adjournment at a time before members could have exercised their rights to ask questions of the witnesses that were there from the Mine Safety Administration, the United Mine Workers, and the mine association of the companies.

Had we had the opportunity without the arbitrary adjournment of the hearing, we would have tried to ask the Mine Safety Administration how they have come to delay and weaken and scrap the 18 regulations that were put forth to protect the miners in the coal mining industry of this Nation and, in fact, regulations that may very well have been able to save the miners, the 12 miners who died in the Sago mine disaster. But we were not allowed to ask that question because of the adjournment by the chairman of the committee.

We would have asked them whether or not they have ignored the requirements of the law that no standard put in place be less protective than the existing standard, as they have continued to chisel away at the safety standards for the miners working in deep coal mines of this Nation, meeting our energy demands for this Nation, for the miners and their families, who every day make the decision to go into the mines in this hazardous occupation.

We would have also asked them whether or not, when they see the failure of the regulations to protect these miners, whether or not this shift of enforcement and the loss of enforcement personnel to a compliance assistance philosophy to work voluntarily with the mining companies, whether or not that led to this mine accident, especially when this particular mine, the Sago mine, had 208 violations in 2005.

It is clear that the owners were interested in maximizing their profits and not complying with safety laws, and it is clear that the penalty system that we have in place does not deter repeat violations, because the Sago mine had many repeat violations, serious violations of the safety rules dealing with combustible gases in the mine and the protection of these miners.

We would have also tried to ask them whether or not they felt that Congress had exercised its oversight authority, since this was the first oversight hearing on mine safety in 5 years.

We would have also asked them to stop shutting out the public in the decision-making process. We would have asked the administration to open up all of its records, including the inspector's notes, to public scrutiny around the Sago mine disaster so that we can be able to do the work to determine whether or not we could have prevented this disaster that took these lives.

We also would have made sure that they would have put in place commonsense rules dealing with the ability to communicate with the miners who were in the mine. We now think we are learning that it might have been possible for those miners to walk out of the mine had they known where they were and had we been able to communicate with them. And while communications devices are available, they are used in some American mines, they are used in some Canadian mines, they are used in Australian mines, they are not very well used, if at all, in the U.S. coal mining industry; and yet the government has done nothing to try to push this technology so we could have had communications with these miners.

□ 1600

Also the idea of locators, so that we would have been able to send a message to these miners about what their situation was and what they might have done to prolong their lives, because we now know they were down in that mine for a very long time waiting to be rescued, but that did not happen.

As we heard from Amber Helms, the 23-year-old daughter of Terry Helms, who died in the explosion, he died in the explosion, she asked us why if she can set up a Web page in her computer, if we can communicate to the solar system, if we can communicate around the world, why couldn't we have communicated to her father and those other men down in that mine that lost their lives?

Why wasn't this put in place when the cost of the items to protect their lives ranged from apparently $20 to $200? It means nothing in terms of the profits of these mines, the revenues they generate and the overriding concern for the safety of their miners.

But, no, we didn't have a chance to ask these questions, because after one round of questioning, the chairman decided that enough was enough, that we were not going to have the opportunity to ask the Mine Safety Administration, Where have you been for 5 years on the issue of rescue chambers in mines and the protection of these miners, and when are their families going to get these answers?

Well, they didn't get them today, and apparently they are not going to get them from the Congress for a very long time.

This Congress has been blind to the need to maintain even the protections that already exist under the law. It was not long ago that some members of our committee, including its former chairman, were actively seeking legislation to abolish MSHA and NIOSH and to cut back critical enforcement provisions.

Under that legislation, 3 out of the 4 mandatory annual inspections at every underground mine would have been eliminated. Inspectors would have needed a warrant before entering mine property. Only miners in unionized mines would have had the right to accompany inspectors as they examined the mine. The circumstances in which an inspector could shut down an unsafe section of a mine would have been restricted. Mine operators would not have had to pay fines for typical citations as long as the hazards were abated. And on and on.

That legislation was defeated. But that apparently hasn't deterred Administration officials from trying to gut MSHA anyway. Now they're just dismantling it and taking it out the back door, where they think no one is watching. Well, we are watching, and legislation must be enacted to ensure that changes are made, changes that make the safety and health of these mine workers a priority, and that prevent the industry from being allowed to get away with further abuses.

I want to commend my colleagues, Congressman RAHALL of West Virginia, and the West Virginia delegation, for their prompt hearings and action on these issues. on February 1st, they introduced H.R. 4695, the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 2006, which enhances and reinforces the original purpose of the landmark Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, as amended by the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977. This legislation is a vital step in this process, and an effort that I am hoping will be a catalyst for change.

Amber's testimony, and the powerful and courageous testimony provided by all

The witnesses at the forum is documented on DVD. I strongly urge all members of this subcommittee to watch the footage of the forum, and the incredibly important questions

posed by these witnesses, questions that have unfortunately, been asked before, but that have not been answered, not by the administration, and not by MSHA. As Amber said:

I understand that nothing that I say today or nothing that happens in the future is going to bring my Dad back. But my Uncle Johnny, my Uncle Mike, my cousin Rocky, as well as every other miner that is underground and every other son who's getting ready to go into the coal mines—because that's where the jobs are in West Virginia and maybe some of these other states—we can prevent their families from going through this.

We owe it to Amber and every other American who has lost a loved one in a mining accident to learn what more we can do to make mines safer. And then, just as Amber says, we must take action to prevent more families from going through the hell that she has had to go through.

CELEBRATING THE INDEPENDENCE OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1839, the Republic of Texas declared its independence on the banks of the Brazos River, which eventually gave rise to the great Lone Star State. Tomorrow, in honor of this historic event in Texas and American history, we will celebrate Texas Independence Day.

I am proud to say that part of this great story of freedom, independence and democracy took place in the 10th Congressional District of Texas, the district I am proud to say I represent.

Texas Independence Day marks a time when today's Texans honor and celebrate the work and sacrifice of Texans many generations ago, people who heroically claimed their freedom from Mexico and sought out their own destiny governed by the laws of a true democracy, a constitution written by the people and the colors of their country's flag waving over what would become the free and independent Republic of Texas.

Between 1820 and 1836, the Mexican Government offered Americans the opportunity to live and work in Texas under Mexican rule, but they grew disheartened by the tyranny and depression. In the Steven F. Austin Colony, which was the first colony, Texans first established a provisional government in 1835 with the intention of writing a declaration of independence soon after. However, the Mexican army was intent on destroying any move toward Texas independence, and the Consultation of 1835, as it was known, adjourned without the organization needed to continue the cause for freedom.

Less than a year later, many of the same delegates present at the Consultation of 1835 arrived along the banks of the Brazos River in the town of Washington, just north of the Austin Colony, which is now Austin County.

By the spring of 1836, the encroachments on Texans' basic freedoms had reached a flash point. On March 1, 1836, 59 delegates hailing from all corners of Texas arrived at the village of Washington along the Brazos River to decide the principles they would invoke in claiming their freedom from Mexico.

There, these brave men drafted the language that would declare their independence from Mexico, and they did so knowing full well that they may have to pay the ultimate price for freedom. As the delegates along the Brazos River wrote the Texas declaration of independence, patriots like Davy Crockett, Jim Bowie and William Travis fought and died for Texas freedom at the Alamo.

After successfully gaining independence from Mexico, Republic of Texas President Sam Houston in 1842 moved the Republic's capital to the birthplace of Texas, Washington on the Brazos River. Three years later, by an act of the United States Congress, Texas was made part of the American Union and became the 28th State of the United States of America.

There can be no argument about the Lone Star State's significant contributions to American history, and we must remember the actions and the sacrifices of those who made Texas independence a reality.

Washington on the Brazos represents an historic event that took place long ago, but tonight we remember Washington on the Brazos as the place where the proud Republic of Texas was born with the desire for freedom and an undying spirit of democracy.

Today, we see that same spirit and determination for freedom and democracy in our fighting men and women overseas and in the people and countries they have liberated. As with the first Texans, those people in distant lands know what it means to be liberated from tyranny and drink from the cup of freedom. They, too, will succeed and flourish in a free and democratic society.

PROVIDING MENTAL HEALTH FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times from this podium, over 130 times actually, about the moral imperative of bringing our troops home from Iraq. With sectarian strife reaching a bloody, violent high in Iraq last week, it is clear that our military presence is doing more harm than good. But for many of our Iraq veterans, even an immediate end to the occupation would be too late to spare them a possible lifetime of physical and psychological damage.

Much is made, and with good reason, of the physical wounds suffered in combat, but even those who return home physically unharmed often face terrifying demons. Even the toughest, bravest and best trained soldiers are not immune to devastating trauma, the result of daily exposure to danger and unspeakable carnage. These demons must be addressed, and they must be addressed medically in order for many soldiers to return to normal, productive lives.

But the Washington Post reports today that not enough veterans are getting the mental health care they need. One-third of returning Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are seeking mental health services, and the great majority of those who are diagnosed with psychiatric problems are going untreated.

It is a budget problem and it is a diagnostic problem. Given the nature of the war in Iraq, we must adjust the official standards for what constitutes trauma and, thus, what qualifies veterans for subsidized treatment.

Because the combat danger in Iraq is anywhere and everywhere, many, many of our troops are exposed to conditions that lead to mental distress. As one psychiatrist at Walter Reed explained, ''There is no front line in Iraq, and everyone in a convoy is a target.'' Steve Robinson, head of the National Gulf War Research Center, told the Post that there are few sanctuaries in Iraq. ''Every place,'' he said, ''is a war zone.''

Meanwhile, it seems the Department of Veterans Affairs is poorly equipped to deal with this situation. Today's Washington Post article cites budget constraints and worries that the Department won't be able to handle the huge influx of returning soldiers in need of mental health treatment.

But who caused those budget constraints? Certainly it wasn't our troops in Iraq who foolishly promised that we could fight a quarter-of-a-trillion-dollar war and dole out billions of dollars of tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. It wasn't our troops who twisted arms to pass this Medicare Part D boondoggle, which is subsidizing the drug companies and the insurance interests while leaving seniors to wrestle with a bewildering bureaucracy.

Is there any reason why we couldn't have anticipated an enormous demand for Iraq-related mental health services? Of course there wasn't. Couldn't we have included enough money into the war supplemental bills this body has passed? Couldn't we have sacrificed other budgetary handouts and goodies, the ones that benefit people who haven't offered a fraction of the sacrifice for their country that our Iraq veterans have?

I guess if you assumed that our troops would be greeted in Iraq as liberators and if you assumed that we would be in and out of Iraq in a flash, you never got the got to the point where you worried about the mental health of returning veterans.

Once again we see the disastrous, tragic consequences of failed planning and poor execution of this war.

We must do everything we can to help our Iraq veterans cope with their traumas. It is the least our government can do after sending them to war on false pretenses, with insufficient equipment and without an exit strategy.

But as an even more urgent matter, we can ensure that no more soldiers suffer from terrifying nightmares and setbacks and flashbacks by ending this occupation and bringing them home at once.

I have actually presented my four-point plan for a radical shift in our Iraq policy to the President of the United States. This policy includes four major areas:

One, greater multilateral cooperation with our allies in enlisting their help in establishing an interim security force in Iraq;

Two, a diplomatic offensive that recasts our role in Iraq as construction partner, rather than military occupier; this means no permanent bases in Iraq, no American claims on Iraqi oil;

Three, a robust post-conflict reconciliation process with a peace commission established to coordinate talks between the Iraqi factions; and

Four, and most importantly, withdrawal of the U.S. Armed Forces.

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

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

ENCOURAGING NEWS ON MEDICARE PART D

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the encouraging news that more than 25 million seniors are now enjoying prescription drug coverage under Medicare Part D. This includes over 1.5 million Americans who have enrolled in the last month alone.

Twenty-five million enrollees. That is 25 million seniors who are saving money every time they visit the pharmacy, 25 million seniors who have better access to drugs they need to prevent and manage their illnesses, 25 million seniors who can now afford protection from many catastrophic medical costs.

Like many of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am working incredibly hard to educate seniors about Medicare Part D. With any new program, parts of the enrollment process certainly can be confusing. After all, this is the largest enrollment effort since the introduction of Medicare 40 years ago. But by investing a little time, seniors can narrow down their choices and find the plan that best fits their prescription drug needs. And let me assure you, the benefits of this program are undoubtedly worth that effort.

I have been thanked by so many seniors who are now reaping the benefits of prescription drug coverage under Medicare, seniors who have seen their prescription drug costs drop by 50 percent or more, seniors who now have more money in their pockets at the end of the month.

In fact, I would like to share with my colleagues two of the many success stories I have heard from my constituents regarding their positive experiences. I hope these stories will encourage other seniors to explore the savings Medicare Part D holds for them.

Take the experience of Carol Burke. She lives in Newnan, Georgia, in my district, my wife's hometown. She recently wrote me, saying, ''I am disturbed by media commentators repeatedly referring to the Medicare drug plan as too difficult to understand and a total disaster. I never hear them say what I truly believe, that it is a wonderful benefit to those of us who have no retirement drug plan provided. A few hours spent with pencil and paper show that the choice to pay a slightly larger premium and have no deductible is clear. The suggestions given in the Medicare 2006 Guidebook are complete and easy to follow, and math is not my strong suit. Thank you for your efforts in providing this much-needed service to seniors.''

Now, my colleagues, that is a real letter, and I completely agree with Mrs. Burke's assessment. It may take a little time to choose the right plan. Seniors might need to rely on family, friends and community organizations to help with the process. But a little time spent enrolling today will pay huge dividends in the upcoming months and years, because affordable prescription drugs help seniors live healthier lives.

□ 1615

Let me share another story with you. I received a phone call from fellow Georgian Mr. Richard Mosrie who recently enrolled in the Medicare part D plan.

Mr. Mosrie explained that he is now saving over $150 a month on his medications, $150 a month. Seniors across America understand what a difference a couple hundred dollars a month can make. These are the stories that seniors need to hear. These are the stories that are happening in every congressional district in America regardless of whether the Congressman or -woman is a Republican or a Democrat.

I find it disappointing that there are people who attempt to use Medicare part D as a political ploy. How cruel to put partisanship over the health of our seniors by encouraging people not to enroll in this great program. That is, in essence, encouraging seniors not to save money and not to improve their health. So, Mr. Speaker, in the following months we will be hearing more and more positive stories from seniors who have enrolled in Medicare part D who are reaping financial and health rewards.

The initial sign-up period runs through May 15, 2006, so there is still time for seniors to enroll without a premium penalty.

As a physician, I know that access to the right medication is a bedrock of good health. Our seniors deserve affordable prescription drug coverage and Congress has passed good legislation to deliver this benefit.

Now is the time for seniors to enroll, and I sincerely hope all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will stand with me in commitment to helping our seniors access the medication they need to stay well.

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

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

THE CENTER CANNOT HOLD

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful that we can even accurately count the number of Iraqis who have died today in their country. The President vows he will stay the course. We have heard this before over and over again, as if saying it repeatedly would alter the reality.

For months the American people have spoken with an ever louder voice urging the President to redeploy U.S. soldiers to get them out of harm's way. For months, many Members of Congress, especially Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania, have urged the President to redeploy the U.S. soldiers to get them out of harm's way.

Now even U.S. soldiers overwhelming say that the U.S. should be out of Iraq this year. In military terms, that is enough time to quickly plan and safely reallocate U.S. soldiers. In other words, the men and women of the United States Armed Forces, those in the battlefield, are saying what this administration refuses to act on.

The ground the President is standing on has shrunk to the size of a postage stamp. His approval ratings have fallen so low they are below sea level. Today, not only is Iraq in the throes of relentless civil violence, even members of the administration are telling Congress that there is danger the violence in Iraq could spill outside the borders and inflame the entire Middle East.

Yet despite the warnings, despite the reality, despite the Iraqi leaders urging

the U.S. to stop interfering with efforts to form a new government, the President is going to stay the course.

The same rhetoric spoken after every wave of violence has really worn threadbare. It is time to set a course, and we have done that. It is time to lead the U.S. out of harm's way because that is what leaders do.

Another U.S. soldier died today in Iraq. The total number of U.S. men and women serving this country in Iraq who have died has climbed to 2,292. They have paid the ultimate sacrifice for Bush's folly. In my judgment, the price they paid was too high. These soldiers are heroes. That much we know. And that is of comfort to their families and this proud and grateful Nation.

But we owe these heroes more than comfort for their families. Many of these soldiers died saving other soldiers. We have to ask ourselves whether we are failing as a Nation because we know Iraq is not working, and yet we leave the soldiers in harm's way.

We have to ask ourselves whether we are failing as a Nation because we allow our government to act contrary to the wishes of the people. This is supposed to be a democracy. This is not about a war time when only the Commander in Chief can know everything there is to know, and we must place our trust in him or her. This is not the Invasion of Normandy.

The war in Iraq is nothing like that. We know what the President knows about the situation. There are no secret intelligence reports laying out the real Iraq story. We know it. We see it on television. We read about it in the newspapers, and we discuss it online. We are truly all in this war. Everyone, except the man who lives at 1600 Pennsylvania. There is not a shred of evidence or paperwork that he has that says repeating the line, ''stay the course,'' is going to benefit the U.S. or the Iraqi people.

Why then are we doing it? It is time for the American people to demand that the President account for his actions and the lack of actions on the Iraq war. Iraq is reeling from its worst fear, the launch of a civil war.

U.S. soldiers are bunkered in their defensive positions. But why are they there at all? Many Iraqi leaders are beginning to blame the U.S. occupation for unleashing the evil, as they call it.

Every day that goes by, the reputation and credibility of our Nation bleeds a little more. That is nothing in comparison to the lost lives and shattered lives of thousands of U.S. soldiers and their loved ones. William Butler Yeats, the Noble Prize laureate who was a Senator in Ireland, said in a poem called ''The Center Cannot Hold,'' it is the Second Coming. Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, the best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate neat intensity.

When will we learn? When will this government listen to the people? The soldiers in battle and the people at home, they know what Iraq is and is not. But two people, or maybe only one, in the White House have yet to learn it. But until they do, Iraq will be a price for which we witness relentless chaos that can be turned loose upon the whole world. We cannot stay the course when there is no course. The best thing is to come home.

Mr. President, give us a plan.

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

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

DUBAI PORTS WORLD DEAL RISKS NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in Minnesota and I are overwhelmingly opposed to the administration handing over day-to-day management of six U.S. ports to a company owned and operated by the United Arab Emirates.

Mr. Speaker, this port management deal poses a very real risk to national security, as many experts have pointed out. As the former Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, Clark Ervin, said last week, ''It is true that our Coast Guard would remain in charge of port security. But that means merely setting standards that ports are to follow and reviewing their security plans. Meeting those standards every day is the job of port operators. They are responsible for hiring security officers, guarding the cargo and overseeing its unloading.''

As another security expert put it, you cannot separate port security from port management. Our ports are on the front lines of our homeland defense, and terminal operators play a key role. It is undisputed that under the contract to manage the six U.S. ports, Dubai Ports World would handle shipping arrivals, departures, unloading at the docks, and many other security-related functions.

The UAE-owned company would be responsible for keeping cargo containers secure from the time they are unloaded from foreign ships until the containers are taken away on trucks. In addition, terminal operators work with port security plans that contain sensitive security information.

They are responsible for securing the perimeter of the terminals and they conduct security training for dock workers.

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental question is this: Do we really want a company owned by a foreign government that has been a home base for terrorists, do we really want that company in charge of these functions? I think not.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we also know the United States Coast Guard conducted an intelligence assessment of Dubai Ports World and its owners in the United Arab Emirates. As a result of that December 13, 2005 intelligence assessment, the Coast Guard warned: ''There are many intelligence gaps concerning the potential for DPW assets to support terrorist operations that preclude the completion of a thorough threat assessment of the merger.''

The intelligence assessment also stated: ''The breadth of the intelligence gaps also infer potential unknown threats against the large number of potential vulnerabilities.''

Mr. Speaker, this Coast Guard assessment raises serious questions on the overall security environment at DP World facilities, the background of some personnel and foreign influence on company operations.

As a cosponsor, Mr. Speaker, of H.R. 4807, authored by Chairman Peter King of our Homeland Security Committee, I strongly support this critical legislation that would allow Congress to block the ports deal following the current 45-day investigation.

Mr. Speaker, the security of our homeland must be our highest priority. That is why we need to pass this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PROBLEMS WITH THE DUBAI PORTS DEAL

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong concern about the Bush administration's agreement to allow a United Arab Emirates company, Dubai Ports World, to manage operations at several U.S. seaports, including the Port of Baltimore in my home State of Maryland.

Let me first emphasize that the Untied Arab Emirates is a valued ally in the war against terrorism, and I sincerely appreciate their contribution to the war effort.

Unfortunately, some pundits and supporters of this deal suggest that bipartisan criticism of the port deal stems from racism or xenophobia or even political-year grandstanding. I reject these arguments. These are the same pundits who were quick to say that Congress was lax in its oversight and failed to connect the dots after a terrorist attack.

The sole issue here is national security and connecting the dots before the facts. Let me be clear. I do not oppose foreign ownership or operation of U.S.

ports, per se. However, I do think that in any case of foreign ownership or operation of sensitive U.S. assets, we need to scrutinize these deals that could threaten our national security.

That should have happened in this case. In cases involving foreign ownership and national security, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States provides for a second-level 45-day security review.

Despite concerns expressed by the Department of Homeland Security and the Coast Guard, that did not occur. Only now, after this controversy has erupted, has the administration agreed to review the deal. Why are both Democrats and Republicans raising objections?

Here are the facts that give us pause: first, the United Arab Emirates honors an Arab boycott of Israel, thereby discriminating against a valued U.S. friend and ally. Second, al Qaeda used the bank system in the United Arab Emirates to execute the 9/11 and the 1998 African Embassy bombings.

Third, the United Arab Emirates was one of three countries that recognized Afghan's brutal Taliban regime.

Four, the 9/11 Commission reports indicated that Osama bin Laden regularly met with United Arab Emirates officials in the camps in Afghanistan. Reports suggest that bin Laden may have, in fact, been tipped off by friends in the United Arab Emirates.

Simply put, the United Arab Emirates' record on terrorism is in fact mixed at best, and serious questions need to be asked about whether this company should be allowed port management.

Let us talk about specific concerns. Last week Joseph King, a former Bush administration official at Customs, said in a Washington Post interview that people's national security fears about the deal are well grounded.

He goes on to point out that under the deal, this company would have carte blanche-like authority to obtain hundreds of visas to relocate managers and other employees to the United States. Using appeals for solidarity or even threats of violence, al Qaeda operatives could force low-level managers to provide these visas to al Qaeda sympathizers.

According to recent articles in a December 13, 2005, intelligence assessment of the company and its owners, the United Arab Emirates, by the Coast Guard warned: ''There are many intelligence gaps concerning the potential for Dubai Ports World or P&O assets to support terrorist operations that preclude'' the completion of a thorough threat assessment.

□ 1630

''The breadth of the intelligence gaps also infer potential unknown threats against a large number of potential vulnerabilities.'' That should give us pause.

Additionally, the Department of Homeland Security initially objected to this deal. What are these intelligence gaps? How big are they? Have they been resolved? All questions we cannot answer right now.

Let me say this. The administration's announcement of this deal is chillingly akin to the administration's prewar intelligence on weapons of mass destruction. There the administration selectively tailored intelligence to support the invasion that it desired from the very beginning. Here, the administration seems to be ignoring, deliberately ignoring, red flags and cherry-picking positive intelligence to support approval of a ports deal that it already wants.

Let me conclude. Thankfully, Congress has put the brakes on this deal. We will be taking a long, serious and hard look at this arrangement. Unfortunately, the Bush administration has already made up its mind to support the deal even before a serious review has begun, and that is not in the best interest of the United States.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN COMPANIES

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this Dubai ports deal will probably go through even though these types of contracts should be given to American-owned companies. But the deal will probably be approved with Congress passing some meaningless, feel-good limitations or restrictions and increasing funding for port security.

The deal will probably go through because, one, it involves $6.8 billion and it is almost unheard of to stop a deal involving big money like that.

Secondly, the President and the entire administration are pushing it as hard as they can.

Third, the columnists and commentators are all piling on using words like ''overreaction, racism and bigotry.'' Even though this is name-calling, rather than discussing the merits, most elected officials are going to do anything possible to avoid being called a racist or bigot or even that they are overreacting.

There are legitimate national security concerns here. The United Arab Emirates may be a strong ally now, but these things change. Our government considered Saddam Hussein as an ally all through the 1980s and supported him in a big way monetarily and in other ways.

While I am concerned about national security, my main concern about this deal is economic. We have far too many foreign companies operating our ports. These are some of the best and most lucrative contracts we have. They should be going to American-owned companies. If we give all these lucrative, big-money contracts to foreign-owned businesses, most of the profits and most of the top jobs will go to people from those countries. At some point we need to start putting our own businesses and shareholders and workers first. After all, the first obligation of the U.S. Congress should be to the American people.

It is also of some concern that this deal is not with a private company, but with an organization owned or controlled by the Government of the United Arab Emirates. Let me emphasize, I have nothing whatsoever against anyone from any foreign country. I am certainly not anti-Arab. I think it is sad that a British-owned company was running these port operations, and I am not anti-British. I think we should be friends with the Arabs and the British, and I believe we should have trade with all countries. But I would want foreign countries to be buying things from American companies and vice versa. And I would like to see American ports, which are some of the most important infrastructure assets we have, to be run and controlled but American companies and American citizens.

I do not believe the Chinese or the Japanese or many other countries would let us run their ports. And most of these contracts to operate businesses on these ports are not advertised widely at all. Most are sweetheart, insider-type deals. I believe there are many American business people who would jump at the chance to do this business if they just knew about these opportunities.

Let us start putting our own people first once again and stop giving all this port business to so many foreign companies or especially not to foreign governments.

SECURING OUR NATION'S PORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that in committee today we had the U.S. Coast Guard, and I want to commend them because after 9/11, they were the first agency within minutes to be on guard, guarding our bridges. And, in fact, after Katrina they were there and they did a yeoman's job. In fact, out of Homeland Security, FEMA, and the other agencies, it is the Coast Guard that really does a good job.

The administration's decision to allow the state-owned Dubai Ports to take over six major U.S. ports has bought the issue of port security to the forefront of national attention. Since September 11, in fact, I have been lobbying the Bush administration for additional security funds for our Nation's ports and other areas of our Nation's infrastructure, such as freight and passenger rail, our subway systems, buses, tunnels and bridges. They also need security.

To me, this funding is particularly needed in my State of Florida whose 14

major ports serve as a key gateway into the United States. Moreover, these ports play a crucial role in transportation of ammunition, supplies and military equipment to our men and women fighting all over the world.

The Bush administration has been telling the American public that they are checking, let us say, about 4 percent of the cargo that comes into the ports. But, in reality, they are only checking the manifests that list the inventory of the ships.

Now, I think the American people are smart enough to know that if you are reading a piece of paper provided by the shippers and what is passing for port security in this Nation, then we are all in a lot of trouble.

In addition, the administration's concentration of terrorist prevention funds in only the aviation industry has jeopardized the safety of other modes of transportation as well. For example, TSA is spending $4.4 billion alone on aviation security while only $36 million, let me repeat, $36 million is spent on all surface transportation security. And with respect to our Nation's ports, which serve as the main economic engine for many of the areas in which they are found, an attack would not only be extremely dangerous for the local citizens, but economically disastrous as well.

This is absolutely the wrong time for our government to make a decision that could give the impression of vulnerability in the security of our ports or our infrastructure system as a whole.

The increased attention on our Nation's security infrastructure has come to the surface on the heels of the possible Dubai sale. I hope that the mass resistance to the sale will at least bring a discussion of the importance of increasing funding for our Nation's infrastructure security in the near future.

In other words, security discussions should serve as a ''stand up'' for our Nation's security. I repeat, I hope this is a ''stand up'' for our Nation's security.

COUNTING VOTES CORRECTLY

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, today I want to share material prepared by former Ambassador William B. Jones to the nation of Haiti. He is currently the Johns Professor of Political Science at Hampden-Sydney College, which is located in the Fifth District of Virginia.

It is the opinion of Ambassador Jones and of myself that citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States should not be counted to determine congressional representation nor for the Electoral College.

The Framers of our Constitution would not have sanctioned illegality as a basis for determining congressional representation and certainly not in fixing the numbers of Presidential electors. The extensive debates on congressional representation were focused on slavery resulting in the three-fifths of a person rationale. It is ridiculous to assume that any of the Framers, given the tenor of their debate and their dedication to establishing a rule of law, would ever have considered allowing citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States to play a role in determining control in the Congress and the election of the President. To assume otherwise would construe the Constitution as protecting and sanctioning illegality.

It was not until the post-Civil War amendments that the issue of defining citizenship arose. The 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments were drafted to redress the inequities of slavery. They were never intended to give blanket sanctions to illegality. ''Persons,'' as used in those amendments, clearly were intended to mean persons who were legally in the country.

It would be ridiculous to assume that the Framers of those amendments, which were intended to safeguard the rights of former slaves or who had been in the country since its founding, intended in any way, shape or form to sanction illegality. The purpose was to enshrine a legal concept of equality, not to twist that concept to sustain, support, sanction or condone illegality.

Once it is determined that the Constitution cannot be used to sanction, authorize, protect or promote illegality, the issue is, what is the remedy to correct the wrongs that have been done to our system of determining congressional representation in fixing the numbers of the Electoral College?

As every citizen has the right to fair and equitable representation and to know that his or her vote is of the same weight as that of any other citizen, then any citizen who has lost representation as a result of the counting of citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States for the purposes of congressional and electoral representation has standing and can bring action to redress the grievance.

Also, and perhaps most important, States that have lost congressional seats and have had their electoral vote reduced as a result of the counting of citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States may have standing to bring action to redress their grievance. It is quite possible that a fair evaluation of the results of counting citizens of foreign states illegally in the United States would actually show that in States that have had their congressional and electoral power increased, there may have actually been an outflow of U.S. citizens and the entire increase in their political power is due to the influx of citizens of foreign countries illegally in this country.

Therefore, a constitutional amendment may not be necessary to redress the inequalities caused by citizens of the United States by counting of citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States for purposes of apportioning congressional and electoral college members.

The Framers of our Constitution, in their great wisdom, enshrined the rule of law into our highest compact. To ignore the rule of law and to allow its subversion to shift and determine political power is totally contrary to the intent of the Framers of the Constitution and of the Framers of the Civil War amendments.

The practicality of determining accurate numbers for congressional and electoral representation is not a deterrent. Modern technology provides many ways of assessing numbers. In fact, almost on a daily basis the number of persons who are citizens of foreign countries illegally in the United States is estimated. Demographics, residential patterns, linguistic realities make it relatively simple to accurately determine numbers and redress the inequities that have resulted in accepting and even supporting illegality.

The fact that those persons may pay some taxes is not relevant and nothing in the Constitution lists payment of taxes as a guarantor of the right to be counted for the purpose of fixing congressional and electoral representation.

The Constitution does insist that political power be equitably divided among the States and no State should have advantage based on illegality.

States have an obligation to protect and defend the rights of their citizens. Those states that have lost Congressional seats and Electoral College votes should bring appropriate legal action to ensure the equitable and constitutional distribution of political power. The United States Supreme Court should be ultimate determiner of the meaning and intent of the Constitution not the Census Bureau.

RECOGNIZING THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 64th anniversary of the Day of Remembrance, a day that commemorates the signing of Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Executive Order 9066 authorized exclusion and internment of all Japanese Americans living on the West Coast during World War II. Rather than focus on the plight of Japanese Americans in this country during World War II, I would like to place the internment experience into a broader historical context.

□ 1645

Our Nation has always battled the dual sentiments of openness and freedom, on the one hand, and fear and apprehension of perceived outsiders on the other.

Giving into fear and apprehension, in 1798 the Alien and Sedition Acts were enacted by the federalist-controlled Congress, allegedly in response to hostile actions of the French Government. In actuality, these laws were designed to destroy Thomas Jefferson's Republican Party, which had openly expressed its sympathies for the French revolutionaries.

Contrary to our notions of freedom, the Alien Act and the Alien Enemies Act gave the President the power to imprison or deport aliens suspected of activities posing a threat to the national government or the national security.

Undermining our belief in openness, the Sedition Act declared that any treasonable activity, including the publication of ''any false, scandalous and malicious writing,'' was a high misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment.

Later, almost predictably, when the economy in this country took a downturn in the 1880s, the Asian community became the target of politicians looking for someone to blame. In 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act to keep out all people of Chinese origin.

During World War II, Japanese Americans were the well-known target of the government's submission to fear, apprehension, and greed.

Also, during this time, which is not very well-known, 10,000 Italian Americans were forced to relocate, and 3,278 were incarcerated while nearly 11,000 German Americans were incarcerated.

German and Italian Americans were restricted during World War II by government measures that branded them enemy aliens and required identification cards, travel restrictions, seizure of personal property as well.

In the post-9/11 world, we need to protect our Nation and our civil liberties more than ever.

I am concerned that rather than learn from our past we are progressively weakening our civil liberties for tokens of security as evidenced by the PATRIOT Act, the NSA wiretapping, and our treatment of so-called ''enemy combatants'' in Guantanamo. These are just a few of today's troubling trends.

Mr. Speaker, we live again in a time of fear and apprehension. Our civil liberties have not been as threatened since World War II. As political leaders, it is our duty to uphold constitutional principles.

Let us remember what Benjamin Franklin said during his time of fear and apprehension. He said, Those who would give up a little bit of security, a little bit of liberties for a little bit of security deserve neither.

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

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

STRAIGHT TALK ON EDUCATION

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I had the honor and privilege of being selected as chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee on the Education and Workforce Committee, which has jurisdiction over higher education.

I am here to give the American people some straight talk about higher education. Some have said we might have cut financial aid for college students. The truth is we have expanded access to college for our neediest students through the record growth of the Pell grant program.

Pell grants are the foundation of Federal student aid. As someone who attended college with the help of Pell grants and as chairman of the Pell Grant Caucus, I know how important they are for our Nation's low-income students.

Since I was elected to Congress in 2000, Pell grant funding has increased by 74 percent, from $7.6 billion to $13.2 billion today. The maximum grant has gone from $3,300 in 2000 to $4,050 today, the highest level in the program's history. The number of students receiving Pell grants has increased from 3.9 million in 2000 to 5.5 million today. We have paid down the Pell grant shortfall and secured this great program for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the straight talk is that Pell grants are helping more students go to college than ever before. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle realize that a first-class education is a child's passport out of poverty.

As chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, I will fight to make sure that all children, rich or poor, have the opportunity to go to college and realize their American Dream.

I look forward very much to working with my Democratic and Republican colleagues in a bipartisan manner to make higher education better for all of our students in the future.

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

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

HONORING BUCK O'NEIL

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed this week that Buck O'Neil of Kansas City was not inducted into the Hall of Fame of baseball.

Buck O'Neil was in the Negro Baseball League as a player and a manager for more than 17 years. Buck taught the people of the Kansas City metropolitan region about the importance of determination and resolve, sometimes in the face of hostility. Buck taught us about baseball; but more importantly, Buck taught us about life.

He is a wonderful role model, and I thank him for his contributions to baseball, to the Kansas City metropolitan region, and to the United States of America.

Buck O'Neil, you are a great American and a gentle man. You will always be a charter member of the Kansas City Hall of Fame.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, this week Kansas City and our entire metropolitan area celebrated our hometown hero, Buck O'Neil, a Hall of Famer in our hearts. It is clear that the baseball Hall of Fame has made a terrible, shameful error in not inducting Buck on this ballot. As one of the Hall's own officials said, ''The Hall of Fame is not complete without Buck O'Neil.''

Buck is the reason 17 members of the Negro Leagues will be inducted this summer. Without his national visibility as an ambassador of the Negro Leagues, they would not have this honor. Without his efforts, very few would know the intimate details of segregated baseball in the United States during the 1930s, 1940s, and even into the 1950s.

Buck, the classy man that he is, will never complain about not being elected to the Hall. In fact, when told by reporters that he had not made it, he smiled and said, ''That's the way the cookie crumbles.'' And so, on behalf of a community in tears, and a 94-year-old baseball legend, I will stand and complain.

The omission of Buck O'Neil was wrongheaded and an insult to Buck, the Negro Leagues, and baseball fans everywhere. Buck O'Neil is a man who has done more than anyone to popularize and keep alive the history of the Negro Leagues. The fact that he was not voted into baseball's Hall of Fame is a wrong that only Major League Baseball can make right, and I hope they will make it right next year.

This humble man, who is careful not to slight, has, in fact, been slighted, apparently by a single vote, by a group who looked shortsightedly at his batting average, but not at what he has done for the game of baseball. There is one thing for sure: Buck's exploits on the baseball diamond were not steroid-aided. At a time when the game of baseball is in search of credibility,

there is a need for a living symbol of all that is good and wholesome about the sport. Who better than Buck O'Neil?

Think about the few people who would come to a baseball stadium and get excited about the opportunity to be near Buck O'Neil. If given an opportunity, Buck O'Neil could be one of the greatest ambassadors in the history of Major League Baseball.

It is rare that an entire community rallies around a single person; but our community loves Buck, what he stands for and his indomitable spirit. Once again, Buck O'Neil is teaching us that disappointments are to be cremated, not embalmed.

Buck's baseball career spans seven decades and has helped make him a foremost authority on baseball history and one of the game's greatest advocates.

I have never met a man who loves baseball and his community more than Buck O'Neil; but more than that, Buck loves life. And for that inspired love, Buck is adored by all those who know him and all who have heard him.

Literally hundreds of thousands of people have been touched by Buck's kind smile. He has traveled the country teaching children and adults about the Negro Leagues, baseball and life in general. Many of you may know his voice as the one in Ken Burns's documentary on baseball. We know him as the man you can find sitting behind home plate at Kansas City Royals baseball games talking to everyone who stops by to say hello.

As Kansas City's mayor, I was inspired by O'Neil to revitalize 18th and Vine, the historical center for black culture and life in Kansas City from the late 1800s to the 1960s. It was the hub of activity for African American homeowners, businesses, jazz and baseball enthusiasts. One block from the district stands the Paseo YMCA building, which was built as a black YMCA in 1914. It served as a temporary home for baseball players, railroad workers, and others making the transition to big-city life.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce a resolution calling for the commissioner of baseball to give a special recognition to Buck O'Neil at the All Star Game. I will nominate through a bill Buck O'Neil for the Congressional Gold Medal.

This week Kansas City and our entire community celebrates our hometown hero, Buck O'Neil—a Hall-of-Famer in our hearts. It is clear the Baseball Hall of Fame has made a terrible shameful error in not inducting Buck on this ballot. As one of the Hall's own officials said, "The Hall of Fame is not complete without Buck O'Neil."

Buck is the reason 17 members of the Negro League's will be inducted this summer. Without his national visibility as an ambassador of the Negro Leagues, they would not have this honor. Without his efforts, very few would know the intimate details of segregated baseball in the U.S. during the 1930's, 40's and even into the 1950's.

Buck, the classy man that he is, will never complain about not being elected to the Hall. In fact, when told he had not made it, he smiled and said, "that's the way the cookie crumbles." And so, on behalf of a community in tears, and a 94 year old baseball legend, I will stand and complain. The omission of Buck O'Neil was wrong-headed and an insult to Buck and baseball fans everywhere. Buck O'Neil is a man who has done more than anyone to popularize and keep alive the history of the Negro Leagues. The fact that he was not voted into Baseball's Hall of Fame is a wrong that only Major League baseball can make right. and I hope they make it right next year.

This humble man who is careful not to slight anyone has been slighted—apparently by a single vote—by a group who looked shortsightedly at his batting average, but not at what he has done for the game of baseball. There is one thing for sure, Buck's exploits on the field were not steroid aided. At a time when the game has become an American past-time in search of credibility, there is a need for a living symbol of all that is good and wholesome about the sport. Who better than Buck O'Neil?

Think about the fan appeal of Buck O'Neil, a bitterless black baseball legend visiting each major league ballpark during the upcoming season. He could attract African American youngsters back to the game, and in doing so, keep the game going for another generation.

It is rare that an entire community rallies around a single person, but our City loves Buck, what he stands for, and his indomitable spirit. Once again, Buck O'Neil is teaching us that disappointments are to be cremated, not embalmed.

Buck's baseball career spans seven decades and has helped make him a foremost authority on baseball history and one of the game's greatest advocates.

Buck Joined the Kansas City Monarchs in 1938. He left the team to serve in the U.S. Navy in World War II. When he returned from the Philippines in 1943, Buck played and managed with the Monarchs until 1955. As a manager, Buck guided the team to five pennants and two Negro World Series titles. As the major leagues' first African-American coach, Buck signed Ernie Banks and Lou Brock to their first minor-league contracts with the Cubs.

I have never met a man who loves baseball and his community more than Buck O'Neil. But, more than that, Buck loves life. And for that inspired love, Buck is adored by all those who know him and all who have heard of him. Literally hundreds of thousands of people have been touched by Buck's kind smile.

He has traveled the country teaching children and adults about the Negro Leagues, baseball, and life. Many of you probably know him as the voice and face of Ken Burn's documentary on baseball. We know him as the man you can find sitting behind home plate at Kansas City Royals games talking to everyone who sops by to say hello.

As Kansas City's mayor, I was inspired by O'Neil to revitalize 18th & Vine—the historical center for black culture and life in Kansas City from the late 1800s–1960s. It was the hub of activity for African-American homeowners, business, jazz, and baseball enthusiasts. One block from the district stands the Paseo YMCA building, which was built as a black YMCA in 1914. It served as a temporary home for baseball players, railroad workers, and others making the transition to big city life in the Midwest. It was there that the Negro National League was founded in 1920.

The 18th and Vine Historic District is now home to the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, where Buck O'Neil serves as Board Chairman. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 227, which would designate the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum as America's National Negro Leagues Baseball Museum. It is the least I can do for Buck and all those great players who played magnificently and in many cases incomparably on segregated fields where their peerless talents were hidden from the nation.

Buck, a long time member of the Bethel AME church in Kansas City, has never been bitter about what happened to him and all the other Negro Leagues players, about the exclusion they felt. He acted out the beliefs of his faith. He has preached a superb sermon with his life. The best sermons are lived and not preached. His reaction to the news that he had not made it into the Hall was a Sunday school lesson in humility and love.

Buck O'Neil represents some of our most noble values: determination, dignity, humility and excellence. He is a pioneer and a trailblazer throughout his life and illustrious career and demonstrates in his everyday actions that determination is the pathway to success.

Buck has said that all that matters to him is that he is in our Kansas City Hall of Fame, the Hall of Fame of those who know and care for him. On behalf of the millions of people who live around Kansas City I can say with absolute certainty—you are a Hall-of-Famer to us, Buck.

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

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

HISTORY OF THE INTERNMENT

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a day that many Americans, loyal Americans and true patriots of this country rise to remember as well during the month of February.

February 19 marks an important day of remembrance for many Americans who remember the ravages of World War II and many Americans who suffered from the ravages of World War II.

February 19, 1942, is the year in which Executive Order 9066 was signed, and this was the order that called for the exclusion and internment of all Japanese Americans living on the west coast during World War II.

I wish to join with my colleague Mr. MIKE HONDA, and other of my colleagues who will speak today, to recognize the hard work and struggle of so many Americans who for years have been loyal to this country, who finally

were rewarded for their loyalty with the recognition they deserve for having served this country and having always considered it their love.

This year happens to mark the 25th anniversary of the 1981 hearings by the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. This commission concluded in 1983 that the internment of Japanese Americans was a result of racism and wartime hysteria back in the 1940s.

Five years after publishing its findings, then-President Ronald Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 that provided an official apology and financial redress to most of the Japanese Americans who were subjected to wrongdoing and who were confined in U.S. internment camps during World War II.

Those loyal Americans were vindicated finally by the fact that we have never once found even a single case of sabotage or espionage involving a Japanese American during World War II. The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 was a culmination of half a century of struggle to bring justice to those whom it had been denied. I am proud that our Nation did the right thing.

But 18 years after the passage of the Civil Liberties Act, there still remains unfinished work to completely rectify and close this regrettable chapter in our Nation's history.

Between December 1941 and February 1948, approximately 2,300 men, women and children of Japanese ancestry became the victims of mass abduction and forced deportation from 13 Latin American countries to the U.S.

During World War II, the U.S. Government orchestrated and financed the deportation of Japanese Latin Americans to be used as hostages in exchange for Americans held by Japan. Over 800 individuals were included in two prisoner-of-war exchanges between the U.S. and Japan. The remaining Japanese Latin Americans were imprisoned in internment camps without the benefit of due process rights until after the end of the war.

□ 1700

Japanese Latin Americans were not only subjected to gross violations of civil rights in the U.S. by being forced into internment camps much like their Japanese American counterparts, but additionally, they were victims of human rights abuses merely because of their ethnic origin.

Today, I want to announce that I soon will be introducing legislation that will create a commission to study the relocation, internment, and deportation of Japanese Latin Americans. It is the right thing to do to affirm our commitment to democracy and the rule of law by exploring this unclosed chapter in our history.

Just 2 weeks ago, I had the privilege of joining with citizens in Los Angeles, in my home city, at the Japanese American National Museum to commemorate the Day of Remembrance. This day, first observed in 1978 in Seattle, has become very important in the Japanese American community. It is a time to reflect, to educate, and to act.

As we meet today to remember and reflect on the tragedy that innocent people experienced during World War II, it is my hope our government will continue to strive to right any wrongs and to prove once again that the strength of our national values and our eye towards redemption will continue to guide us. A necessary first step to achieving this altruistic goal is swift passage of the legislation which I will soon be introducing.

Mr. Speaker, today we should remember because many Americans have.

THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, 64 years ago, on February 19, 1942, tens of thousands of Japanese Americans were forcibly removed from their homes and communities in one of the great suspensions of liberty in our Nation's history. We recall the day President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 as a Day of Remembrance. This was the day the constitutional rights of Japanese Americans and legal residents along the West Coast were suspended and they were incarcerated during World War II.

Families and communities were uprooted from the life they had known. This memory is actually quite bittersweet for me and my family. My grandparents and parents were uprooted from their communities, their lives, their homes, their businesses, despite the fact that they were American citizens. My parents actually met and married at the Poston Internment Camp, my birthplace. In fact, my father says that that was probably the only good thing that came out of that camp.

Growing up, my parents protected me from the experience they went through of having the loyalty they held for this Nation being questioned. And as I was growing up, my parents made a concerted effort to teach me to believe in this country and love this country despite what it did to them.

I shared this sense of patriotism with my husband. Bob, who despite spending his toddler years in a camp, grew up to have a staunch and steadfast belief in our country and our Constitution, including the ideals of justice and equality firmly embedded in both.

Because of the implications of this incarceration, my grandparents, my parents like Bob's and so many others of this generation, did not speak of their experience in the internment camp. It wasn't until my father was much older that this time period was brought up.

But this is an experience that we cannot allow to fade. The government at all levels was blinded by war, and it is imperative that we learn the lesson this moment in history has taught us, including this Nation's ability to recognize and acknowledge our mistakes.

As we mark this tragic anniversary, I hope every American will take this day to affirm their commitment to our Constitution and the rights and protections it guarantees for all of us.

CELEBRATING COMMUNITY: A TRIBUTE TO BLACK FRATERNAL, SOCIAL AND CIVIC INSTITUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I just want to join my colleagues tonight, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) in reminding us of the terrible scar on our Nation's history: the internment of Japanese Americans. And I want to say to them that as an African American, as a person of color in our country, from California, that we join you in making sure that this body continues to remind the entire country that never again shall we allow such a gross violation of the human rights of any, any people in our country and throughout the world.

So thank you, Mr. HONDA and Ms. MATSUI, for once again allowing us to participate and reminding us of this great atrocity.

I want to also add tonight my voice to those of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in honoring an organization whose fight against the oppression and discrimination that all of us have felt in this country, whether we were directly victimized by it or not, it affected all of us, which gave birth to the modern-day civil rights movement, and that is the NAACP.

Today, this body unanimously passed H. Con. Res. 355, which was a bipartisan resolution honoring the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on their 97th anniversary. This is the largest and the oldest civil rights organization in our country.

Late last night, we concluded Black History Month by commemorating this month with activities led by the Congressional Black Caucus Chair, our great leader, Chairman MEL WATT, on the floor. But it was very late last night, and I hope people had an opportunity to listen to the few Members who were here to talk about the glorious history of African Americans in America.

Today, in keeping with the ideals of Black History Month and the tradition of our ancestors, we must recommit ourselves to a plan of action. For generations, the NAACP has provided the blueprint for organizing the African American community and other communities, communities of color,

throughout our country to build these coalitions for success.

In December, the House unanimously adopted my resolution recognizing the 140th anniversary of the 13th amendment. The abolition of slavery in 1865 should have been, should have been, a new day for African Americans. Yet 40 years later, African Americans continued to fight the repression and discrimination. It was this continued frustration and pain that led to the birth of the modern civil rights movement.

In Ontario, Canada, in 1905, a group of African American leaders developed an action plan and launched the Niagara Movement. Emerging from the Niagara Movement the call was issued and diverse progressives formed the National Negro Committee, which soon developed into the NAACP. For almost 100 years, since that historic meeting, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has been the cornerstone of the social justice movement of minority communities.

Mr. Speaker, last year, Mr. Hilary Shelton, the Director of the NAACP's Washington Bureau, delivered a Black History Month speech to the Federal Aviation Administration, the following excerpt of which outlines the development of the NAACP.

From 1905 through 1910, an organization of African American intellectuals led by W.E.B. Du Bois and calling for full political, civil, and social and civil rights for African Americans. This stance stood in clear contrast to the accommodation philosophy proposed by Booker T. Washington in the Atlanta Compromise of 1895, You see, the Niagara Movement was the forerunner of the NAACP. In the summer of 1905, 29 prominent African Americans, including Du Bois, met secretly at Niagara Falls, Ontario, and drew up a manifesto calling for full civil liberties, abolition of racial discrimination, and recognition of human brotherhood, a forerunner to the United Nations U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. Subsequent annual meetings were held in such symbolic locations as Harpers Ferry, W.Va., and Boston's Faneuil Hall.

Despite the establishment of 30 branches and the achievement of a few scattered civil-rights victories at the local level, the group suffered from organizational weakness and lack of funds as well as a permanent headquarters or staff, and it never was able to attract mass support. After the Springfield (ILL.) Race Riot of 1908, however, white liberals joined with the nucleus of Niagara ''militants'' and founded the NAACP the following year. The Niagara Movement disbanded in 1910, with the leadership of Du Bois forming the main continuity between the two organizations.

Dubois and the many other brave men and women of the Niagara Movement to the reigns of the challenges of there day to lead the Niagara movement and now the NAACP, we too must rise up to take on the challenges of our generation.

Founded on February 12, 1909, the NAACP's diverse founders, Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling, understood the importance of organizing and motivating people. Currently headed by Julian Bond and the President and CEO, Mr. Bruce Gordon, the NAACP exemplifies a movement that has transcended race, class, and generations in the fight for equal rights for African Americans and all disenfranchised people.

The focus of the NAACP has always been working to build coalitions for equality and opportunity in the United States. However, they never forget to advocate for Africans throughout the Diaspora. In Washington, D.C., the NAACP's Legislative Bureau mobilizes communities on issues from the fiscal year 2007 budget shortfalls, to equal opportunity, to the importance of an independent judiciary and racial profiling. Every session, the NAACP's D.C. Bureau outlines what issues and legislation will impact minority communities both here in the United States and abroad. Their vigilance is a constant reminder of how much work there is to do.

Recently, the NAACP's priorities have been rebuilding the gulf coast in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and addressing disparity in wealth, housing, and basic social services. That is the tragedy that unfolded, that we witnessed and which was exposed as a result of this tragedy of Katrina and Rita.

Also, the NAACP is very committed to reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act, the culmination of a movement that took blood, sweat, tears, and lives, and the sacrifices of those who came before us. This is set to expire next year.

They are committed to reforming our prison system, where our country has the largest prison population in the world. This is especially important since six in ten of those persons are people of color.

So let me just congratulate the NAACP on the 97th anniversary of this institution, and I urge everyone to use this occasion to recommit themselves to the struggle for freedom, justice, and peace.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2006.

Representative BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEE: On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), our Nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots civil rights organization, I am urging you, in the strongest terms possible, to reject provisions in President Bush's proposed budget for 2007 and instead pass a budget plan that supports and encourages low- and middle-income Americans. A Nation's budget reflects its priorities; our willingness ability to care for the sick and elderly, educate the young, protect our surroundings, respond to natural emergencies and protect those less fortunate. The budget proposal put forth by President Bush for fiscal year 2007 does not reflect the priorities of, nor does it serve the governmental needs, the majority of Americans. Rather, the President's proposal would benefit the wealthiest Americans while short-changing low- and middle-income Americans and saddling future generations with a debilitating deficit.

I urge you to demonstrate the necessary leadership skills and to work with your colleagues to develop a budget proposal that ensures that the basic needs of all our citizens are met. This means rejecting the cuts in federal funding for education, health care, job training, small business promotion, the protection of our basic civil rights and liberties and energy assistance. This also means rejecting the President's proposed tax cuts, which have been proven to mostly benefit only the wealthiest Americans and cripple our ability to address some of the most basic needs of our society while at the same time ballooning our deficit.

Although a majority of the Administration's proposed cuts or program eliminations are problematic for the NAACP, we are especially troubled by the provision in the budget to reduce funding for the crucial work of the EEOC. The President's budget for 2007 includes a cut in funding of the EEOC Budget from $333 million to $323 million, most of which would be taken from State and local operations. State and local enforcement agencies handle about 42 percent of the total Title VII caseload, yet, they are being asked to take 60 percent of the budget cut. Because enforcement of civil rights laws is a key element of the strategic goals and initiatives of the NAACP, we are especially troubled by these proposals.

Again, on behalf of the millions of NAACP members and friends of civil rights across this Nation I hope that you will work hard to see that the values of supporting our young, our ill and our elderly as well as those less fortunate are addressed in this year's budget. I look forward to working with you to ensure that the needs of all Americans are met. Thank you in advance for your attention to the concerns of the NAACP.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4167, NATIONAL FOOD UNIFORMITY ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–381) on the resolution (H. Res. 702) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to address the House once again. We would like to thank the Democratic leadership, Leader PELOSI, and also Mr. STENY HOYER, Democratic whip, Mr. JAMES CLYBURN, who is our chairman, and our vice chairman and also our steering committee that is working towards making sure that we head in the right direction as Americans.

Working in a bipartisan way, I think, is very, very important for the development of our country; and I had an opportunity to talk to our vice chair, Mr. LARSON, a little earlier today, and he was very excited about hopefully, maybe in this second stage of the 109th Congress, Mr. Speaker, we can work in a bipartisan way on behalf of the American people.

As you know, the 30-something Working Group comes to the floor every time we get an opportunity to come to the floor to talk about issues that are facing everyday Americans and projects that we should be working on in a bipartisan way. We also share not only with the Members but with the American people our efforts on this side, being in the minority here in this body, being a few numbers behind the Republican numbers here that are Members of this House, of how we would govern, how we would stand on behalf of the American people, how we would make sure that those individuals that punch in every day to go to work and know what it means to take a 15-minute break in the morning and one in the afternoon and a solid 30 minutes of lunch, if they get that; and to give voice to those seniors and those veterans that have served our country.

We said we would uphold the commitment to them of lifelong health care and making sure that we are there for them, because they have allowed us to salute one flag today, Mr. Speaker. Those individuals that are getting sand in their teeth right now, our men and women in uniform right now in Iraq and Afghanistan and other parts of the world, the Horn of Africa, as we start working this effort against terrorism, I think it is important we give voice to them; the families that are looking for how they are going to make ends meet on their health care needs.

On this side of the aisle we have many proposals that are stuck in committee, Mr. Speaker, and also proposals that will never see the light of day on this floor. Not because there is not a great effort on this side, not only in the area of ideas, but forward-leaning, hard facts of how we can provide health care for not only small businesses to offer to their employees, but also for individuals that would like to make sure their children can grow up healthy.

□ 1715

So I feel very good, Mr. Speaker, about the position of the Democratic Caucus within the House. The American people feel very good about it, and I think it is important that we allow the American people to see an opportunity for us to work in a bipartisan way.

Last time I was on the floor, Mr. Speaker, along with Mr. RYAN and Mr. DELAHUNT, we talked about the House Democrats innovation agenda. And in that agenda we talk about broadband access for all Americans, not just for some Americans. We talk about the fact that we need more scientists and math teachers in our classrooms, and that is going to be accomplished within a short period of time.

We also gave quotes from private sector company presidents and CEOs that are literally begging this Congress to move forward as it relates to our agenda and innovation. We talk about innovation. We are talking about preparing not only this generation, but the next generation to not compete against the next county, not compete against the next state, not even competing with one another as it relates to Americans, but to make sure that America stays ahead of or parallel to other countries and what they are doing.

There is a great deal of frustration out there, Mr. Speaker, of many Americans that are concerned about the fact that they cannot get a job. They try to train themselves. They try to educate themselves, but they cannot get a job because we are bringing individuals over from other countries to be able to fill those jobs because we have not stepped up to the plate to incentivize economically many of the citizens of the United States of America to be able to afford the education they need to rise to the occasion that many of these companies call for.

Competition is fierce, and the last thing that we should be doing, especially in this budget as we look at it and, Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk a little bit about the budget too today. But as we start looking at the decisions that are made here in Washington, D.C., it brings about a great deal of frustration on behalf of many of us here, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle.

I could say some of my colleagues on the Republican side, just a few of them, are very concerned with the direction that the Republican majority is taking us.

Now, we talk a lot about ''leadering up,'' making sure that we do what our constituents sent us up here to do. They did not send us up here to create a K Street project. They did not send us up here to be able to have the President's back as it relates to special port deals. They sent us up here to represent them. And I think it is important that they get their votes' worth.

And I think it is also important for the American people to pay very close attention, and I do mean very close attention, because if the 30-something Working Group has anything to do with it, Mr. Speaker, I mean we want to reveal all of the secrets that may be held in the dark halls of Congress that may have a reverse effect on what the American people have asked for out of its government.

And I think it is important also that we give light to the democratic ideas, which should be bipartisan ideas, but we know that the majority party has not accepted a bipartisan spirit on many efforts that we are pushing for as it relates to health care, many efforts that we push for as it relates to the budget, the direction this country is going to go financially. Many of the issues as it relates to education and, in some instances, as it relates to foreign policy, as it relates to our troops, as it relates to those families that are here, also as it relates to veterans. So there are a number of issues that we should be coming together on that we are prepared to work on.

We have legislation on this side of the aisle to increase transparency as it relates to the legislative process and how we function ethically here within this House. But there is not a bipartisan spirit at this time to be able to genuinely move forward in a way that we can give the American people what they need.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I hold up almost, I would call, an executive copy of the Democratic side Innovation Plan. This is not a plan that, the ink is pretty dry on this plan. It has been around for 3, 4 months, and it has been in the works for a very long time now. It is not just Democratic ideas. They are American ideas to move us forward.

We ask and we challenge the Republican majority to do what we want to do. We wish that we could have this on the floor right now, and if we had anything to do with it as it relates to being in the majority of this House, we would perform just like we performed on the budget.

I would say that the Members can pick up a copy of this, if they want to get a copy of it, the American people too, at www.HouseDemocrats.gov. You can download it. It is on a PDF file. You can feel free to take a look at it, and we look forward to hearing from many of you as it relates to how we can work together.

The President talked about innovation, but we have to do more than talk about innovation; we have to do something with it. The President's budget does not speak towards innovation.

Have you ever heard the saying, Mr. Speaker, You put your money where your mouth is? Well, in this case we are not putting our money where our mouth is. We are putting rhetoric where our mouth is. The Republican majority is in charge. They are also going to go through a long budget process. They say trust me, trust me, trust me.

Well, I think as it relates to how we iron out the facts here, Mr. Speaker in

the remaining time that we have, and I must say, Mr. RYAN will be back here claiming another hour in between for us to have an opportunity to really be able to drive this issue home.

Trust us: When you start talking about special port deals, until it was revealed to the American people, it was going to be business as usual here in Washington, D.C. And I can tell you that being from a city that one of these ports were going to be handed over to a foreign nation that has a checkered past it is working on and trying to improve its accountability in the effort against terrorism, I think it is important for us to remind ourselves that the ports, our ports especially, here in the United States, have a lot to do with our economic outcome. And I think it is also important to even reflect on how easy it is to allow foreign governments and foreign companies to have free rein in our country.

And I think it is important and it is disturbing to me as an American, let alone a Member of Congress, to see time after time, example after example of special deals, back-room talks, things that individuals would not even come out under the lights here on the floor to talk about until they have to. And the American people have spoken. They are concerned.

But what I am disturbed about, Mr. Speaker, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. RYAN, I am concerned about the fact that the President is saying, Well, I have not changed my mind. I know there will be a 45-day review. The White House did release a statement saying that we agree that there should be a 45-day review.

Hello, Mr. Speaker. That is the law. And I think it is important for everyone to understand that making laws and carrying out what is on U.S. Code statutes, that it is important that we abide by it. I mean, oh, well, goodness, you mean to tell me we have to follow the law this time?

Mr. RYAN, I have been talking, maybe for the last 10 minutes about ''trust us.'' We can run this government, we know how to run this government; that is what the majority is saying. But time after time, again, not just quietly here within the halls of Congress, but it is revealed to the American people. I am concerned about what else is going on that we do not know about right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, that has really been the problem here. And I thank the gentleman, and I want to congratulate you, as your partner down here at the 30-somethings, for your recent election to the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation as their chairman; and I want to congratulate you, only in your second term to receive that distinguished honor. But I agree with you 100 percent.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If the gentleman would yield for a moment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I just also want to concur and extend my congratulations to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK). That is a high honor and one that the gentleman is very worthy of; and those of us who belong to the 30-something group want to express our pride. Great job. We expect big things.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thanks to you both for your kind remarks.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Wait a minute. He did not yield to you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, we are not going to focus on this right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He did not yield to you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I did not yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, let me just say this, because I do not want you to get too far off on that. I want to thank the board members of the foundation for seeing fit to allow me to do it. And we are going to continue to do the good things we have been doing.

We provide internship opportunities for African American kids to come to Capitol Hill, be exposed to something that, for generations, they were not exposed to. We provide fellowships to many of the folks in research, desperately needed research on health and a number of other issues. So there will be things that we will continue to do as we move on.

But thank you so much, gentlemen. I appreciate it. And I thank the board members and also the Members. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, you are our guy.

But back to the reason we are here, the issue of ''trust us.'' And all we have to do, really is look at the facts. And I really believe that the Republican majority, they may believe that they are actually doing the right thing. I do not think there is any malice. I do not think they hate people. I do not think they are bad people. Many of them on the other side are our friends.

What I do argue, Mr. Speaker, is that the Republican Party is void of any knowledge about how to execute government. And I believe they do not have the ideals necessary to advance this government and this country in the 21st century. They just do not have them. They are just stuck, I think, in an era that no longer exists. Their old phrases no longer apply to how society is today. And so all they have, quite frankly, Mr. MEEK, is to say, ''Trust us.''

But when we look at Katrina and the fact that there are 11,000 trailers sitting in Hope, Arkansas, worth $300 million that are now in the mud because they did not know how to deliver them or they did not know where they went, or they did not know where they should go, meanwhile people are still homeless down there. That means you do not know how to administer government.

When you start a $700 billion prescription drug program and you do not allow for any kind of negotiation down of the drug prices, that means you do not know how to execute government.

When you lose $9 billion in Iraq and you get a Three Stooges routine that, you got it, I mean you got it, I mean Curly got it, no one knows where $9 billion is, it is just example after example after example that this outfit does not know how to execute government.

And when you have spent, as the Republican majority has, the last 10 or 15 or quite frankly, since President Reagan, running down government, it does not work. Government is the problem. And then you actually need it, and the outfit who hates government doesn't know how to execute it in a way that is meaningful.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If my friend would yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That is, I think, such a valid point. There was a recent interview by Brian Williams of ABC News with the former head of FEMA. Do you remember Mike Brown, also known as ''Brownie'' to President Bush?

Well, during the course of that interview, for the first time, I would suggest, there was much new information revealed by Mr. Brown. Do you remember when there was confusion as to when the President was first informed about the potential destruction of Hurricane Katrina? And the President claimed that, Well, he saw it for the first time on TV? Well, Mr. Brown has a totally different version of that particular scenario.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Sure.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Maybe that version is different now since he is no longer on the payroll of the Department of Homeland Security. I do not know. Maybe.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I think we have to obviously factor into the account that he was kept as a consultant after he was fired from the payroll, and he is now no longer on the payroll of the American taxpayer. So maybe that is part of the basis for his new-found candor.

But he claims that he had a conference call with President Bush and a variety of officials, both at the Federal, the State and the local level where he articulated his grave concern that in his gut this was going to be one of the most devastating natural disasters ever to be experienced in our history. And clearly, his gut was right on that particular occasion.

Let me just, if I may, for several minutes, just read excerpts of that particular interview. This is Brian Williams. I want to ask you, Why didn't you shout it from the mountain tops? Or do you feel that you did?

I told everybody in that conference, and this is Mr. Brown's response, the President, Chertoff, the State, New Orleans, my gut tells me this is the big one. I want to push everything forward as far as we can. I want to jam up supply lines. I want to cut bureaucratic red tape. I want to do everything that we can.

So what date did the President first hear your voice?

The first time was probably on Saturday before landfall, August 27. But the alarm bells were being sounded on Sunday, prior to landfall, because not only was I having conferences with the President on the telephone, but he was also on the videoconference with all of the State emergency managers, all of the Federal departments and agencies, and listened in to the entire conversation, including the Director of the National Hurricane Centers' warnings.

□ 1730

And so when we see trailers in Hope, Arkansas, and you made that allusion, Mr. RYAN, that some of them may not be fit for families anymore because of the rot that the weather has caused, whom do we get angry at?

First of all, you can get mad at me, said Mr. Brown, if you want, but I think we ought to get mad at Congress, we ought to get mad at the President, we ought to get mad at Secretary Chertoff. ''I raised the flag, Mr. President, and I told you that FEMA was being marginalized.''

Mr. RYAN, this absolutely segues into your observation that they have brought government agencies down to the point where they are now ineffective. They are practically incapable of delivering basic services in times of emergency.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And I just want to say to the gentleman, one, how much I agree with you. And two is we are not saying that government is the only answer in many situations. It is not. In many situations it needs to get out of the way. Maybe it does need to be a bit smaller. But it has responsibilities, and certain responsibilities are not being met under this administration because of an utter and total disrespect for government in general, and this outfit comes with the same old ideas that are not applicable today, and this is the kind of execution of government that you get. You get 11,000 trailers in Hope, Arkansas, with nowhere to put them.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But you asked, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, about the reaction of the White House to issues that ought to be part of our public discourse. And the response is ''trust me.''

How can we trust the executive branch when we have a former director that stands up now and says, Mr. President, on at least a couple of occasions and on numerous occasions to your staff, I raised the flag and told you that FEMA was being marginalized and was not going to be able to respond and, in fact, was on a path to failure. I told you so, Mr. President.

Where was the executive branch? Where was this Republican majority in terms of exercising its responsibility to oversee and to hold accountable executive agency performance? It was not there because this Republican majority, in its management of this Congress, has done nothing more than simply to rubber-stamp the administration's proposals.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, I can guarantee you this: on some given Tuesday morning about a year and a couple of months ago, I guarantee you that every last one of our constituents, if we had a sign out saying that we will rubber-stamp bad ideas, we would not be in Congress. We just would not be here. And time after time the Republican majority does it.

I mean, let us just get a rubber stamp. Staff, can we get a rubber stamp? I want to get a rubber stamp and the ink should be red, and it should say: We have the President's back no matter what. No matter what. If it puts our country in debt to other countries, no matter what. If it comes down to a lack of intelligence and putting our men and women in harm's way, no matter what, we are with the President. The American people, we will tell them something when it comes down to election time through marketing commercials, but we are here to serve the President.

I mean, that is what I am hearing from the majority side. Imagine, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, before I yield to you, if there was a Democratic President in the White House right now? Imagine. For far less this Congress, Mr. President, moved to impeach the President of the United States, for far less.

So, Mr. DELAHUNT, I am so glad that you took us through memory lane about what people have said, especially when it comes down to Mr. Brownie, whom we do not necessarily hold high up as a person that we take a great deal of input from, Mr. Brownie; but I think it is important that we understand exactly and spell out to the Members and the American people what they have said, what they are doing. And our purpose for being here is to say that, listen, a lot of this would not be going on if the oversight were there.

Mr. DELAHUNT. If we did not have a rubber-stamp attitude towards this administration in this Congress, believe me, we would be delivering a service to the American people that all of us could embrace.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am a little out of practice with my word-inedgewise with you guys.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We have missed you.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is good to be back with my 30-something friends and to engage in this dialogue.

What we have been asking for months is, where is the outrage? Where was the outrage about issue after issue that has come to light since Hurricane Katrina wreaked the devastation that it did?

I mean, just by way of example, in the Davis committee report that was just issued, where were the top White House officials on the day Katrina struck? Now, we knew in advance of Katrina, and I live in south Florida, where the hurricane center is. We had days of watching Katrina approach the gulf coast. So it is not like we did not know a category five hurricane was approaching the gulf coast. On the day Katrina struck, President Bush, we know, was on vacation in Crawford, Texas. Vice President CHENEY, a little known fact, was fly fishing at his ranch in Wyoming. This was on the day Katrina struck. Chief of Staff Andrew Card was vacationing at his lakefront summer home in Maine, and Homeland Security adviser Francis Townsend was also vacationing in Maine.

Now, why would they leave a relatively junior official in charge of the situation room in the White House when you have a cat five hurricane bearing down on probably what they knew, they knew, was the most vulnerable region in the country when it came to hurricane preparedness and what they knew would likely be the aftermath?

Why did President Bush and other top administration officials insist that the levees did not break until Tuesday when now we know, with the Davis report and with Mr. Brown's revelation, that he told them the day Katrina struck, the night that Katrina struck?

Mr. DELAHUNT. The day before, Debbie.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They knew.

Mr. DELAHUNT. In his own words.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I know what the House rules are, and I know what they constrain us from doing, but they knew. And that is what Michael Brown testified. They knew. He told them. And now he is free from the constraints from working for the administration, and let us acknowledge that the four of us have been fairly critical of Mr. Brown. We meted out our own share of criticism of his performance. But now that he has been freed of his ties to the administration, and we all acknowledge that when you work for an administration, unfortunately, sadly, with this administration in particular, loyalty to your dying day is supposed to be the most valuable, particularly if they are continuing to sign your paycheck.

He made it clear when they were no longer signing his paycheck, 60 days after he was supposedly no longer with the Department, that he issued warning after warning to Secretary Chertoff, to the President. He indicated that he personally spoke with the President and told him that there was a levee break, that there was significant damage and he sounded the alarm bells. And the President was on vacation in Crawford, Texas. The Vice President was fly fishing in Wyoming. Homeland Security adviser Francis Townsend was in Maine, and his chief of staff was at home in Maine.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And they want us to trust them.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Trust them. They have got our back.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And a lot of what they were trying to say, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, was how were we to know. We found out they did know.

They were warned. And then not only were they warned, but they were spread out all over the country saying our responsibility is to execute this particular agency at this particular time and we should all be here. That is a level of incompetence that I think is unsurpassed.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Indifference, incompetence, corruption, cronyism, it is all a consistent pattern. One would think when they got hit hard in the face with the criticism and the visceral reaction of the American people in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and the response to their indifference that they would learn. But now, no. They were not just surprised, but astonished at the American people's reaction to their indifference on this port deal. I mean, you go from one thing to the other. The indifference and the callous disregard for what the American people's needs are in terms of security in a natural disaster or a potential man-made disaster. Their indifference and insensitivity is just astonishing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. How many times do we hear from our friends on the Republican side that government needs to run like a business, it needs to be flexible and this and that? This is an atrocity. This business would be bankrupt if you ran it the way we are running FEMA. If that was a business, it would be bankrupt. The war in Iraq, in that execution, the administration of that war, after we conquered Baghdad, that business would be bankrupt. It would go belly up.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And the execution of the Medicare prescription drug benefit, the so-called part D, what has occurred, let me suggest, is that the Republican Party in both this branch as well as in the White House, but particularly in the White House, has developed a habit, a habit of incompetence and a habit that could have been, in my judgment, interrupted and dealt with if we had aggressive oversight and accountability by Members of the House and Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No doubt.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But rather than doing that, when you speak to Democrats who are ranking members of full committees and subcommittees about conducting investigations, whether it be into energy, whether it be into the reconstruction of Iraq and the magnitude of corruption that is part and parcel of that reconstruction, the list goes on and on and on, and they say no. And that is why we are being embarrassed today. That is why someone like Michael Brown, the former head of FEMA, stands up and says, Mr. President, you have marginalized FEMA. We do not have the capacity to do it. I told you so. And yet not a word, not an agreement to work in a bipartisan fashion with Democrats to ensure that the mistakes that have been made are not replicated, are not continually being made to the detriment of the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And for our friends in the business community, it is like having a board of directors or having shareholders. If the people running the business are not doing the job, Mr. MEEK, then the board of directors may have to make a decision. Well, the United States Congress, Mr. MEEK, is the board of directors.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is our responsibility, to say if the executive branch is not executing their responsibilities the way they should, then we have to intervene and make some big-time decisions.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And, Mr. RYAN, those decisions would be made if we had NANCY PELOSI as Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, if we had the Democrat leadership team.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. But what do we have?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We have the Republican Congress, the Republican majority. We have the rubber stamp Republican Congress.

The staff is trying to find some red ink for me. They brought some black ink, but I need some red ink. We need to stamp this bigger. So I think we will get that by the end of the week.

□ 1745

But I think it is important, Mr. RYAN, that we point out to the American people and also to the majority that enough is enough. It is not their country, it is our country, it is all of our country. And the bottom line is we cannot sit idly by and let historians say some Members of Congress did not participate in trying to stop what is happening right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is a great point. We will get criticism levied at us from the majority, saying how dare the 30-Somethings go out there night after night, sometimes 2 hours a night, and all they are is critical.

Wait a minute. Are you asking us to just sit by and let all this happen, and no one is providing a little sunlight on this? I hate to tell them, but Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution creates this body, Mr. MEEK, this body, and the problem I think with the majority in the House and in the Senate, the Republican majority in the House and in the Senate, is they are too coachable. They are too coachable, because the President coaches them, and he basically says ''We need X, Y and Z,'' and it goes out and happens. They are too coachable.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They have the desire and the will to be coached by this administration into a fiscal nightmare, and that is what has happened, and that is what is happening throughout.

Mr. RYAN, would you please get that chart, because I think it is time for us to really get into the nitty-gritty, because folks do not understand, Mr. Speaker, they just think, Mr. DELAHUNT, that the 30-Somethings, we just kind of get together over a hot dog and a Diet Coke and say, Well, what are we going to say today? What are we going to share with Members today?

But, guess what, Mr. Speaker? We have third-party validators, and we have the facts here and we want to share that at this time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The execution of government includes a lot of different things, including how administrative agencies are run and Medicare and the prescription drug program are run. But the one issue that highlights the incompetence of the Republican majority and the Republican President is what we have been doing as far as our national debt and our annual deficits.

Now, this chart, and this is really one of the great charts, it is good, shows increases in the Federal debt in foreign borrowing. So way out here in the blue is the increase in the national debt from 2001 to 2005. Over $1 trillion, $1.18 trillion was the increase in the national debt just in the past 4 years. Of that debt, of that increase, $1.16 trillion was borrowed from foreign sources, Mr. DELAHUNT. Right here.

You want to know how much we borrowed from U.S. interests, from domestic borrowing? Right here. $0.02 trillion. I mean, we are mortgaging our future to foreign interests, the Japanese Government, the Chinese Government.

Mr. DELAHUNT. OPEC.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you. We are no longer controlling our own destiny.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Isn't it ironic, if the gentleman would yield, that we speak about energy independence, and I think that there is a consensus that clearly it is in our national security to develop an energy program that weans us from being dependent on foreign sources of energy, with a particular focus on OPEC.

Well, I wonder if we can wean ourselves from borrowing tens of billions, hundreds of billions of dollars, from foreign sources like OPEC, like the Chinese, like the Japanese.

We have now created here in the United States, and I will utilize President Bush's phrase, an ''ownership society.'' Well, the reality is that under his leadership, with the approval of this Congress, we have created an ownership society in the United States. Unfortunately, the owners are the Japanese, the Koreans, the Chinese and OPEC.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. OPEC.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. OPEC.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Because of the economic policies. So what do we gain? What do we gain from securing our independence in terms of energy and at the same time become increasingly reliant on other nations, including potential adversaries and competitors like China to provide subsidies for tax cuts?

To me, that makes no sense. We lose our political flexibility. We cede, I would suggest, some of our sovereignty when we allow ourselves to become borrowers from foreign nations.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. DELAHUNT, if you do not mind, I want to share another chart. This is the public debt held by China. One country, in 2000, they held $62 billion. In 2005, they hold $257 billion in public debt. This is when the President took office.

Now look at it. With the rubber stamp, Congress has just, time after time after time, continued to exacerbate this problem.

Now, look, in June of 2002, the Republicans increased the debt limit by $450 billion. That means they are okaying the Treasury to go out and borrow more money. In May of 2003, they increased it again by another $984 billion. In November of 2004, they did another $800 billion. Now we have got a pending increase that we know is going to happen because this runaway train isn't getting stopped any time soon, another $781 billion.

That is $3 trillion in debt that the Republican House and Senate and Republican White House went out and borrowed from foreign countries.

Now, who is patriotic now? You want to call this patriotism, mortgaging the future of the country to the Japanese and Chinese Governments and—

Mr. MEEK of Florida. OPEC.

Again, Mr. RYAN, it is just amazing. I want to put my Secretary of Treasury's picture up, Mr. John W. Snow. Like I say, he is an accountant type of figure within our government. We appreciate his service to our country, appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate.

You know, you have seen this letter before about where Secretary Snow wrote one of our respected Senators on the other side basically saying, ''I will be unable to continue to finance government operations if we don't raise the debt ceiling.'' It said, ''Currently the limit is $8.184 trillion, and we will breach that by February 2006.''

Well, the month of February has passed, and, guess what? We got another letter right here dated February 16, 2006, to the Honorable Ranking Member JOHN SPRATT on the Democratic side on the Budget Committee. This is what it says. I am going to read it slowly.

On December 29, Mr. RYAN, that is this letter right here, I want to make sure the Members see it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This was last year.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This was actually the 29th. Mr. Speaker, on the 29th of December, I was back in Miami with my family. We were finished polishing off what was left over from Christmas dinner, what have you, looking forward to New Year's. You all were doing the family thing.

But that letter was written saying we need to raise the debt ceiling, when no one was paying attention.

Now it comes down to, ''On December 29, I wrote the Congress regarding the need to increase the statutory debt limit. Because the debt limit has not risen, I must inform the Congress, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 8438(h)(2) that in my determination, by reason of the public debt limit, I will be unable to fully invest in the Government Security Investment Fund, called the G Fund, of the Federal Employees Retirement System in special interest-bearing Treasury securities beginning on February 16.''

Mr. RYAN and Mr. DELAHUNT, this letter was written on February 16. So that means that the Secretary, Mr. Snow, had to suspend. He waited until the last day. He didn't say in 2 weeks I am going to have to suspend payments to the G Fund, which is the retirement system for Federal employees. He waited until the day he could no longer wait any longer to write this letter. He is informing the Congress on that day.

The statute governing the G Fund explicitly authorized the Secretary of Treasury to suspend the investment to the G Fund to avoid breaching the statutory debt limit.

Now, let me just tell you, he goes on and on and on. But the bottom line is, gentlemen, that the Secretary now has to exercise his statutory authority to freeze payments to the G Fund.

I want to just say to the Federal employees, because some of them work here in this building, within this Congress, he goes on in the second paragraph saying, ''We can replenish it when you raise the debt ceiling.''

I want to tell you something, and I want to let the Secretary know on behalf of the Republican Congress, even though I am a Democrat, if we were in charge, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have to ink up this rubber stamp, and I am going to do it on behalf of the Republican majority and just go ahead and rubber-stamp it for him, because, guess what? That debt ceiling is going to be raised.

I guarantee you, just like before, in the past, every Democrat will vote against raising that debt ceiling, because it will be giving our country away to other countries financially. That seems to not be a value of the Republican majority.

I just want to point something out. I have already read this letter.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if my friend would yield for just 1 minute. What if one day those nations that are purchasing and buying our bonds, our Treasury notes, Treasury bills, for some reason they decided, maybe because of some political reason, they decided not to purchase in the financial markets American debt instruments? What would happen to our economy? Does anybody have that answer? I mean, I have my own theories, but I am not sure. Could they come over and foreclose? I wonder what they would do.

Now, here is Red China. Red China. It is kind of ironic when you think of Red China, and here we are piling up this red ink, Red China piling up red ink and it is all American red ink. And in 5 years, we have gone from owing the Chinese, Mr. Speaker, $84 billion, to over $200 billion.

I listen to the debates on the floor of this House, I listen to them in committee, and when I hear my Republican colleagues and my friends on the other side speak about China, it is always with trepidation, it is concern about Taiwan, it is looking at China as a potential threat. And yet here we are, knocking on the door of Mao Zedong's China saying, you know what? Would you buy this instrument from us? Give us your dollars.

I am telling you, I think we are putting not only our economy at risk, but we are putting our national security at risk. It is like having a Middle East gulf state operating American ports without doing due diligence. That is exactly what it is, Mr. Speaker. We are giving the country away.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, if I may reclaim my time, I am going to tell you right now, you are talking about giving the country away. We are at the point where half of our debt is going to be owned by foreign nations.

□ 1800

If I may, I just want to, if I can, like you said, bear with me for a minute. I want to make sure that all of you can bear with me for a minute. You have seen this chart before.

The President and this Republican Congress. Well, let me just go ahead and put the Republican Congress on here. We want to make sure that they get good credit for this, because the President could not do it by himself. $1.05 trillion has been borrowed by this administration within 4 years between 2001–2005.

Forty-two Presidents before President Bush and this Republican Congress were only able to borrow $1.01 trillion: 224 years. World War I, Mr. Speaker, Vietnam, Korea, Great Depression. You name it. Hurricanes. You name it. Earthquakes. You name it. $1.01 trillion, 224 years. $1.05 trillion and counting, if the Republican Congress is not stopped.

What does this mean, Mr. RYAN? Well, this is a map of our great country, the United States of America. We even thought enough to make sure that everyone is in there, Florida Keys and Hawaii and the great State of Alaska. What does it mean? Well, in that $1.16 trillion that Mr. RYAN talked about as it relates to the foreign investment, Korea owns a little bit of the American pie coming in at $56.5 billion of our debt.

Well, we can go on down. Germany. Everybody has a piece of this thing thanks to this Republican Congress and the President of the United States. Germany comes in at $65.7 billion. This bothers me putting these countries on this map, but I just want to make sure, because it is up to us to break this thing down so not only the Members know exactly what they are doing to the country, but not for the country, and they understand exactly what is going on here, because I do not want anyone to say on our watch that this

happened and we did not try to do something about it.

Now, the UK, quote unquote our friend and partner. They own a piece of the American pie at $223.2 billion, buying our debt. Meanwhile, the President says, follow me. The Republican Congress says, we know exactly what we are doing. Taiwan. Taiwan. People laugh, oh, Taiwan this, Taiwan what. But guess what? They own $71.3 billion of the American pie and our debt. That means that they own something.

The President says he wants an ownership society. Hello. It is going to other nations. Our neighbor, Canada. I am going to put them right here: $53.8 billion that they own of our debt. That means that we owe them; financially we owe them.

Just got finished talking about Red China, Communist China. A lot of our jobs are in China. A lot of Americans have to train Chinese workers to take over their jobs, and then they are fired and they are put on some sort of government assistance.

China comes in at a whopping $249.8 billion. A whopping $249.8 billion, using a lot of our money because they have a positive trade with us, and we have negative trade with them. But better yet, you let the Republican majority tell you, and the President tells you, oh, we know exactly what we are doing, do not worry, we got you.

OPEC nations. Mr. DELAHUNT, I want you to talk further about this, including Saudi Arabia, comes in at $67.8 billion of the American apple pie, the American apple pie.

And Japan, the island of Japan I must add, comes in big time, $682.8 billion. $682.8 billion. Mr. RYAN, it is not the Meek Report, the Delahunt Report or the Ryan Report. This is reality. And these numbers, Mr. Speaker, as you talk about third-party validators, are from the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

And I guarantee you, Mr. Snow does not report to us or anyone that has a Democrat behind their name. And anyone, I challenge them on the Republican side to march out here and start talking about how they are going to explain this, how they are going to explain selling America to other countries.

How they are going to explain with a straight face, come in here and say, we should make tax cuts permanent for billionaires, meanwhile we are borrowing from other nations to pay for it. How do you explain that, Mr. DELAHUNT? So when you start talking about special deals on ports and folks come out and say, well, I did not know anything about that. Wow, that is not anything new.

I did not know anything about the fact that there were not any weapons of mass destruction. I am tired of folks saying they do not know and we were wrong. I am tired of that. That is not the American way, Mr. DELAHUNT.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We did not know anything about Katrina being a devastating natural disaster. We did not know about FEMA not having the resources. We did not know about the lack of coordination. You know what? You know what? They know nothing. They do not know how to govern.

And that is what I would describe as a habit that has developed over time, a habit of incompetence.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. No doubt about it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, you know what OPEC means and what they owe? I just want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, in case someone may say, well, they pointed out the obvious. Some may say the negative, if you ask the Republican majority. Oh, they are so negative. Well, guess what? We believe in telling the American people the truth.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Find a positive way to explain that. Our friends on the other side who say we are always being negative. Figure out, if they can explain to us a positive way of saying that this country is being sold off to other countries piece by piece.

If they can find a positive way of explaining that, we are open to it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. There you go. I do not how to do it.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am just thinking here. You know how the political pundits divide this country up into blue States and red States. Well, you know, if you would bring back that previous poster, you know, you ought to paint those numbers there in red, because here is what is happening to the United States. It is becoming all red. It is becoming all red while we sit here and whistle in the dark.

Because we are indebting ourselves and our future to foreign nations and that map says it all, Mr. MEEK, says it all.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. DELAHUNT, let me just real quickly, because our hour is coming to an end. We, the Democrats, Mr. SPRATT who is our Democratic leader on the Budget Committee, 2006 budget resolution failed 165–264.

Republicans 0–28. The bottom line, no Republicans voted for it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. What is that?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What this is saying is basically that we want to balance the budget, we want to pay as we go, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Before you can spend any money, you have got to find a way to pay for it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Not this borrow money from foreign countries stuff. Again, in Spratt substitute amendment to Resolution 393, 2005 budget, again, voted down 224, not one Republican voted to pay as we go, Mr. Speaker.

Now what I am going to do, Mr. RYAN, when we come back in an hour, I am going to read off other examples, at least five others within the last couple of years. We have tried to put this country on the right track. But guess what? The Republican majority has blocked us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We heard from the President during the State of the Union address a bunch of fuzzy math, but we are going to balance the budget by 2009.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, they are saying that they are going to cut taxes. Only we have balanced the budget, the Democratic Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are going to cut the budget in half by 2009. That reminds me of the old Lou Rawls song, I will see you when I get there. Do you know what I mean?

This is just to put a bow on everything that we have been talking about. When we are paying the interest on all of this debt, you know, we are not borrowing the money from Sky Bank or Home Savings in downtown Warren, Ohio. We are borrowing it from these other countries, and we are paying them debt.

Look what we are doing just on the interest on the debt, Mr. MEEK, Mr. DELAHUNT. This is the net interest we pay in the 2007 budget, what we are going to have to pay, almost $250 billion just on the interest on all of that money that Mr. MEEK showed you where we are borrowing it from.

But also look what we are not spending it on because of it. Here is education. Here is homeland security. Here is veterans. All of these programs are taking a hit because our friends on the other side do not know how to balance the budget. They waste spending. They lose $9 billion in Iraq. They waste $300 billion on 11,000 trailers sitting in the mud in Hope, Arkansas, and meanwhile Pell grants are going up, veterans are asked to pay more, and we cannot take care of our own ports.

We will be back in an hour. But if you want to get a hold of us, Members who are watching this in our offices, www.housedemocrats.gov/30something

Mr. MEEK of Florida. With that, thank you, Mr. RYAN, Mr. DELAHUNT. We would like to thank the Democratic leader for the time.

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come before the House this evening with another edition of the Official Truth Squad to, as we have talked about, kind of set the record straight.

I want to thank the Republican leadership and the Republican Conference for allowing me and other Members of our conference to come and talk this evening.

The group that we have just heard, I was a little encouraged at the very beginning, because the tone was a little different, but then they just could not help themselves. They just could not help themselves. So we launched into

hyperbole, and we launched into disinformation, and we launched into misinformation, and we launched into distortion.

And frankly when I go home, when I talk to constituents at home, they say, what on Earth is going on up there in Congress? Why is it so partisan? And it is just tough to understand how people can be so doggone negative and think that it results in a positive outcome.

It is tough to understand how the politics of division are seen to be the way that we ought to go as a Nation. And it really is remarkable. We are, all of us, on the same team, Republicans, Democrats, Independents. We are all on the same team. We are all Americans.

We have got some incredible challenges that confront us as a Nation. And the politics of division, frankly, they do a disservice to us as a Nation. They are not helpful. I believe they are frankly shameful for the individuals that seem to believe that that is the way that we ought to conduct ourselves in public discourse. It just does not make any sense, Mr. Speaker. It does not make any sense.

It is not new, though. It has been going on in American politics, frankly, for a long time. Some would say that some folks on the other side of the aisle now have elevated it to a grand tradition and to a new height of excellence. But I want to read something that President Abraham Lincoln said that talked about the politics of division and how destructive it is.

□ 1815

He talked about his philosophy of government and social philosophy. ''You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot encourage the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.''

It kind of crystallizes American philosophy, we are all in this together. Mr. Lincoln was a master at putting words and thoughts together and contrast together. I do not think it has ever been said better, frankly.

I highlight that because I encourage my colleagues all across this Chamber to recognize that the kind of politics of division that seems to be practiced by some is not helpful, it is not productive. It does a disservice to all.

We are here with another session of the Official Truth Squad. The Official Truth Squad began when a group of freshman Republicans got together and talked about just what we were hearing from our constituents. Why on earth do you hear the kind of personal accusations that go on up there in Washington?

So we thought we would put together some truthful episodes. So we try to come here almost every night while we are in Washington to bring about some truth and talk about honest, open debate in Washington about a variety of topics.

Truth is incredibly important to the public discourse. If we are not dealing in truth, then we cannot reach the right conclusions. We cannot reach the right solutions to the challenges we have got.

I am joined tonight by a number of folks. I would like to recognize, first, Congresswoman SCHMIDT from the great State of Ohio. She has been just a stellar member of the freshman class and a great proponent of freedom and liberty. We are going to talk a little bit about national security tonight, and Congresswoman SCHMIDT comes with an incredible background and expertise and experience serving at both the local level and the State level and the first woman to represent the district that she represents from southern Ohio.

And we welcome you tonight, Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much for coming, and we look forward to your words on national security.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance that we as a nation need to continue to do all we can to prevent another terrorist attack on our homeland.

Some of us on this side of the aisle a few weeks ago had the chance to listen to the President, and the President talked about how 9/11 has changed all of us, and it has changed us forever.

I remember that day as if it was yesterday. In fact, a few weeks ago I talked again about how when my daughter lived in New York in Manhattan and we as a Nation witnessed the attacks on the Twin Towers, my daughter and I, we had dinner at the Windows on the World just 30 days before the event. And I knew she did not work close to the building, but I did not know the subway system. So when I saw the towers come down I was scared, scared about where she was. I was also horribly afraid that another attack would occur.

The thing that was so frustrating was my husband and I could not get through to her because cell phones were the only way to get through and the buildings that housed the towers were destroyed. We did not get through to her for 2 full days. It made me realize how important national security and homeland security are for our Nation. Thank God, we only had fear and did not have regret and sorrow as so many others did.

We as a Nation must do everything in our power to prevent another attack. Period.

I rise today to congratulate the hardworking men and women of our intelligence agencies and first responders on preventing another attempt since 9/11. The headlines normally fail to mention that it has been over 4 years since our Nation was hit by those terrorists on that horrific day. I, like most Americans, like Congress, wake up every morning feeling safe, proceed with my day without even worrying about the threat of an attack because I know that from law enforcement to our national security apparatus, thousands of highly trained professionals are diligently watching and working and protecting.

Men and women using the latest technologies and a lot of muscle are hard at work around the clock making sure that those that want to hurt us are kept away.

I hope everyone understands that the desire of the terrorist organizations to launch a deadly attack has not subsided. It is their mission to attack and destroy us, to attack and destroy our way of life. But what has changed is that our ability to thwart attacks has dramatically increased.

The latest in database technology, coupled with surveillance technologies, is proving to be a powerful force in identifying those potential attackers who want to kill us. We owe a great deal of gratitude to these men and women on the front lines of our defense.

Just this past week the media reported that some 200,000 people across the globe are on our watchlist, persons that we have reason to believe wish to do us harm, but most importantly, 200,000 people we have already identified as potential threats. And when you know who your enemy is, you have got a better chance at seeing them come at you.

When we wake up each morning and turn on our television sets and there is no news of an attack, we do not even think that there might have been one. That, in itself, is a tribute to the hard work of our national security team. We go about our lives without fear of another attack because of the job they are doing each and every minute of each and every day for us. And that means we must give them every tool needed to complete their mission.

Their mission is not only important, it is a matter of life and death. Our life and death. My life and death. Your life and death, Mr. Speaker.

Much has been said about the National Security Agency's surveillance program in the media. Much of it is nonsense and distortion, and I am so glad we have the Official Truth Squad here tonight to talk about that.

I asked my constituents in a recent survey what they thought about the National Security Agency's surveillance program. Over 2,000 people have responded to date. Slightly less than 80 percent support the program.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent is a huge number. That is a supermajority of folks, folks like you and me representing all kind of ideologies and political affiliations. Eighty percent want the NSA to continue to do their job so you and I can remain free from terrorist attacks.

The American people, first and foremost, want to be safe in their homes

and go about their lives without that fear again of another 9/11. They exhibit far more common sense than the media ever gives them credit for.

One of our colleagues from the great State of Texas has a great saying that Texas could use a whole lot less of Washington and Washington could use a whole lot more of Texas. I agree. Unfortunately, some day I hope in the very, very far, distant future we may well again be attacked. That attack may well be much larger in scope than 9/11 ever hoped to be. And on that day I hope and I pray that we can all say we did everything in our power we could do to prevent it. That is our responsibility. Do you not agree?

It is our responsibility to give this agency the tools necessary to protect the American people from another terrorist attack. I am glad we are giving them those tools.

It is our responsibility to see that they continue to have them so that you and I can wake up once again tomorrow morning in the freest nation in the world, free to be able to go about doing our business without fear of an enemy knocking at our door.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much, Congresswoman SCHMIDT. I appreciate you coming and joining us tonight. Your stories are always spellbinding and very moving.

And the story that you tell of your experience with your daughter on that fateful day is chilling. It brings back all the memories that all of us have and how thankful we all should be, are, can be of the incredible job that the first responders are doing all across this Nation, all across this Nation. So I thank you very much for coming and being with us.

One of the privileges that we have, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, is to gain certain information, to be briefed on certain things that are happening around the world and certain activities that the American Government and American Defense Department are doing. Some of those things we can share, some of them we cannot share, but what I can share with the American people is this certainty.

The fact that since 9/11 we have not had a major terrorist attack on the United States is not a mistake. It is not a mistake. It is not just by chance that we have, as Congresswoman SCHMIDT said, been able to awaken each morning and not really think about the possibility that it might happen again.

There are men and women all across this Nation who are performing heroic tasks day in and day out, and we all should be incredibly grateful and appreciative of their efforts.

I was pleased also to hear Congresswoman SCHMIDT bring up the NSA domestic terrorist surveillance project that is ongoing, a project that has been denigrated by many folks, a project that is frankly having an incredible effect on our national security and our ability to protect ourselves. It is a program that was put in place by the President and the National Security Agency. And Congress, the appropriate individuals in Congress, were informed, were in the loop, were given information, were told about it; and now some have kind of changed that story.

But when it came to light in the public and there were discussions about whether or not it was the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do, it appeared to me that it was one of those issues that, as Congresswoman SCHMIDT said, our constituents believed in strongly. So I started asking.

I hold a lot of town hall meetings, and I do a lot of speaking to a lot of groups back home, and when I do I oftentimes ask them. I said, if you had the opportunity as a nation, as the American Government, to know where terrorists were in terms of the use of a phone line, if you could know that and you were able to detect when they were making a telephone call from their home or from their cell phone into the United States, would you want to know what was going on in that conversation?

Mr. Speaker, I promise you I have not had a single soul tell me that they do not think that that is what the government ought to be doing. In fact, what they say is, if we were not doing that, if we were not doing that, then we would not be living up to our responsibilities that we have as a government to do probably the most important thing that we do day in and day out as a Federal Government, and that is to protect our homeland, to provide national security.

So I am certain that the support that we see for this program is universal around the Nation. And we are not talking about listening into an American citizen call to an American citizen call domestically. Remember what we are talking about. We are talking about known terrorist cells, known terrorist phone numbers, a known terrorist identity having communication with someone in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have the capability to detect that kind of communication, and I believe strongly, strongly, that my constituents, what they tell me is consistent with what folks believe around the Nation; and that is that we ought to continue that program and we ought to make certain that we are doing what we can do to protect our homeland.

We have also the opportunity so many times to hear from world leaders, and today was a day that I will not forget very soon. We had the Prime Minister of Italy, Silvio Berlusconi, come and he gave an address to a joint session of Congress. I was incredibly struck by so many of the comments that he made. And thank goodness they gave me a translation because my Italian is not very good. But I wanted to highlight a couple of the things that he said, because it just rings so true, and it talks about the incredible importance of what we as a Nation are doing, having done, and are doing now around the world.

□ 1830

So here are a couple of quotes from Prime Minister Berlusconi that he gave before Congress today. He said, Today, I am still grateful to the United States for the high price in lives you continue to pay in the fight against terrorism to assure our common security and defend human rights around the world. As I will never tire of repeating, when I see your flag, I do not merely see the flag of a great country. Above all, I see a symbol, a universal symbol, of democracy and freedom.

What an incredible picture he draws of what I feel in my heart and I know that so many of my constituents feel about the symbol of our Nation and about the incredibly important work that we are doing as a Nation. To have a leader of another country stand up and say proudly that he believes strongly in the work that the United States is doing to fight terrorism and to commit once again his nation to that fight was just incredibly inspiring.

Prime Minister Berlusconi also said, History has shown that the aspiration to democracy is universal and that liberty and democracy are contagious.

It is just a reaffirmation of what we have talked about for the past number of years and how important this war on terrorism is and how important it is to plant the seeds of democracy around the world. This is what we are doing, and what that does is make it so that we as a Nation are more secure. We are not only more free, but we are more secure as democracy moves around the world.

Here are a couple of other quotes from the Prime Minister. He stood here just in this Chamber today and said, Only democracy can provide liberty and only liberty can guarantee that individuals will be able to develop their talents, channel their energies, achieve their dreams, and conquer prosperity. The only possible road is to work together to spread democracy.

Is that not an inspiring message from another world leader? The only possible road is to work together to spread democracy.

This is the final portion of his speech that I would like to share with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the Members once again of the House and frankly with our citizens. This was incredibly moving. Many of us had tears in our eyes as he closed, and he said, Allow me to conclude by sharing with you a brief story. It is the story of a young man who had just graduated from high school. His father took him to a cemetery that was the final resting place for brave young soldiers, young people who had crossed an ocean to restore dignity and liberty to an oppressed people. In showing him those crosses, that father made his son vow never to forget the ultimate sacrifice those young American soldiers made for his freedom. That father made his son vow eternal

gratitude to that country. The Prime Minister said, That father was my father and that young man was me. I have never forgotten that sacrifice and that vow and I never will.

Incredible words from a world leader, who draws us a picture of a time 60 years ago, 50 years ago, when his father took him to a cemetery filled with American soldiers who had fought for his freedom. He tells us that he was asked by his father never to forget that sacrifice, and he vowed that he never would.

The seeds of liberty, the seeds of freedom, the seeds of democracy that we plant around the world, we may never know when we will see the fruit of that planting. I wonder myself today whether there is an Iraqi man and an Iraqi woman who are telling similar stories to their sons and their daughters and that in 30 or 40 years we would be honored and privileged to have the Prime Minister or the President of a free Iraq come before the United States House of Representatives and tell that same story, as how they were inspired by their mom or their dad as they recognize the sacrifice that American soldiers made on their behalf. An incredible, incredible picture in words.

I had the opportunity to speak to an American Legion group at home a number of weeks ago, and then another American Legion chapter came and visited my office just the other day. I was struck by something that they said. The American Legion's motto is, ''For God and country,'' and it is an appropriate motto: ''For God and country.''

There is an American Legion division that was supposed to go to an elementary school, a public elementary school in our Nation and tell the young folks at the elementary school about the American Legion, about the history and their heritage. They were called a couple of days before their visit, and they were told, no, we cannot have you come; we have been threatened with a lawsuit because of your motto, ''For god and country.''

Mr. Speaker, I am just struck by the incredible diligence of all the men and women who fight for our national security, all of the men and women who have fought for our national security, and they recognize over and over and over again that freedom is not free, that there is a price to pay.

Then I am struck by so many individuals it appears that want to destroy the roots that we have that brought about our national security and about our freedom, and I just appreciate so much the opportunity to stand before the House of Representatives as a member of the Official Truth Squad and bring these stories to try to invigorate and uplift the American people to be proud of our heritage, to be proud of the men and women who are serving us so remarkably around the Nation and around the world.

I am pleased now to be joined by a colleague, Congressman STEVE PEARCE, who is coming and participating with the Official Truth Squad this evening, to talk about our national security, homeland security and bringing some truth and honesty to the debate that we have here in the United States House of Representatives. I am pleased to yield to Congressman PEARCE.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think your conversation is exactly correct, that right now in America, when I visit the troops in Iraq, the young men and women there ask me one question that I cannot answer, and that is, they ask how come my parents do not see the good things that I am doing on TV at night. How come they only see the bad things? Why is the press trying to mislead the public?

So I appreciate your truth squad here where you begin to talk about the magnificent things that our troops are doing because, when I am there, our troops tell us that we are winning in the neighborhoods and the hearts of the Iraqi people and the hearts of people who distrusted us.

I had three young men there from New Mexico. They call themselves the Three Amigos. They were telling me, when we were out on patrol the first days that we were there, and this was way back at the beginning of the war, they said that the people would peek out their window and open the window curtain and take a look out. The next week, maybe the window curtain was pulled open, the door still locked, the windows down. Gradually, the door opened up, and they would let their kids stand in the door and look at the Americans.

Then they talked about the thing that I found in the Philippines when I was in the Air Force flying into Vietnam when you walk out among kids, and Asia and kids in other parts of the country, the thing they want to do is they want to touch the hair on your arm. So these young troops are saying, you know, the strangest things, the kids came out and the moms are holding them up to our face where the kids can see. They want to touch the hair on our arm. It was exactly the same thing I had experienced back in 1971, 1972, and 1973.

It brings down to me the fact that these Iraqis had been told for 35 years that the Americans will kill you. The truth is Saddam Hussein would kill them. He was always telling them an untruth; and when the truth was known, then the Iraqi people began to settle down.

I would say also that, in this country, if there is a big issue today, one we as a Nation face, it is truth. It is the understanding of what objective truth is. It is the understanding of who can tell us and who will tell us the truth. So I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to bring some truth to this floor because often we have got our friends who come and they talk about special interests and are pointing at the other team. The truth is, the biggest special interest group in this body are the trial lawyers, and the biggest special interest group in the other body are trial lawyers. They are the ones that are getting the most influence here. Yet our friends seem to forget that they are a special interest group and they are causing great outcomes in legislation.

So I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to bring truth to the floor of the House of Representatives and especially as it regards our troops because our troops are doing magnificent things as they are in harm's way every day. We as a grateful Nation should always take the time to say thank you, not only to the troops but also to families of the troops, for being willing to be the last wedge between tyranny that originates in the Middle East and freedoms that we are trying to export from this country. I think that we owe all of our families and all of our troops a good round of thanks from a grateful Nation.

I salute the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much. I appreciate you bringing up truth again.

The Official Truth Squad, we have got a quote that we oftentimes refer to that kind of gets to the heart of the matter. It is a quote from Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and what he said is that everyone's entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts. So I appreciate so much you bringing truth to the fore, and there are some facts that oftentimes get distorted.

One of them is that people talk about the decrease or the cuts in the defense budget, in the military budget and how on Earth can you continue as we are doing right now by cutting those folks that are protecting us. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the numbers, there are not any cuts at all, and there are not any cuts appropriately because we are in the time that we are in right now and the budgetary authority, which means the amount of money that is able to be appropriated to the military in 2000, was $287 billion; in the next year, 2001, $303 billion. It does not look like a cut to me: 2002, $328 billion, and you see as we go out 2003, $365 billion; the following year, $376 billion; and 2005, 2006, $411 billion.

Now, the truth of the matter is that that budget is appropriately increasing in spite of what you hear from the other side; and, in fact, you hear oftentimes some claims from folks on the other side of the aisle who say that we are not making any progress in national security, we are not making any progress in Iraq. I am always fond of bringing charts and pictures because I think that they speak so much louder than words.

This one is a phenomenal one. We are transitioning in Iraq, in the political environment, in the economic environment and in the military environment; and one of the transitions that is occurring is the transition of force levels of the Iraqi Army. What they are doing is momentous work over there.

In fact, what this chart shows is that in August of 2004 there were only five Iraqi battalions in combat, and you see the steady continual increase, and what many folks will not tell you is that in January of 2006, just a little over a month ago, 98 Iraqi Army battalions in combat.

What does that mean? That means that American soldiers, American men and women who have been serving in this war on terror and protecting your freedom and mine, can begin to come home. That is what that means. So we are making progress along those lines.

To give some other identity to the kinds of progress that is being made over there, this is the statistic that I just mentioned in August of 2004, only a handful of Iraqi Army battalions were in the fight. Now there are nearly 100, but it goes on.

In July of 2004, there were no operational army division brigade headquarters in Iraq, and today, eight brigade headquarters. Thirty-seven battalions have assumed battle space.

In July 2004, a little under 2 years ago, there were no operational special police, commando, public order, mechanized police or emergency response units. Under the Ministry of the Interior in Iraq, not one, not any of them; and in less than 2 years, today, there are 28 such battalions in the battle.

November 2004, there were about 115,000 trained and equipped Iraqi security forces. Today, over 227,000, nearly a quarter of a million trained and equipped security forces and others, if you talk about local police, individuals.

□ 1845

And the experience and the ability of the Iraqi forces has increased remarkably. In December of last year, 2 months ago, the Iraqi armed forces had more independent operations than did coalition forces. Mr. Speaker, did you hear that: more independent operations by the Iraqi forces than coalition forces. Remarkable.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have a couple other folks join me; and fellow Georgian, Congressman KINGSTON, who has such great insight into national security and great service here in the House of Representatives, is here; and I appreciate his coming down.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. PRICE. I just wanted to say that I have the honor of representing the 3rd Infantry Division in Hinesville, Georgia, and in Savannah, Georgia, as well as the 1st Battalion 75th Ranger Regiment, and in all maybe as high as 20,000 troops from my district who have been in Iraq, the 48th Brigade, some coming and some going. But the thing that struck me as I went to Iraq in December is the amount of the turf, as you have mentioned, which has already been ceded to Iraqi security patrol.

When we were there, 50 percent of Baghdad was already under Iraqi control. And last week, I had the honor of meeting with General Webster, who was in charge of the 3rd Infantry Division over there, he just got back, and he told me that number now in Baghdad is about 60 percent. In Mozul, 25 to 30 percent of it is under Iraqi security patrol. And the government of Mozul, interestingly enough, is headed by a mayor who is a Sunni, and he has suffered personally. His family has been attacked because of it. Yet, at the same time, here is a guy who is still facing the wind and saying, let's get the job done, and not turning back.

One of the things I know you and I have heard from folks in Iraq and in Afghanistan is, we want to know is America here to stay until we are up and running. I know there are a lot of Democrats who would like to pull out tomorrow, and I understand that. I wish all our troops were home from everywhere. But the message that we got from the folks over there is, we really appreciate what you are doing; we need you to stay until the job is done.

And then as I have talked to the 3rd Infantry soldiers, it is the same thing: we have to finish this job. We just can't faint in the face of adversity. There are so many in America, the Michael Moores, the Cindy Sheehans, the fringe branch of the liberals that want us to cut and run. I think that would be such a huge disservice to all the troops who have died.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield back to me for a moment, I think it is important to note that there are some in this Chamber who want to do just that, who say to pull out immediately. But as we both know, and our constituents and citizens around the Nation know, that is not feasible nor is it advisable.

What is at stake, and I was telling the Members earlier, the Italian Prime Minister today really clearly defined what is at stake: if we as a free people in this world are able to plant liberty and democracy around the world, we increase our security. We increase our security.

And I know that the gentleman would concur with that.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is a message we hear from all over, particularly new Europe, emerging Europe, the Europe that had been 50 years under the Soviet bloc. They understand freedom, and they understand oppression. They do not take it for granted. They are not so anti-American as the Germans and the French seem to be. They do not enjoy the U.S. kicking that so many of our fair weather friends over there do.

But along with military progress in Iraq, there has been tremendous economic progress. As I was there looking down from the helicopter over the streets of Baghdad, I saw small businesses, traffic jams, people moving in and out of buildings buying things and so forth.

There is a port in Iraq that under Saddam Hussein never was used. Today, it has 40 ships a month going into it. In terms of newspapers and banking, it is coming back. In 2003, there were 13 Iraqi companies listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Today, I think that number is somewhere between 60 and 80. That is a lot of progress.

The GDP last year, I think, was something like $15 billion. Today it is $29 billion. A very small economy, but that is a huge step. The unemployment rate was something like 70 percent, and it is now 26 percent. Still very high unemployment rate by our standards, but for the Middle East, pretty doggone good. I can tell you that the Palestinian Authority wishes their unemployment rate were that low.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It is great that you are able to share those statistics, because what they do is show and demonstrate to the American people that in fact there is a plan and there is progress.

We hear some of our friends on the other side saying there is no plan, nothing is happening over there that is making any progress. But the three-prong plan that you know about well is: one, military, which we have talked about; the other, economic, that you have so clearly identified with the increase in GDP, a 100 percent increase in their economy, the decrease in their unemployment, which is cut by two-thirds, which is remarkable in terms of the progress there; and then there's the third arm, which is the political arm. And what we have seen, what the world has seen over the past year are three independent elections, each with growing participation by the Iraqi people. They understand what is at stake. They understand what is at stake.

So for anybody to even have any sensibility about saying that there just isn't a plan or has not been any progress, just doesn't make sense to me.

Mr. KINGSTON. There is one Sunni province that went from something like a 2 percent voter turnout in January 2005 to December 15, 2005, having over a 60 percent voter turnout. Lots of people risking lives to go to the polls and very enthusiastic about it. When you think about the 300 political parties, when here we worry about Democrats versus Republicans, but 300 different political parties electing 275 members of a new parliament to serve now for 4-year terms, it is going to take awhile to have a coalition government put together. Usually those things take two or three months to happen.

But what I saw when I was over there is people wanting to put down the gun and pick up the pencil and pick up the paper and say let's move from the battlefield to the legislative chamber and debate this.

There are so many challenges to starting a new nation, but what they need right now is the world community behind them. They do not need world criticism behind them. I think sometimes our disagreements with the administration's foreign policy has led us

to be anti-Iraqi people, and I do not think the critics of the administration intend it to be that way, but that is the way it comes out overseas.

So I think we have to say, you know, Democrats and Republicans, and Republicans versus Republicans, can disagree on our foreign policy in Iraq and the war on terrorism; but we have to stand behind the Iraqi people. It is in everyone's interest for Iraq to succeed. And this is the point we are at. We cannot go back and say, well, this is what we should have done in 2003, this is what we should have done here and there. You have to take the situation as it is today and from this point on how are we going to move through the future.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Without a doubt. I am so glad you joined us to talk about this, because that is what the Official Truth Squad is all about, bringing to light the truth of issues, but also understanding and appreciating and articulating what our constituents know, and that is that these challenges are not Republican challenges or Democrat challenges; they are American challenges. They are challenges we all have to face together.

I know the gentleman joins me in just calling on our colleagues to step up, to recognize that the Iraqi people need our support now more than ever before, and to recognize that we have a lot of hurdles, a lot of challenges, but together we can overcome them, as can they.

I appreciate the gentleman's participation tonight and his expertise and perspective to the Official Truth Squad.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I appreciate being with you.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by another great colleague, a gentleman from Texas, another member of the freshman class and a great fellow who has participated in many of these Official Truth Squad activities, Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, a former judge and chief justice of the court of appeals in Texas. He has just great experience with this area of the history of national security, and he comes tonight to share some of his thoughts with us.

Congressman GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, it is refreshing to hear about good things going on in Iraq. Of course, we know that some have been concerned a civil war may be breaking out over there, but the truth is what this boils down to is they have been finding with the IEDs, these explosive devices that have been killing now both Iraqis and Americans, that that hasn't worked. They have seen we have a President with firm resolve; that we are going to stay the course and make sure the country is ready to stand on its own and then let her stand.

So they realized they were not being successful in that regard, so a last-ditch effort you have terrorists from other areas coming in and blowing up their own precious mosques to try to turn Shi'a against Sunni. It is obvious that this is a last-ditch effort to try to divide the country, because it scares a lot of folks over there greatly to think about a democracy succeeding right in the heart of the Middle East. I mean, that could spread to Iran. Boy, that scares Iran. It could spread to Syria. There are a number of countries over there that it scares them because democracy, as the President has said, could change things, and those folks are right on each other's borders.

If I could take you back to 1973, between my sophomore and junior year in college, I was an exchange student in the former Soviet Union. Back then we didn't call it the former Soviet Union, it was the Soviet Union, and I spent a summer there and associated with and dealt with college students there in Ukraine, where I was. And I developed a number of friends, one of whom was an engineering student, a smart guy. He spoke a little better English than I did Russian. Well, a lot better English than I did Russian.

We had some wonderful conversations. Very frank, very honest discussions. And at one point he was saying, you Americans seem to not understand why we would cling to communism, but it is the best thing we have ever had. We have had two major wars on our own soil and we have had to divert most everything to defense just to protect ourselves. As he pointed out, you, on the other hand, you have got two major oceans protecting the east and the west.

Think about that. That is profound. And that is something that will be written about the United States hundreds of years from now when someone writes about the rise and fall of the greatest Nation in the history of the world, that we had two major oceans. Now, I would say that is a blessing from God. That is what has allowed this Nation to be nourished and to grow without much threat of intervention from other countries because they had to cross two major oceans to get here.

The thing that concerns me is finding out we are potentially allowing footholds on our own soil. We are giving up an advantage. I didn't realize we had other foreign countries managing, leasing, utilizing avenues of entry in our ports. But now we have one transaction that is up right now with the UAE, the United Arab Emirates. As some have pointed out, the UAE has been our friend since 9/11, and that is interesting in and of itself; but there is a transaction in question that has stirred up much of America, for them to purchase or lease terminals at six of our ports. So I think it bears looking into.

If this goes through, of course they would be handling shipping arrivals, departures, unloading at the dock, and other security sensitive functions. Yes, we would still have our Coast Guard. Yes, we would still have American Customs at work. Some of us are aware that they do not always catch everything. We are a little sarcastic sometimes in Texas. But they may have containers sitting on their docks for a number of days. They will necessarily be aware of the manner in which our government inspects containers, how it selects the maybe 5 to 6 percent that it actually x-rays, how it goes about selecting which container will be one of the maybe 1 percent that they actually examine.

The current administration has looked at the issue and seems surprised that Americans are really upset about the issue.

□ 1900

And I want to say about this President, he is the first President in at least 30 years to take seriously the threat of a foreign government. I know I was in the United States Army at Fort Benning, Georgia, back when the United States soil was attacked and Americans were taken hostage. That is an act of war. Under international law, you attack somebody's embassy, as ours was attacked in Iran, it is an act of war and it justifies defending yourself. And we did nothing. We begged them to let them go.

And then later, because of a lack of leadership here in Washington, there was a failed rescue attempt that embarrassed us even further. But it sent a message that perhaps we do not have the stomach, we cannot handle these things. Perhaps if we had had an administration in Washington 30 years ago that took care of business when we were attacked, we would not be worrying about these issues now. But it did not and so we do.

Some say, well, since the UAE is one of three nations to have recognized the Taliban as an official government, that that gives them concern, as it should. There are indications that the UAE also saw an opportunity for making money, and so apparently there were al Qaeda moneys that flowed through UAE systems.

But this administration has done more to fight terrorism abroad than any perhaps in history. This terrorism is a relatively new phenomenon for our young country. But we have not done so well at home. And so it bears looking at even more closely.

We need legal immigration. We need people legally coming across the border, willing to work. Most all of us were a result of immigrants, even being here. It is a good thing, if you are willing to work. But we need to secure our borders so terrorists do not come in.

Now, since there is a war going on near our U.S. border, at our U.S. border, and some of us believe there have been insufficient efforts by the Federal Government to intervene and help our sheriffs and those that are trying to fight that war, it gets even more critical.

I personally do not believe that this great Nation should be contracting out any rights to manage, operate, use,

own any avenue of entry into the U.S., whether it is an airport, whether it is a bridge across our border, whether it is a road across our border, or whether it is a terminal in our seaports. That is just problematic.

Now, the UAE has been our friend. They have been helpful to us in the war on terror, and we do want them as an ally. And I hope and pray we have a longstanding relationship with them that just brings us closer.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman's comments about the Dubai ports deal, because I know that you have received a lot of communication from home and I have as well. I tell you, it is one of those lightning rod issues that really people have this visceral reaction that we just ought not to be allowing a foreign government to have some type of operational control over our ports. And I tell you—and I could not agree more.

But I will tell you what I think is the wonder and the beauty of our system of government is that what we have is congressional oversight that allows us to get together, we did so just today in the Financial Services Committee, and ask the administration what, how did you reach that decision? Did we touch all the bases? Did we do all the right steps? Did we make all the right steps? The Senate has done the same thing and we will move through this process.

And so I am heartened by a system of government that has checks and balances, that you and I serve in one of those branches, and it allows us to move forward and make certain that we understand what our constituents understand and that the administration understands what our constituents understand, and that is that port security is border security and border security is necessary for national security.

So I appreciate you bringing that issue up.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield back?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Please.

Mr. GOHMERT. This is also part of an important process. Some people say, why would you come down and talk for an hour on the floor of the House? It is part of educating our colleagues with information we have gleaned in preparing to come here. It is part of educating the people that would bother to watch this on television. And we have picked up some facts. And it is important people understand there are changing relationships, one of the things that concerns us when we have a contract that deals with an avenue of entry into this country with a foreign country.

After World War II, we had no better friend than France. They knew that they had their freedom, they got their country back over the graves of the brave men and women of the United States and other countries, they got it back for them. Our Americans died.

Now, it hasn't been too many years later they have forgotten all about that. Now they call us imperialists. And I get a chuckle when I hear somebody from France saying we are imperialists, because if we really were, they would not be speaking French over there in their country right now, and they would not be running their own country and they would not be calling us names now.

But anyway, they are. But it just shows an example of how things change with other countries, even some that have been dear friends.

And I wanted to point out something else that we learned that helps people assess how close the UAE actually looks at issues like we do. So I went back, I think not only do words have meaning, but votes have meaning; and I have a bill pending that we have filed, the U.N. Voting Accountability Act, and we have got a lot of Republicans, I know, supporting us. I do not know that I have Democrats supporting us. But it basically says any country that voted against us more than half the time in the U.N. the preceding year gets no financial assistance this year. And then it gives the exception for national security, but to the President.

But that caused me to say, well, I wonder how the UAE has voted in the U.N.? Well, I went back and looked. My staff has done a great job helping out. In 2002, the year after 9/11, there were 90 votes in the U.N. Of those, the UAE voted against our position 61 times, with our position, 13 times, abstained 13 times and was absent 3 times. Now, not exactly a real good, helpful voting record for the U.S.

But in 2003, there were 85 votes in the U.N. UAE voted against our position 66 times, with our position they agreed 8 times, abstained 9 times and were absent 2 times. Then I went ahead and put these up.

We do not have 2005 records; those will come out from the U.N. on March 31, according to their own rules. But in 2004, the UAE, well, there were 79 votes in the U.N. in 2004. They voted with the United States 5 times. Oh, good friend, yeah. And then against the United States 62 times, abstained 10 times and were absent 2 times.

So I think those are telling. And I think it is part of the democratic process that as Republicans we feel an obligation, I know I do, to come down and educate people on what it is we are looking back at.

We know no government lasts forever. I know I left the bench because having three daughters, I just could not leave this world without trying to leave this country better than it was when we found it.

I do not want to leave a country that is not secure.

I do not want to leave a country that is overly in debt. And those are reasons, I know we have talked before with my good friend from Georgia, these are things we hold dear that are important to us. And I want to make sure that in the 100, 200, 300, whoever knows how many years from now when somebody writes The Rise and Fall of the Greatest Nation on Earth, it does not fall to us that we let things slip by giving people who may have liked us at one time a foothold on our soil that elevated into something that hurt us down the road.

One other parenthetical. Of course, as an old judge, I am concerned about due process. And I heard the gentleman from Georgia talking about eavesdropping on foreigners calling in here. We know terrorists. By golly, if a terrorist is calling the United States, we need to know what they are saying.

But on the other hand, when you look at due process within the United States, it has been so critical, it is so important to us. If you do not secure the borders and keep out people that want to come in and hurt you, then you are necessarily going to have give up due process rights within the United States to protect yourself and stay secure.

I do not want to do that. I want to secure all our avenues of entry and make sure we do not give up due process rights.

Of course, if you are a terrorist trying to phone home or phone into our home from your home where you hate us, then look out. We are going to be watching.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas so very, very much for enlightening us. And I think the take-home message here is that port security is border security and border security is national security. And that is something I think that the American people understand very, very clearly.

And I appreciate you bringing the information about the U.N. votes. We have got, if you look at it, in fact, there are not many nations on the face of the Earth that support us as we would like them to in the United Nations, and we look forward to bringing that information to light.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a part of the Official Truth Squad, a group that comes down here almost every night and tries to bring some positive information about the United States, who tries to shed light on issues that are so often distorted here in the House Chamber.

The most important thing is, I think, that we all are truly blessed to live in this wondrous Nation. This is a nation that has given more freedom and more liberty and more prosperity to more individuals on the face of the Earth than any Nation in the history of mankind; and it is our privilege, it is our privilege to represent a portion of that Nation here in the House of Representatives.

I once again appreciate the opportunity to share some thoughts with my colleagues here in the House, and look forward to coming back at some point in the future. And I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Vice Chairman, appointed on February 16, 2006:

Mr. DREIER, California
Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois
Mr. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
Mr. ENGLISH, Pennsylvania
Mr. WELLER, Illinois
Mr. REYES, Texas
Mrs. DAVIS, California
Mr. FORTUÑO, Puerto Rico.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, Mr. Speaker. And it has been interesting to listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

For the last number of years we have had the privilege on our side of the aisle of the leader giving the 30-something Democrats the opportunity to take the floor each night at least for 1 hour, if not 2, to talk about the things that are important to America and, in particular, important to our generation. So now it is nice to see that at least the other side is beginning to recognize that this is an important venue to get some information out to the people. As I said, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

There are times, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to agree and times that we are going to disagree. The gentleman from Texas and I were just commiserating, and he and I were both elected just over 13 months ago and sworn into this esteemed body. And I was just joking with him that the chart that he just brought out and talked about related to the United Arab Emirates voting record with the United States and the United Nations is actually a document that I had with me right here in my hand and was one of the things that I was going to discuss as well.

Because I think this port deal, normally we talk about our differences in the 30-something Working Group with the Republicans on the other side of the aisle; in this case, I am heartened to see, at least for some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we have not differed on the really deep concern that many of us have as a result directly of our constituents' feedback on this port deal with Dubai Ports World and the administration.

When I can concur with my colleagues, I will do that. In this case, the administration has repeatedly indicated what a good friend the UAE is to the United States. And we only have very few examples that we can utilize to determine what the definition of ''friend'' is.

One measure of friendship is certainly how often they support us in terms of human rights and the other important issues that come up in the United Nations. There is a pitiful record that the United Arab Emirates has. And in terms of supporting us in the United Nations, not only is it pitiful but it was not so good before 2001, and it has only gotten worse since 2001.

So I stand here and am able to say that I am glad to see that our colleagues have at least pointed out that there is deep concern on the part of the legislative branch, at least some of us in the legislative branch, about the continued rapid-fire movement forward on this port deal.

□ 1915

I continue to scratch my head, we continue to scratch our heads on our side of the aisle, at the brazen nature of the defense that the President has engaged in of this deal. The revelation that came to light less than a week ago now that this is a deal that the President was not even aware of. And I sit on the Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade and Technology Subcommittee, which had a hearing today. Not only did we learn that the President did not have any knowledge of this deal but neither did the Secretary that was responsible for each of these agencies that is part of the process to approve the deal nor the Deputy Secretary nor the Under Secretary under them nor the Under Secretary under them. Three levels below the Secretary of each of the agencies responsible for reviewing the foreign investment deals that are proposed to occur in the United States, that was the level of awareness that there was in the agencies like the Department of Homeland Security, like the Department of State, like the intelligence agencies that are involved in the process of approving this. That is so disturbing, it is hard to explain.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the time that I have been in Congress and, quite honestly, since I spent 12 years prior to being in Congress in the Florida legislature, and I will even include the 13 years combined that I have served in public office, I have not seen or gotten feedback this quickly and in this enormity in as short a period of time on an issue as I have on this proposed port deal. And I am talking about compared to Social Security privatization, the Medicare prescription drug program.

I get a lot of responses and feedback on those issues, but they are lengthy and voluminous over a period of time. I have little old ladies and elderly gentlemen call my office, I represent a large senior citizen population, calling my office crying because they are in fear. I represent an area that includes the Port of Miami. My district abuts the Port of Miami. I had an opportunity to tour the Port of Miami Terminal Operating Company and saw firsthand what the potential threat is in the event that this company owned by the United Arab Emirates goes astray in the event that we no longer consider them an ally down the road, that there is absolutely no question that there is a potential national security risk. And for the President and his administration to continue to insist that there is not a national security risk when it is clear that they have not even begun to examine this potential risk closely, that is just shocking.

We have had a number of different revelations that have occurred over the last week, not the least of which is that the Coast Guard brought up their concern during the process, the CPS process, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. During that committee's process, the Coast Guard raised concerns. The Department of Homeland Security raised concerns. And let me back up for a second because although there are millions of people who have been paying attention to this, let me take this opportunity to back up for a second and just explain what it is I am talking about.

Of course, so many people are aware that there is a proposal that was considered over the last several months but that only recently came to light by most people in this administration, most people responsible for this decision. It only recently came to light in the last several weeks where we have learned that Dubai Ports World, which is a company, a foreign corporation, owned 100 percent by the government of the United Arab Emirates, is in the process of closing a deal. The deal is supposed to closed tomorrow. They have purchased an interest in P&O, a stevedoring company; and after tomorrow when the deal closes, they will now own and operate the terminal operating companies at six of our major ports. Six major ports.

When you have a proposal like that in the United States, it is supposed to go through the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. That is made up of a number of different agencies in the United States. It is supposed to include people like the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary of State. The Secretary of the Treasury chairs it. You have numerous intelligence agencies that have the highest level, or are supposed to have the highest level, of Secretaries serving on that committee, and they go through a review process, by law. This is a law that they are supposed to follow whereby they take it through a 30-day review process. And after that 30-day review, if there are national security concerns, then that is supposed to

trigger an additional 45-day review, a national security review, so that we can investigate whether there are national security implications to the foreign investment in the United States.

Now, given that the United Arab Emirates just 5 years ago was referred to 58 times in the 9/11 Commission report as having some level of involvement with the 9/11 attacks, knowing that just on the surface, how is it possible that a 45-day national security review was not triggered? Where were the alarm bells? Where was the concern? I mean, one has only to tour the terminals, like I did last week at the Port of Miami, downtown Miami, literally just across the water from the port, and see the devastating potential impact if you have just one or two people. There were not thousands of people that planned the 9/11 attack. It only takes a few determined terrorists to wreak havoc and horror on our Nation. And honestly, it would take almost no one to engage in a terrorist act, God forbid, in the event that our relationship with the United Arab Emirates somehow changes in the near future or down the road. But we will have no mechanism to remove them from our country.

What happens, and what I learned when I went to the Port of Miami to see firsthand the problem, what happens is that it is not that the United Arab Emirates or Dubai Ports World is going to run our ports. That is not accurate. But they are going to have control of the largest terminal operating company, and this is just in Miami, the largest terminal operating company that is responsible for loading and unloading containers in the Port of Miami. There are a million containers that go through the Port of Miami every single year, a million. And this company that is owned by the UAE is going to be in charge of the loading and unloading of those containers. What I learned when I went to the Port of Miami was that while they are not in charge of the security or running the port itself, each terminal operating company is responsible for their own security internally in their terminals and on their property. So because you have a million containers going through the Port of Miami, that is a whole lot of the security measures that are taken on the Port of Miami and that this company, and as a result the UAE, is responsible for.

In addition, what is equally disturbing is that the individuals in the companies that run these terminal operating companies, they have an intimate knowledge of the security measures that are taken on the port grounds itself. So we know two things. One, they are responsible for security within their own terminal for those million containers. One million containers at least at the Port of Miami go in and out of there over the course of a year. And their personnel also have intimate knowledge of the security measures taken at the port every single day. It only takes one or two rogues, it only takes one or two bitter people, it only takes one or two people who differ even with the government of the UAE, if they currently are our friends, and I would argue that given their track record in terms of the support or lack of support for things we care about in the United Nations and for a number of other reasons that they are not the friends that President Bush represents that they are, but it does not take more than one or two people who hold hate in their heart for the United States and our people to wreak havoc on us. They are not just this close. They would be here. They would be here on our ports on our grounds.

Let us take this a step further because beyond just the United Nations votes that my colleagues talked about and that I just mentioned, we also have the United Arab Emirates that is a member of the Arab League of Nations. The Arab League of Nations is currently engaged in a boycott of the State of Israel. The United Arab Emirates supports that boycott. Now, Israel is the United States' strongest ally in the Middle East. So now we have a second layer of evidence that the United Arab Emirates is not a very good friend of the United States. How could we allow, both for national security reasons and for economic fairness reasons, a country like the United Arab Emirates to do business and to purchase a very significant terminal operating company in our six major ports and allow them to do that kind of business here when they refuse to do business with the State of Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East? That is unconscionable.

And with all due respect, the President touts his support for the State of Israel and what a good friend this President has been to the State of Israel. Well, I think we have one example here where he is not being such a good friend to the State of Israel if he could turn the other cheek and vociferously defend a business deal even in spite of the fact that this country denies the State of Israel's legitimacy in terms of their existence and engages in harm to the State of Israel by supporting an economic boycott. So to me the proof is in the pudding. I think words are nice, but actions are a whole lot better. Up and down this deal is disturbing.

Now, another colleague of mine, Congressman BACHUS from the State of Alabama, again I want to cite he is also a colleague of mine from the other side of the aisle, in the subcommittee hearing today, he talked about the fact that in the United Arab Emirates, they will not allow the United States to have 100 percent ownership of a company on their port; yet we are allowing the United Arab Emirates to have a 100 percent ownership of a company in our port. And when he asked the administration to explain that, they had no explanation. He was going to have to get back to us. Well, of course he was going to have to get back to us because there is no explanation for that. This is a matter of fairness. This is a matter of what is wrong versus what is right, and this is a matter of national security.

Now, here is where I am going to part company with my colleagues on this because it is wonderful that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are opposing, rightfully so, this port deal and joining Democrats on our side of the aisle in our concern, our deep and grave concern in opposition to this port deal. However, it would have been far nicer if they had not come so late to the dance in terms of their recognizing that port security is a deep and troubling problem that we have in the United States.

We currently check less than 5 percent of the containers that come through our ports in the United States. Now, that is bad enough. But over the course of the last 5 years, and this is something else I learned when I went to the Port of Miami last week, the difference between our appropriations for airport security, in 5 years we have appropriated an additional $18 billion for airport security and less than $700 million for port security. Now, I just could not believe when I learned how lopsided the difference in security measures were. If I am a terrorist, and I am not, but if I am a terrorist, it really does not take a smart terrorist to recognize that if you have that lopsided a difference in terms of the money we have spent to shore up our security at our airports versus our ports, where do you think the weak spot is, and where do you think they are most likely to zero in on in terms of attack?

They are most likely to zero in on port security and that weakness. And now what do we do? Without a national security review, without any concern expressed by this administration whatsoever, we allow a country that just 5 years ago was involved in terms of financing, allowing the financing, housing the 9/11 terrorists, allowing the financing of that attack and, in addition to that, allowing the transport of nuclear material through their country to the state of Iran. That is not allowing, it is not even strong enough to say that that is allowing the fox into the hen house. It is not strong enough to say that.

Where we part company with our friends on the other side of the aisle is in terms of our support for port security, because time and again, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats in this Chamber have proposed increases in funding for port security. We have proposed going from the 5 percent to 100 percent in terms of checking the containers that come through our ports.

□ 1930

Each time we have offered an amendment that would do that, that would accomplish that. The Republicans in this body have rejected it, rejected it with their red lights on that board right above your head, Mr. Speaker.

And that is just so incredibly disturbing, because it is very nice to

stand here on this floor and verbally oppose this ports deal on national security grounds, but when we have an opportunity to do something about it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see my colleagues join us not just with words, but with their actions as well.

I would like to see them support the Appropriations Committee ranking member on our side, Mr. OBEY from Wisconsin. He proposed last year and the year before just a 5 percent decrease in the tax cuts for our wealthiest Americans who make more than $1 million a year, the wealthiest, arguably no skin off their noses; and to spend that money, I believe it was an additional $750 million, I have to double-check that number, but to be able to come close to spending an additional $1 billion on port security just by dropping the tax cut for our wealthiest Americans by 5 percent.

And that was rejected. The Democrats voted for it and the Republicans voted against it.

So it is very nice, and I am pleased to see, and I have been yearning as a freshman, it is the thing that has caused me the most concern, consternation. Over the course of the last year, my good friend from Texas and I have talked about it many a time; we serve on the Judiciary Committee together. There is too much animosity in this Chamber. There are too many differences. We focus more on our differences than we do on our potential alliances.

This is a time when we have an opportunity to come together. I would like to see us come together in words and in deeds. We have that opportunity here, and it would be great. I am hopeful that henceforth we are going to be able to lock elbows and move together to oppose this deal and to address the national security concerns that deals like this present.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Florida yielding.

We get into Washington, we get up here around the Capitol, we all have our committees and subcommittees, all these things we are trying to oversee and do. I was not aware that it was as easy as apparently it is for a foreign company to manage, own, lease terminals in our ports. Were you aware of that?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No. I wasn't aware of that either. I was shocked.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, and I hope we can work together, not only to shore up an avenue of entry through our ports, as you pointed out. We would not let somebody, a foreign government, a foreign-owned company, even our close friends, I would not think, operate an airport or bring their own planes in. Yes, you can check them, we will let Customs do their thing. We wouldn't do that.

We wouldn't lease a bridge to someone else to operate or manage, I wouldn't think. Gosh, I would hope not.

Anyway, I hope that we can work together towards securing the avenues of entry into this country, because I don't know if you heard me saying it earlier, the gentlelady from Florida, but we all want to be secure. But if we don't secure our outer perimeter, then people that want to hurt us will come in, and then you lose due process rights at that point in order to be secure. I don't want to do that.

So I appreciate your comments and your heartfelt notions on this issue, and hope we can work together.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I look forward to that, and I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I have legislation that I have introduced just today that your colleague from Texas, Mr. POE, has joined me on that would prohibit foreign-government-owned companies from owning terminal operating companies. I would love to have you as a cosponsor of that legislation.

I hope you lead your conference beyond this port deal and your opposition to it to trying to shore up the port security at our Nation's ports, because unfortunately, your party has been less than supportive of trying to do that. I appreciate you being willing to engage in some dialogue with us. Thank you so much.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I thank the gentlewoman for taking this time and for making the remarks that she did.

I was in my office working and listening to your presentation, and not only did you lay out a cogent case why this deal with Dubai World Ports makes no sense at all in terms of the security interests of our country, but also the other reasons that you pointed out in terms of their role, in terms of the boycott on Israel and all the other issues of concern there.

But as I left my office, you were also talking about the fact that we have a port security system that still has an awful lot of holes in it. The number of containers, we were told by the CIA that the most likely attack on America would be in a dirty bomb or weapon of mass destruction inside of a container. Now, 4 years later, we still find ourselves where we are inspecting those containers once they arrive in Florida or the San Francisco Bay area in my district, which is far too late.

So even if you thought it would be a good idea to outsource the ownership of these ports to a foreign entity, you certainly would not do it when you have the kind of port security system that we have in place today with so many, so many flaws in that system.

There has been a lot of suggestions about how to get this done. There are ports around the world engaging in very serious screening of these containers, but not all of the ports from which we receive cargo.

So I just wanted to join the gentlewoman in her remarks, because I think there are two issues here. One, this is a real bad deal and doesn't make any sense. People in my district were stunned when the President would say one day he was going to veto it and the next day he hadn't been told about it. He was so well informed he was going to veto it, but not well informed enough to discuss it, because he hadn't seen the deal.

Then, secondly, they think about the problems that we are having trying to secure this worldwide traffic in containers, and they just think that somebody has lost their mind in terms of starting at this point the outsourcing of these ports to foreign ownerships and then, of course, to a country-owned company that has a lot of questionable activities in its background with respect to terrorism and other items.

I just want to thank the gentlewoman for raising these issues. I think it is important, and it is important that they continue to be raised during this 45-day period.

Thank you and the other 30-Somethings for doing this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is a privilege to have you down here. The gentleman from California has been a leader for many years. Obviously, there are some significant national security concerns that the State of California has.

We have got to make sure that we have the long-term security interests and needs of this country addressed going forward, and that this debate and dialogue not just be isolated just to this deal. This deal affects six ports in our country, six significant ports. Dubai Ports World will also own terminals and other interests at many other ports in our country. This is actually bigger than this one-port deal.

This is a matter of national security. This is a matter of trying to ensure that, going forward, we fill this gaping hole in our national security.

The two of you sit on the Armed Services Committee. Obviously, you are engaged every single day. Mr. MEEK serves on the Homeland Security Committee and has intimate knowledge of the significant problems we have.

Before I turn it over to one of the two of you, I think that what Mr. MILLER just said is really important to note. Actually, let me go back to what the gentleman from Georgia was saying before you all got here and before I began the 30-something hour.

The gentleman from Georgia made reference to how wonderful it is that we have a legislative process and a system of checks and balances and that the Congress can engage in oversight. It should be noted that the oversight we are engaging in now, we are forcing, we are taking it upon ourselves, because it certainly hasn't been oversight supported by this administration. In fact, the President threatened last week that if we dared to pass any legislation that halted this deal, his all-important business deal, he would veto it.

Now, that doesn't really sound very democratic. It appears to me that this President cares a lot about exporting democracy and not a lot about practicing it.

So I just think that is an important piece of information that our citizens in this country should understand: who is concerned about looking out for our national security interests. It doesn't appear that the administration is.

I would be happy to yield to either of the gentlemen.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, I 100 percent agree with you.

You know, the fact that they could even claim that there is some kind of oversight going on is an absolute joke. Anybody who has even been paying the least bit of attention to what has been happening here the past 4 or 5 years can see that there hasn't been any oversight.

The discussion tonight has been about foreign countries running our ports, as if this is the first time, or as if this hasn't been going on. Other countries have, piece by piece, been taking more and more of the United States of America.

In the last 4 years, this has been the increase in our national debt: $1.18 trillion has been the increase of that debt that this Nation, the Republican House, the Republican Senate and the Republican President have run up. $1.16 trillion of that has been borrowed from foreign interests.

Of this number, this is what we get from foreign interests, and this is what we borrow from domestic interests. This is piecemeal, piece by piece by piece by piece, selling off the United States of America.

So it is not just the ports, as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was saying. This is about the debt, the interest, our country. Who is holding the debt? Japan, China, the Caribbean, Taiwan, OPEC, Korea, all own bits and pieces of the United States. If you look at Japan and China, they own almost $900 billion, almost the whole kit and caboodle of the $1.18 trillion that we have. Most of that is owned by Japan and China.

Again, I ask my friends, including the judge who was down here, give us a good, solid way to explain this scenario of our country raising the debt limit, the Republican House and Republican Senate and Republican White House raising the debt limit by $3 trillion since President Bush has been in, more debt than we have borrowed from foreign interests in the past 224 years, the Republican Congress and the President. How do you explain that and make it sound good, make it sound positive? Because there is no way.

But our constitutional obligation, Mr. MEEK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, is that we are here to oversee what this President is doing, and if we feel that this President and this Congress, Republican Congress, is not doing what they need to be doing to strengthen the United States of America, then our job is to call you out on it; not because we want to, but because that is our obligation here. Not because we like it.

This is our second hour tonight. We could be doing a lot of other, different things. But this is important to the country because this President and this Republican Congress is selling this country off piece by piece by piece.

I say this to our friends in Congress, Mr. Speaker, who may be watching in their offices, that if you are a business person, you can't just keep going out and borrowing money and borrowing money and borrowing money; and if business isn't going so well, borrow money. Get it from China, get it from Japan, get it from Korea. You can't go out and borrow and borrow. We have an obligation. The trade deficit with China, $202 billion from $84 billion just a few years ago in 2000.

I yield to my friend, who has been just a strong advocate on being a deficit hawk and getting us to balance our budget. I appreciate your leadership.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I think it is important for us to continue to say it and say it again, that this Congress, the majority side has the President's back. It has the President's back.

I think it is important, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, that we continue to explain that and let it be known they are more committed to the President's back versus the American people's back, and I think it is important that you continue to outline that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, it has been clear on a number of different levels that they have the President's back much more so than the Republicans' back. We can see that when it comes to their support for the President's budget, when they support the President's initiatives at every level.

□ 1945

You see the red and green lights up on the board, and even when the more moderate Republican colleagues of ours obviously desperately want to vote differently, they hold the board open for as long as humanly possible so that they can twist arms and get those colleagues of ours to change their votes and vote differently than obviously their conscience has told them that they should vote.

We are facing down now a need to increase the debt limit. The Treasury Secretary has indicated that we are going to bump up against our debt limit any day now, really within the next month. And we still have not voted to do that. One of the interesting things that I have found politically over the years is that the Republicans often accuse Democrats of being tax-and-spend Liberals. All I ever hear is tax-and-spend Liberal, almost like equating it with curse words.

What has been clear is that the Republicans, since they have been in charge of this government, and in total control of this government, they have been borrow-and-spenders. We have reached the point in America now where this administration, this President, has spent more than the previous President certainly, and other Presidents combined.

We have spent more money now than the previous administration, yet Republicans continue to accuse Democrats of being tax-and-spend Liberals. It is really just funny. It has reached the point of sardonic humor.

Let us look at the issue of the debt limit. You see here that we have increased the debt limit not just on one, not just on two, but on five occasions. We had had $3 trillion of increases of the debt limit. In billions of dollars, you have in June of 2002, $450 billion increase in the debt limit.

In May of 2003, $984 billion increase in the debt limit. November of 2004, $800 billion increase in the debt limit. The pending increase now is another $781 billion for a total of over $3 trillion in increasing of the debt limit. That means that our future generations, my children, their children, are going to owe incredible sums of money, have debt to foreign nations, and that is not even talking about the deficit.

So many people really have trouble getting their arms around the difference between the debt and the deficit. We have a problem with the deficit in this country. And we have examples of that in chart form as well.

The deficit in this country has now reached $8 trillion. $8 trillion. Next week, Mr. Speaker, when we come back and do the 30-something hour, we are going to have a chart that will try to illustrate for people just what that means, what a billion dollars will do. Because it is really staggering when you think about it. People have trouble getting their mind around that concept: $8 trillion translated to every person in this country means that every person in this country owes $27,000. And when I am talking about a person, I am talking about infants as well, babies as well.

Let us look at the budget deficits of prior Presidents. If you start with President Reagan in 1982, he had a deficit of $128 billion. We had a deficit of $128 billion. You go all of the way down to this President, and we are at $323 billion.

Now that is just for fiscal year 2006. And that is obviously increased, except for one year where it was a little bit higher. In 2004 it was a little bit higher, $412 billion. So I feel heartened that we had somewhat of a drop, but it is on the increase again.

We have got to make sure that we get back to the point that we were at during the Clinton administration when we did not know from the term deficit, because we had a surplus. What we were debating during the Clinton administration was what we were going to do with that surplus: Were we going to use it to shore up the difficulties we were having with social security? Were we going to use it to shore up the difficulties that we were having with

Medicare? We cannot have those discussions any more because we are operating at our biggest deficit in history.

What we have proposed, and what Republicans have consistently rejected, is going back to the PAYGO rules, the pay-as-you-go rule, which means you do not spend it if you do not have it.

The Republicans have repeatedly and unanimously rejected going back to the PAYGO rules. These are two examples of amendments that were offered by Mr. SPRATT from South Carolina in the 2006 budget resolution and the 2005 budget resolution.

In 2006, it failed 165–264. And you had zero Republicans supporting it, 228 Republicans opposing it. In the 2005 budget resolution, it failed 194–232. Zero Republicans supporting it, 224 Republicans opposing pay-as-you-go.

Now, who is fiscally responsible and who is not? I really ask you to think about that. We have got to make sure that we return to pay-as-you-go, because even though it is difficult, that is a hard policy to adopt, making sure you have the money before you spend it, anyone who lives, if you think about it in terms of your household budget, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to only spend the money you have.

But we all know that you are obviously in the best fiscal shape, you have the most fiscally sound budget in your home when you are only spending what you take in.

There are a lot of Americans that do not do that. There are a lot of Americans that have credit card debt. There are a lot of Americans in this country who struggle every day to make sure that they can pay their bills. And quite honestly, the only way that they are often able to cover the needs that they have is by deficit spending in their own household.

But they know that it is not the right thing to do; and ideally if they could afford it, most of these families would not engage in that practice. The problem is that they are not in very good shape fiscally in their own household, so they have to. The Federal Government does not have to. You definitely cannot argue that we do not have the money to adopt this practice. We do. We have the money; we just do not have the wherewithal.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership here has not had the nerve. I guess for lack of a better term it has not had the nerve to adopt that responsible policy. I really do not understand it. I come from a State legislative background, 12 years in the Florida legislature. Anyone who comes from a legislative background and was an elected official in their home State in this body understands that every State in the country has to operate in the black, according to their constitution. You cannot deficit spend in a State budget. You cannot do it.

You have only the ability to spend the money that you have. The Federal Government has, I guess it is a luxury, but it is a luxury that comes back to bite you very soon as you progress down the road, and you end up throwing your own future into tremendous debt.

There is a USA Today editorial that was just from the other day, and it talks about who is really the party of small government and big spending and who is not. It was really interesting. USA Today said tax cuts, they say, forced hard decisions and restrained reckless spending.

The last time we looked, though, Republicans controlled both Congress and the White House. They are the spenders. In fact, since they took control in 2001, they, meaning the Republicans, have increased spending by an average of nearly 7½ percent a year, more than double the rate in the last 5 years of the Clinton era budget. That is really telling.

So who is fiscally responsible? Who is for smaller government? Who is for responsible fiscal policy? Clearly, given this chart, where it indicates in USA Today's opinion, our third-party validator and this chart right here, which shows the increase, drastic increase of the deficit over time from the Reagan administration to now.

Let us look at the blue area right here. See the blue years. The blue years are surplus, Mr. Speaker, surplus, when we did not have a deficit, when we had PAYGO. When we only spent the money that we had.

We had some Members, Mr. Speaker, in our caucus that lost their elections because of that vote, that lost their elections ensuring that we would adopt responsible fiscal policy. That is because we stand on principle.

We do not blindly support our President, we do not walk in lock step, we vote our conscience. And I wish that I had not seen the angst in so many of my Republican colleagues' faces when they had their arms wrenched behind their backs and were essentially forced to vote differently than you know in their heart they believed.

It is really sad. I feel so free to come on this floor and, you know, Leader PELOSI, she tells you, you do what you feel is right. I know we are not always going to agree. You have to be able to do what you think is best for your district. Now, of course, she would like us to be unified. And because we have such strong beliefs and values in our caucus, we have the most unified caucus that we have had in history, really since the 1950s, the most unified caucus.

The Democratic caucus in this Chamber knows that we can take this country in a new direction, that together America can do better, and that if we work together and work through our differences and build consensus instead of forcing our colleagues to do what they do not necessarily believe in, then we are going to make sure that we can come up with sound policy.

The Clinton years we had surplus. The other chart that you just had up is also telling. Again, we do not force people in the Democratic caucus to do what they do not believe. I cannot imagine that my Republican colleagues in every single district in this country stood in front of their constituents during their campaigns and said, you know what, I believe in deficit spending. I believe in an $8 trillion deficit.

I just doubt that if I were in their districts at a town hall meeting, that they would be telling their constituents they were glad that we had an $8 trillion deficit. But yet they come up here and they vote to continue to support policies like that.

I do not get it. Other than blind loyalty, I do not get it. Blind loyalty is what is hurting our constituents here in the United States of America.

Let us look at how just the interest payments on the national debt, we are going back to talking about the debt, the money that we owe to other countries now. Just look at what the interest payments would pay for if we did not have to spend them on covering the national debt.

If we did not have to spend them, we could spend them on education, we could spend them on homeland security, we could spend them on improving the quality of life for our Nation's veterans. You have about $50 billion that we could spend on helping our Nation's veterans. You have about, I think that is about $30 billion that you could spend on shoring up homeland security.

We are talking about domestic discretionary funding, the kind of funding that we can specifically direct to port security and airport security and making sure that our Nation's borders are not infiltrated by terrorists; but we cannot spend that money on those things because we are paying interest on our debt to other countries.

You could spend almost $100 million, I think it is about $75 billion dollars, excuse me, we get the Bs and Ms confused sometimes, $75 billion on education.

Now, one of the biggest frustrations that I know I get in terms of feedback from my constituents, Mr. Speaker, is the No Child Left Behind Act and the fact that this President committed from day one, and Mr. MILLER, my good friend from California who was just here, championed that legislation on our side with the administration's commitment that they were going to support full funding.

We have not had full funding on No Child Left Behind. We have not had the ability to really implement that legislation and ensure that our children in our public schools are prepared for the path that they choose in life. What we have done instead is we have had to spend that money on things like interest on the national debt. We have had to spend that money on tax cuts, because it is tax cuts that have been the top priority of this administration.

Still today this President's and this administration's highest priority appears to be making the tax cuts for our

wealthiest Americans permanent, in the face of the national debt being the size that it is, in the face of us having an $8 trillion deficit where each American owes $27,000 apiece.

How is that possible? There are times when you just have to say, we cannot afford it. It would be nice, but we cannot afford it. When does that happen here?

Mr. MEEK, I do not understand when that happens here. You know, I am a mom. I have three little kids. There are times that I have to disappoint my 6-year-olds, my twin 6-year-olds, and my 2½ year old. I have to tell them no, we cannot buy that toy. We cannot buy that toy. I would like to buy you that toy, but we have to save somewhere. We have to do some belt-tightening.

No just is not in the equation with this administration. Sure we can have billions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy. Sure we can spend money on whatever we want. Sure we can continue to spiral our deficit bigger and bigger and bigger, and we can go more and more in debt to foreign countries. You know what? It is time for us to act like responsible parents do and occasionally say no.

Occasionally remember that the household budget is something that we have to be responsible about and return to the days when we were only spending what we had, return to the policy of PAYGO.

□ 2000

I just do not understand it. I really do not.

Mr. MEEK, I have been talking about national debt. I have been talking about what we could spend if we had the interest payments on the national debt, what we could do for veterans and homeland security and education. Instead, the net interest that we are spending is $250 billion. We can see what that would buy and it is really disturbing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RYAN and I had to run down to an Armed Services Committee meeting. We had a roll call vote. And of course we want to be there for every vote. That is the reason why the people sent us to Washington.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is important to verbalize that those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle have tried to do everything we could to stop the Republican majority and the President from running this country literally into the debt where it is now. Foreign nations owning what they own.

I just want to come for the record because I believe in third party validators. March 30, 2004, Republicans voted 209 to 209, Republicans vote against our resolution 209 to 209 to reject the motion by Representative MIKE THOMPSON to instruct conferees to include PAYGO requirements in that budget, in the FY 2006 budget resolution, in 2004. I am sorry. That was 2004 vote number 97.

A similar measure was on May 5, 2004, Republicans voted 208 to 215. They voted 215, we voted 208 to reject a similar motion by Representative DENNIS MOORE of Kansas, Democrat. That is 2004 vote number 145.

Another resolution or a vote that we put forth, an amendment similar to November 18, 2004. Republicans voted to block a consideration by Congressman Stenholm at that time to not raise the debt limit which also had PAYGO requirements, not to increase the debt limit. It also had PAYGO requirements. That is 2004 vote number 534.

There are a couple of other votes that you have, Mr. RYAN. Would you call those out.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to. This is the pay as you go. This is if you spend money or you give tax cuts, you have got to find other areas to cut spending or raise another kind of revenue. There will be no budget deficits. Everything will be deficit neutral. Pay as you go.

Mr. MEEK just gave 3 scenarios where the Democrats put forth amendments or motions to try to control the spending of the Republican Congress, and in each instance the Democrats all voted for balancing the budget and the Republicans all voted against balancing the budget.

Again, Mr. SPRATT, our good friend from South Carolina who is our ranking member on the Budget Committee, who was the architect of the Clinton balanced budget from 1993 that led to 20 million new jobs and surplus revenue, Mr. SPRATT offered a substitute amendment. Rollcall vote number 87 on March 17, 2005. It failed. Not one Republican voted for the PAYGO that was included in Mr. SPRATT's substitute amendment.

Again, Mr. SPRATT offered another amendment. Rollcall vote 91 March 25 of 2004. Again, pay as you go. Deficit neutral. Help us reduce the deficit. Help us get back to balanced budgets. Again, not one Republican voted for that substitute.

Time and time again, Mr. MEEK, we have offered solutions to this problem to quit selling off our country piece by piece, and the Republican Congress has voted against it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, as we come in for a close there is so much information to share there is just not enough time to do it, but it is important that we go through that to make sure that not only Members on the majority side know, the American people know, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing everything in our power to be able to stop them from selling our country off to foreign nations.

Let me illustrate this a little bit more. The U.K. owns $223.2 billion of our debt, Mr. Speaker. I think that is important to identify. You also have Germany. Germany owns $65.7 billion of U.S. debt. That is what they own of this country. OPEC nations, including Saudi Arabia and other countries, $67.8 billion of our debt. This is what they own of the United States of America.

It troubles me to put this on the silhouette of our country, but I think it is important that we break this down so the Members know exactly what they are doing.

Taiwan, some may have products and toys from Taiwan, and you say ''little Taiwan.'' Guess what? Little Taiwan owns $71.3 billion of our debt.

People are so concerned about China, Mr. Speaker, and I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. We are all sworn to protect this country. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, yourself included, Mr. RYAN and other Members in this Chamber, but guess what? Red China, Communist China owns $249.8 billion of U.S. debt.

The Republican majority is so much out of control until we are running to countries that are communist countries saying, buy our debt. We need it. We cannot stop ourselves. We cannot help ourselves.

Canada, some folks up on the northern border like to go over to Canada but guess what they own? $58.8 billion of the American pie. You also have Korea, Korea, $65.5 billion of the American apple pie. And guess what, Japan, the island of Japan, some folks look at Japan on the map, Mr. Speaker, and say, well, it is not as big as the United States of America. But guess what? They own $682.8 billion of U.S. debt.

We are well on our way, Mr. Speaker, to half of our debt being owned by foreign nations, some that we have some issues with.

So Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about secret port deals and all this stuff, this is what is going on right now. Mr. RYAN, we are going to bring this out as many times as possible. I want the majority side to figure out a positive way to talk about how we owe these countries that I have put here, and others that are unnamed, this kind of money.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Like you said, what is our benefit? We get to fund our deficit and that is about it. We do not go belly up. But what is our benefit? We do not have more money to invest in education as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ pointed out. We do not have more money to invest for our veterans. This is money that is going to pay the interest on the money that we are borrowing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, you go back and you say, well, the majority side says, well, we are doing fine. We want to cut the deficit in half. Do not worry. Let us do it. Trust us.

Well, ''trust us'' has gotten us to this point and this has to stop, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let me say real quick, trust us, this is the debt limit increases just since 2002. Since President Bush, Republican House, Republican Senate, $3 trillion in new borrowing from the Republican Congress. This is third party validator. This is fact.

The Truth Squad can come out and check the facts and maybe help us find

a positive way to talk about it. June 2, 2002, the Republicans raised the debt limit by $450 billion. May of 2003, $984 billion. November of 2004, $800 billion.

Now, the next increase is going to be for $781 billion more. $3 trillion since President Bush and the Republican House and the Republican Senate have been in charge of this operation here. And we just keep going and borrowing and borrowing and borrowing from the Japanese, the Chinese, the OPEC countries. And at the end it is mortgaging the future of this country.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. When I began the hour I talked about imitation being the sincerest form of flattery so it is interesting to see that they have now engaged in a little dialogue here.

This whole conversation has really been a reflection of the culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence. Whether it is the debt that foreign countries owe, whether it is the $8 trillion deficit that we have, whether it is the pitiful and disgusting response to Hurricane Katrina or this port deal that is deeply disturbing and that brought up no national security implications for this President or this administration.

Before we close it out, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MEEK, I do want to urge people to go on the Washingtonpost.com website and see the video that has just been released of President Bush being warned about the dangers of Hurricane Katrina before the hurricane hit and him not asking a single question; him being warned about the levee breaks, warned about the people in the Superdome. There is video. Washingtonpost.com.

We want to thank the Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI for the opportunity to be here and to spend time with the American people. I know Mr. RYAN will detail how people can reach us, if they have comments, on our website.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to thank Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is good to have you back.

Mr. MEEK, congratulations again for being elected to chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation. You are such a young member. Congratulations for getting that reward from your peers.

Www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30Something. All of the charts that the Members saw tonight can be accessed off this website. The third party validators. This is not KENDRICK MEEK and DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and TIM RYAN making this stuff up. These are facts. And hopefully these facts will lead to us recognizing that we are not doing everything we can and hopefully we can get the country going back in the right direction.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF S. 1777, KATRINA EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2006

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider in the House Senate bill (S. 1777) to provide relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina; that the bill be considered as read; that the amendment that I have placed at the desk be considered as adopted; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except 1 hour debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SOUDER.

S. 1777

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Katrina Emergency Assistance Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of an individual eligible to receive unemployment assistance under section 410(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5177(a)) as a result of a disaster declaration made for Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita on or after August 29, 2005, the President shall make such assistance available for 39 weeks after the date of the disaster declaration.

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

There was no objection.

COLOMBIA

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened to the last special order. It was the longest extensions of remarks devoted to how to increase taxes in America that I have heard.

It is one thing for the other party to criticize us in spending and then vote against every attempt to control the budget. They can criticize us simultaneously as they did in the last hour for not spending enough in education and then not controlling the budget. There was such inconsistency. We are clearly in the season of partisanship, but the harshness and tone and the misrepresentation has been very uncomfortable. And I hope that as we go through this year we can have reasonable debate over very, very difficult questions on international trade, on how we manage our deficit, on how we manage our tax code, on how we manage our spending without the tremendously aggressive tone of partisanship that is increasingly happening in America.

I want to talk about a subject that will hopefully be relatively bipartisan as we move through. It certainly has been in part. And there is a broader issue that has come up, and that is related to the issue of Colombia.

Colombia, most of us think of, if I ask you what do you think of, probably the first thing you think of historically would be coffee. Colombian coffee. Juan Valdez and Colombian coffee. I know in Indiana and at least me from Indiana and many other people would think Colombia is spelled like the District of Columbia. But it is not. If you think it is not, just listen to the accent when they go ''Colombian coffee.'' It is C-O-L-O-M-B-I-A.

Colombian coffee and Juan Valdez were established images in the United States until about the eighties when the number one thing Americans started to think about with Colombia was cocaine.

□ 2015

Almost all, 90-some percent, of the cocaine that comes in the United States and all around the world comes from Colombia. Almost all of our heroin and a high percentage of heroin around the world comes from Colombia. Now Afghanistan has kind of dominated the world on heroin, but in the United States while Asian heroin and Afghan heroin is coming into the west coast, most of the rest of the country has either Colombian heroin or some variation of Mexican heroin.

So now when many people think of Colombia, if I say, oh, I am going to Colombia, people go, well, do not get shot. They do not think do not drink too much coffee. They think do not get shot, and that is partly because of the book by Tom Clancy and then the movie, ''Clear and Present Danger,'' which talked about kind of the height of the Medellin cartel. Then the book, ''Killing Pablo,'' which then was followed up with a movie about Pablo Escobar running the Medellin cartel, and the visions of Colombia from those movies and books have really driven the definition of Colombia.

What I want to do a little bit tonight to lay this out is to tell you a little bit about the history of Colombia; then how, in fact, the drugs because of the American drug habit and the European drug habit, it is not domestic consumption of cocaine and heroin that drove the problems and the violence in Colombia. It was U.S. and European drug addictions that drove Colombia to the situation where they are today.

Then what we have been doing in Congress, starting under the Clinton administration, moving to the Bush administration, with Plan Colombia and the Andean Initiative and some of the impacts of that, and then finishing up with some of the hope of Colombia, which on Monday President Bush and President Uribe of Colombia signed the Colombian Free Trade Agreement and what that would mean both for us and for Colombia and for the Central American region.

So let me first start with this map; and the number one thing that becomes apparent from the map, which I like a lot in this map, is you can tell that it is a geographically diverse country, that it is the start of the Andean mountains. Venezuela is over to the right. Lake Maracaibo, the number one oil region in all of the Americas and possibly in the world, the richest oil well is over there, the big lake, just south of the mountains. The mountain up at the top, I believe, is around 12 to 14,000 feet. Then you come into these kind of lower Andes where you get down to 14,000 feet here and about 8,000 to 10,000 feet in the middle.

If you continue on down, actually the Andes do not go as much directly through Ecuador, but jump over to Peru and down through Chile. Then you get down to the huge Andes, where they are 23,000 feet, and Machu Picchu is in Peru, and then runs down through Colombia down in this range. The equator obviously moves here, roughly through Ecuador, but this whole area is the basic center of the world where the equator is working through.

So all this side to the east is jungle, and you can see these big rivers down here, Putumayo coming through along the border between Colombia and Ecuador, all feed into the Amazon basin. Brazil is over here to the right, and all this area drains into the Amazon River, and then the Amazon River comes out and pours out to the north of Brazil.

In this pattern, first off you see Colombia really has basically three parts. It has a coastal region, and it is, I believe, the only country in South America with both a Caribbean side up there and an eastern Pacific side here. So about half of Colombia is a little more on the Pacific and a little, about half, is on the Caribbean. So it is on both oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific. Then you have the mountainous region, and then you have this huge jungle.

Now, in understanding the history of Colombia, by looking at the map you start to understand and can more understand the economics of Colombia, the democratic traditions of Colombia and the problem that we have with narcotics in Colombia and how we have been addressing the problems. But if you do not understand the geography, you cannot understand the history very well and the economics and the politics.

First off, there are 1,098 municipalities. Many of these municipalities are very, very small. Most of them are in the mountains. Bogota, here is 7 million people in Bogota. Medellin, which is up a little higher in the mountains, is 2 million people. Cali, which is down over here in the mountains closer to the eastern Pacific, is about 2 million people. Cartagena, which is up kind of in between the edge of Panama and the larger mountain to the top, is about 1 million people. Santa Marta, up towards the big mountain, is about half a million people.

What you see is the bulk of the people are actually in the mountains, but there are small municipalities scattered all through the mountains. Then there are some out here in the Amazon; but the Amazon basin, this whole green area over there, is basically uninhabited except for a very small native population. There are no roads to connect it. There are no airstrips other than the occasional coca producer plain, that it is basically undeveloped. There are a few cities, Barraquilla up towards the mountain between Cartagena and Santa Marta is another 2 million in the city; but other than Barraquilla and Cartagena on the coast, that coast is more developed. This coast has no big cities on it, and most of the people are in the mountains.

So most of the democracy, the histories, the traditions in Colombia are in the mountains, not in the Amazon basin or along the coast.

Well, how did that happen and why did it happen? Partly because they have great temperatures. In Bogota now, it is basically 70 to 72 degrees during the day, and it is about 40 to 50 at night. If you go another time of the year, it is in the 70s during the day and about 40 to 50 at night. In other words, it is fairly stable because Bogota is up at 5,000 to 6,000 feet. So are the other cities. So one thing you had was stable weather.

A second thing which is important to understand, and I should have said this earlier, is that Colombia is the oldest democracy in South America, 200 years. You get this impression sometimes from the news media and other people that all of South and Central America, where all these military dictatorships that do not have a tradition, that Colombia just fights all the time, that they have these revolutions all the time. No, they do not. They have had periods of violence and different things. They had one military general dictatorship for 4 years in the 1950s. That is it. It has been a functioning democracy.

We did not have the most stable government during our Civil War either. Abraham Lincoln held it together the best he could; but we were fighting with each other, and we had a period of civil war, too. In other words, the period of civil war, true, where you had a military governance and a period of civil war was basically the same as the United States.

So Americans who point the finger and say Colombia is a violent country, it is not true. They are an old democracy, an old democracy. Basically, why was Bogota with 7 million people and Medellin with a couple of million people and Cali with a couple of million people, why are they in the mountains? Because to move 100 kilometers, which would be 60 miles, can take you up to 4 hours, 25 kilometers an hour, because you have these roads moving between these cities. Now, if you have a decent road, you can get all the way up to 25 miles an hour. It takes a long time to move between the cities.

So why are they there? Well, because probably more Americans have been to, I think it is safe to say, Hawaii than Colombia. If you go to the Big Island in Hawaii, where are you going to find the coffee? The coffee in Central America, Hawaii, and South America is at elevations between usually 3,000 to 6,000 feet. If you go south of Kahlua-Kona and the famous Kona coffee region in Hawaii, you are going to see the same pattern that you see in Guatemala, in Ecuador, in Colombia and elsewhere, that is, somewhere around mid-afternoon some rain comes in. There is some cloud cover. You are high enough up in the mountains that you get rain and you get steady rain. At the same time, you do not get so much that it drowns your crops. You have the drying out in the elevation, and it gives you a mix.

So you tend to see coffee at 3,000 to 6,000 elevation and with good soil. Colombia's coffee region is in this zone in here where the people are because, for many years, it was Colombian coffee that was their key ingredient that kept their economy going. Ironically, because coffee plantations are relatively small, as you see if you go to Hawaii and other places, it has not been a business that really thrives on huge conglomerate farms. Because you have that mid-size farm, you see this tradition of more, it is not as much of the middle class as the United States, but unlike other countries, where you see, say, bananas dominate or other products completely dominate like oil, like Venezuela, you do not have just a few rich people controlling 90 percent of the wealth. You have more of a middle class, thanks to the historic part of coffee.

But guess what else you have in those mountains: you have gold in those hills. Interestingly, you also have not too far from Bogota almost all the emerald mines in the world. So interestingly, let me give you a little side point that is lost and is very wrapped up in our immigration debate in the United States.

The number one source of income in pretty much every country, in Central America certainly, and even increasingly in South America, is expatriated income. What does that mean? It means that for all the complaining about the wage rates in the United States that the Mexicans who come in the United States, the Guatemalans, the Salvadorans, the Hondurans, Ecuadorans send somewhere between 25 and 50 percent of their wages back to their home country. It started in the smaller countries that that income became greater than any crop they produced; but even Mexico, until the recent rise in oil prices, the expatriated income going back to Mexico was greater than even their oil revenues because their number one business that they export anymore are immigrants who send part of their income back to their country.

Colombia, when I was there last week from Fort Wayne, Indiana, my hometown, we have regional connections. We are a regional airport, but not a hub airport. So everywhere we go, every week when I go back and forth, I live in Fort Wayne and my family is in Fort Wayne, when I go back and forth, I have to take a plane to Detroit or to Cincinnati or to Cleveland or to Chicago or to somewhere to get to Washington. But I could take a plane to Atlanta. I had about an hour and a half in Atlanta and then a plane straight from Atlanta to Bogota.

Bottom line is, I could go from Fort Wayne, Indiana, to Bogota in about net, from the time I got to the Fort Wayne airport with that layover to Bogota, about 9 hours. To come from Fort Wayne to Washington, DC, takes me four to five, and I had the same number of plane switches. Now, with that type of access into Miami from Cartagena, you are talking like an hour and a half flight. It is just a basic short hop over.

Now that said, we have between 600,000 and 800,000 Colombian immigrants in the United States. They tend to be, based on studies, the highest educated group of immigrants from anywhere we have for a variety of reasons, but the bottom line is that expatriated income to Colombia is about $3 billion. It is 3 percent of their national income.

Now, what sent me into that discussion was gold and emeralds and jewelry are 5.7 percent of their gross national product. Meaning that in gold and emeralds alone, forget coffee which is a huge percent, that they have more of an internal economy than almost anybody in all of Central and South America.

Now, when you look at that, the mix of what they have in their economy, it is not just about gold and emeralds. I know many people, like me, are fascinated with gold and emeralds, and many people are fascinated with coffee; but few people know that the same areas that were doing the coffee and where the gold and emeralds are, when you look at why is so much of the population in Bogota and Medellin and Cali, you have to look at flowers.

Sixty-seven percent of cut flowers in the United States come from Colombia. The flight connections that I just talked about not only work for people; it goes even faster for freight, because the freight companies can do a direct flight into the different regional places and then distribute it. Think about that. If you buy cut flowers, the four big seasons are, I find this interesting, Mother's Day is the biggest, not Valentine's Day. It says something still for our values in the United States. Mother's Day is number one. Valentine's Day is number two. Then I cannot remember whether Christmas or Thanksgiving.

The four big periods that they basically put the stuff in all these huge kind of, for lack of a better word, greenhouses on steroids, just huge floral operations are located near the different airports because the key thing is how to move these flowers into the United States in basically 24 hours so they can get into the huge chains, the Wal-Marts, the Meyers'es, the Safeways, the Targets, the huge grocery operation wholesalers where most flowers are sold.

□ 2030

We are not talking about what you might get from your local greenhouse; we are talking about the huge operations where flowers are sold. The only real rival is Ecuador on roses. Colombia dominates 67 percent of the American market. Guatemala, I think, has some orchids. So you may find certain specialty flowers in some areas, but Colombia is basically where all our flowers come from. And flowers constitute nearly twice as much as expatriated income.

In other words, now we have got coffee, we have got gold and emeralds and jewelry, and we have flowers. But there is also apparel. Medellin, in particular, is known as an apparel center. So you have another sector of the economy, apparel, that is around 5 percent.

Now, the reason I am raising this is when I get into the drug question, part of the reason we think of, well, these countries, like Afghanistan, I would guess, it is safe to say right now that about 70 to 80 percent of their working economy is related to heroin.

But Colombia isn't dependent on coca; coca is a small percentage. They have businesses in Colombia. They had businesses in Colombia. They had successful markets in Colombia. America's drug addiction hurt their business. It wasn't that they needed to have a product to sell.

When you go to Bolivia, which had tin, and now President Alva Morales, who came out of the coca growers, because it was very hard to do substitution of other things because coca had been such a critical thing to the Cuchabama area, where President Morales was from, and it was done by a lot of the native peoples. And it is a very difficult question for he and others to handle in a country like Bolivia. But in Colombia they had a different country that was corrupted by America's and Europe's drug habits.

Now, I mentioned apparel, flowers, coffee, gold and jewelry, and others. But guess what their two biggest things are? One is oil. Oil constitutes 26 percent of their exports. There are two big operators and then a smaller EcoPetrol is the Colombian company that is a partner; and basically Colombia owns the ground and the resources. The operating companies are two, B.P. and Occidental.

Occidental is in this range up in there. Now, the question comes, how do you get the oil from there, which is part of this gigantic field that is coming down from Venezuela, to the coast, because you have to go through the mountains? Now, in that challenge, because unlike the traditional things they had, the oil is scattered up there and down here, the second biggest category besides oil is coal. And coal is in this region right here. Neither of those things are in places where they have very many people.

Now, I want to do one other transition, but I want to illustrate that the biggest categories are energy and their biggest country that uses those imports is the United States. Colombia at one point was our eighth largest oil supplier. According to the President's energy plan, it is now emerging again as one of our primary oil countries. They have an estimate of 47 billion barrels in reserves. That is their estimate. That may be slightly high or it may be slightly low. But in this process of understanding how much oil is there, having a stable Colombia is important to our energy.

The coal mine there is either the second or third biggest in the world, and I will show some pictures of it in a few minutes. And when they get the new mine open, it will be the biggest in the world, and it is low sulfur coal, which means it is safer coal. And where it comes into, the bulk of it, the coal mine in that area is owned by a company that is based out of Alabama, and it is co-owned then with the Colombian Government, and the coal comes into the United States for our energy.

In fact, somewhere near 40 percent of their oil comes to the United States and somewhere near 15 percent or so of their exports are coal to the United States, critical energy sources if we are not going to mine it in the United States. And this is open-pit mining, as opposed to what we are doing mostly in the United States. We are sending miners down below. We have all seen the tragic accidents, and we are battling about mine safety standards in the United States.

But if we don't have coal and we don't do nuclear, and we have pretty well dammed about every river you can dam in the United States. And Canada is pretty much doing the same thing. We have pretty well put windmills about everywhere you can put windmills, and there is now objection and pushback when we do the big windmill farms. We are working with solar.

And there are people worried about oil; they are one of the big oil places where we have enough oil. But if you are going to shut off everything, then your costs are going to go up, because the less supply there is, the higher prices are going to be. And if you regulate it too much, nobody will go down and dig up the reserves in Colombia. So then it won't be so expensive, we just won't have any. We will just get to sit at home maybe and just freeze.

So there has to be an energy supply that helps keep the price down, and it needs to be balanced. And this is relatively clean in a country that is favorable to us.

And before I move into a little more depth with this, I want to share also, in

thinking about Colombia, a couple of other points. Pablo Escabar isn't the primary export or famous Colombian, but we don't necessarily think of the people we might know.

Grammy Award winning Colombian rock stars Shakira and Juanes sell out their concerts in the United States and around the world. They are very famous. I am more familiar with Shakira than Juanes, but they are both taking the U.S. market by storm. Fernando Botero is one of the world's most accomplished painters and sculptors. Wherever you go both in Colombia and other countries, you will see these big, kind of oversized Botero paintings and statues. It is an acquired taste. It is not my taste, but he is very famous.

Gabriel Garcia Marquez is among the world's most widely read novelists and has won basically every writing award you can, and has a home there in Cartagena and is from the countryside. Juan Pablo Montoya has sped to the top of the Formula 1 auto racing circuit. He's a very famous racing driver.

Colombia actress Catalina Sandino Moreno was nominated for an Academy Award for best actress this year in ''Maria Full of Grace.'' So when you watch the Academy Awards, you will see a Colombian as one of the nominees.

I am a big baseball fan, and while Colombia doesn't have as many shortstops as Venezuela, Edgar Renteria, Orlando Cabrera, and other Colombians are in baseball. Even if you set aside all these economic and industrial exports, they also export culture around the world.

The Colombians have stronger universities, they have more educated people, and people who are famously literate and writing many books, not just Marquez, but I wanted to use that as an illustration because we have a warped view in America about what Colombia is that makes it very hard for us to kind of tackle the battles on funding narcotics and what is actually happening in Colombia.

Now, let me talk just for a little here about what happened in the drug wars. To some degree in these areas, the most famous cartel probably in world history is the Medellin cartel. Medellin was the home of Pablo Escobar. Last week, when I was in Colombia, President Uribe, who is originally from the Medellin area, asked me what did I think about Medellin; how did it strike me. And I said, well, my impression of Medellin was that it was a dusty little town and up on the hill Pablo Escobar had this fantastic estate that he had bought with his billions of dollars of American cocaine money, and then bought these exotic animals and started a zoo, and all the people came up to his zoo because they didn't have anything else to do.

Then I flew into the airport that was above the city before we went to the other airport down in the city, and this is just one of their promotional brochures, but this is Medellin. Medellin isn't a dusty little town that Pablo Escobar had a little house above it with a zoo where people would go because there was nowhere else to go. Medellin is a city of 2 million people with all sorts of businesses functioning in it, with huge high-rises, parks all over the city, all sorts of athletic facilities and arts facilities, and with major universities there.

How in the world did Americans who were tracking it not understand what was happening in Medellin? Partly because of the violence.

I believe in my trip to Medellin this week I was the first Member of Congress to get into Medellin since all the coca wars broke out, because it has been so difficult to travel. Our ambassador was able to drive from Bogota to Medellin, and that is the first time an American ambassador has been able to go on that road for, I believe, 20 to 30 years. Things got really bad, and it left us with a really wrong impression about what Colombia is and what is happening in Colombia.

So Pablo Escobar was controlling the Medellin cartel. And Colombia has been probably the most cooperative country in all of Central and South America in working with extraditions, when we go after these big guys. Why? Why would the different presidents work with the United States when in other countries they have not worked as much with us on extraditing, that is, sending their criminals to the U.S. to go through our court systems? Partly because they had an economy. It was our drugs that wrecked their economy.

There has been some reluctance on the part of some of these countries to send their citizens back to the United States because they are worried. For all the talk about wanting to get rid of the drugs in their country, if they get rid of the drugs in their country, what is going to happen to their banks? Who will build the big buildings? Who will open all the stuff if you suck a couple billion dollars out of most economies and they sink? So to some degree, quite frankly, we get lip service.

But in Colombia they actually extradite, if we can prove the case, major drug criminals. So we broke the Medellin cartel.

Then many Americans know of the Cali cartel, which is another of the big cities I pointed to. It is more over in this zone in the mountains. So we had the Cali cartel, and we broke up the Cali cartel.

In the process of breaking up these cartels, there are three violent groups in Colombia that have dogged over the years and challenged democracy. Rather than participate in elections, because they do not have any support, they chose to use violence. One is the FARC. The FARC are probably the best known, the most violent, and the ones most embroiled in the drug trafficking.

I know some dissident groups want to make the FARC to be like their Che Guevara, communist revolutionaries who just want to have land reform, but, no, they are a bunch of drug-pushing drug addicts who want to violently overthrow their government because they won't participate in the democratic process. When they founded the FARC, for some of them it was about land reform, but it is long past that. They are basically thugs.

One young man I met, and I have been to Colombia now 11 times, it could be 10, it could be 12 times, somewhere in that range, since I was elected to Congress in 1994, but when you go into Colombia and you talk to them—and I went with colleagues who are now, both of them, governors, Governor Blagojevich and Governor Sanford, and we were waiting for Speaker HASTERT to come into the area.

We weren't as important at the time, so because there was a big rainstorm going on, they turned his helicopter around because they didn't think it was safe, but they brought us in by taking a handkerchief and cleaning off the windshield of the helicopter and trying to find the ground, so we were there for a little bit. And they brought in a captured FARC.

He was a young guy, and we asked him a question, and I can't remember if it was Mark or Rod who said, have you ever killed anybody? And he said, well, yes. And this kid is maybe 18 years old.

And we said, why did you kill him? He said, well, he hadn't paid his fees.

What do you mean, he hadn't paid his fees? He said, well, he owed us money and he didn't pay his fees. He said, I warned him.

We said, well, how did you kill him? He said, well, he was eating lunch at a restaurant and I came up behind him and I took the pistol and I shot him in the back of his head. He hadn't paid his fees.

Now, what the FARC does is they provided protection money first. In other words, if you wanted to grow coca for the different cartels, you paid the FARC, say 5, 10 percent, much like the Mafia worked in the United States in a shakedown operation, and then they ''protected'' you from U.S. forces. But then they decided that wasn't enough margin, so they started killing the people who wouldn't cooperate and grow coca. They didn't want you growing palm heart, they didn't want you growing bananas, they didn't want you growing coffee. Coca is more profitable, so we will shoot you if you don't.

So Colombia has a huge number of displaced persons right now at the Nelson Mandela kind of training center, a housing center outside the edge of Cartagena where I visited several years ago with Congressmen DAVIS and MORAN, and there are tens of thousands of people who have been chased out of these villages because they were being killed by the FARC for not cooperating in coca and they became drug runners.

The second big group are the paramilitaries, or the AUC. Now, what happened there was, many people started hiring guns, kind of Pinkerton detectives gone bad. They started hiring

guns to fight the FARC. So what happened is, the FARC would come in to one of these villages in the outer areas and basically shoot you if you didn't grow coca; then the paramilitaries, the AUC, would come in and kill you if you did grow coca. And pretty soon the AUC realized, hey, there is more money to be made in coca, so they start fighting over the different zones and over who gets to do the shakedowns. And what used to be the paramilitary protection, instead of operating as paramilitary protection, themselves became drug dealers.

However, interestingly, because of their history of being hired for protection, in this period of being hired for protection, the AUC, the paramilitaries, have about 10-to-12 public support where the FARC only has one or two.

□ 2045

Now from some of the leftist groups in the United States you would think the FARC has 10 to 12 percent or 20 or 30 or 40 percent, but they do not. They have minimal percent. But the paramilitaries, because they were trying to protect the villagers, had more but they went bad too.

Now the third group, the ELN tends to work in these mountains and the mountains up towards the top. The ELN basically does not appear to be as heavily involved in coca. Their business is kidnapping people. They kidnap people for ransom, and that is how they fund their group. Of the two, I do not know how you could say kidnapping is less egregious than coca because at least in kidnapping you just kill the individuals with you. They captured some new tribes' missionaries and killed them. We do not know for sure, but we have not heard from them for close to 8 years now. And others, if they do not get the ransom, the historic pattern is they kill them.

You always hope that the FARC has captured some of our U.S. soldiers, so we can hope they are alive. The FARC is a little different than the ELN. The ELN is kidnapping for money. The FARC is in the business of kidnapping for trade. And if you want to read a great book on the Diary of Kidnapping by Gabriel Marquez, it will give you some idea of what they put these different people through.

But the ELN also appears to, at times, be more willing to work with communities and less violent overall. Even though kidnapping is awful, they are not in the business of cocaine, which kills in the United States, illegal drugs kill in the United States 20- to 30,000 people a year of which a big chunk of that is cocaine.

So basically you are not just a kidnapper if you do cocaine; you are a murderer. You are a mass murderer if you are growing fields of cocaine. You can try to coat it over and say, oh, these poor peasants are just trying to make a living. Look, mass murderers. They are killing more people than somebody going into a school and killing six people.

A coca field growing may be killing thousands of people, depending on how it is broken and how it moves through the city. They are mass murderers in every step of that process. The grower is a mass murderer, the people who process it are mass murderers, the people who transit it are mass murderers, the people who sell it in the street are mass murderers because they are killing people with the cocaine.

It is not this kind of quiet little thing that you are drinking coffee on the side. It is killing people. And in trying to hold that accountable, we have these three different revolutionary groups that have more or less terrorized at the margin. At one point, at the peak of the Medellin cartel, which is what the movie Clear and Present Danger is about, based off the book, which is roughly, my first visit into Colombia, former Ambassador Busby was with us, and he was there during the period of the greatest violence. And I said, is the book Clear and Present Danger accurate? You were the ambassador during that period. And he said, not completely. I died in the book. But it was basically accurate in that somewhere in the vicinity of two-thirds of the judges and a big chunk of the legislative body was killed. Many mayors were killed.

It is one thing to say we have differences between the Republicans and Democrats and we argue on the House floor about how to do it. We argue back in our districts. But basically it is another thing if you are running for office and they are going to murder you.

President Uribe's father was assassinated. Vice President Santos was kidnapped and escaped. There are very few leaders who do not have huge prices on their heads. And particularly in that period it took incredible courage to be a leader in Colombia.

And then it came back up again after the groups. For a variety of reasons, we got control of the Medellin and Cali cartels. It looked like we were stabilizing it and it took off again, which led to the modern Plan Colombia.

The peak problem here in the second kind of wave that came up was, in the year 1999 Colombia, for all those things I was talking about, had a negative growth rate, the only year it has had a negative growth rate, about a 4 to 5 percent GDP that was negative.

How did they get a negative growth rate? Well, one thing is that I talked about the oil fields up here. That pipeline has to go over the mountains, and in that area, Occidental Petroleum, the oil that was headed for Houston and into the United States, had 91 percent of their oil production stopped that year because they basically had, I think it was 200 pipeline attacks that, even at a fast speed, it takes you a while to fix the pipeline, 24, 48, 72 hours, basically meaning nothing got from the oil fields. Nine percent got there.

I earlier said that oil was 40 percent of their exports. You knock out oil, you cannot get any money.

The big coal mine that we visited, if you are there, how do you get it to the ocean? Certainly not by roads. There are no roads in the jungle. At this huge coal mine the people driving the trucks, let me give you an idea of the scale of this coal mine.

In the U.S. roads nothing can be bigger than 40 tons. Their trucks are 140 tons that this particular coal operation is. It just gives a vague idea of the size of this mine; it is just an incredible scale. You can see a truck that is a 140-ton truck there.

I have been in the iron mines in Montana and Arizona and in northern Minnesota, whether it is copper or iron, the open pit mining. You are talking in this little tiny corner is when we talk about the huge mines. And, in fact, much of this area has already been covered up and started to be reclaimed.

Now, this huge mine, these guys who are driving these 140-ton trucks, they did not know how to drive a car. There are no roads there, or to the degree there are roads, it takes you at most, I said, 15 miles an hour. So most of these drivers, they are training the Colombians, the Drummond oil mine, which is, I mean the coal mine people who come out of Alabama, this is a book on what they have done for social balance. Because when you are up—let me show one other picture, and I want to go back to the big map. I want to show this one for a second from Drummond. This is the coal cars.

In Indiana we have a law that you cannot, a train cannot block an intersection for more than 20 minutes. I asked, do you have a 20-minute rule? They said, no, we have a 30-minute rule.

Now, in that map, and I will have it back up in a minute, but basically it has to go from that coal mine all the way out to the Caribbean Sea. They load 90 cars at a time with coal. The 30-minute rule, because they only have one track, that track has to shut down for 30 minutes so the empty cars can come back in to get reloaded. The operation goes 24/7, 365 days a year. In other words, basically it is a permanent block to an intersection. They do not have a 20-minute rule. The 30-minute rule means you switch directions. So basically you would need an overpass. But they do not have any roads anyway. It is a jungle.

Now what happened with Drummond, because if you are out in the middle of nowhere and you are doing constant filling of train cars as far as the eye can see that direction, as far as the eye can see that direction, that are going 24/7, and you do not have anybody who can drive the trucks, and you do not have very many people, what do you have to do? You have to build the infrastructure.

So they have been building schools in the area. They have been building housing in the area. They have been

doing health care in the area. Seven thousand meals a day are served by Drummond coal mine because when you come into this coal mine they have different various places where you can eat. They provide multiple shifts for people to eat. And they provide 7,000 meals a day, which means that is an incredible food operation. It is an incredible health care operation. And what they have chosen to do is invest in the infrastructure and the people.

Now, what is interesting about this investment in people is that part of the challenge that you have, if you are going to change the drug patterns in Colombia, is you have to have some alternatives for the people. So here is roughly where the coal mine was. It goes up by that big mountain up there and it comes, the train track will go somewhat similar to the oil pipeline.

The trains in 1999 were being shot up and intercepted. You could not get anybody to get coal out if you are going to die, so until you could get a little bit of order, they could not ship coal. So they had a negative growth rate, not because Colombia did not have products, but because Americans got so addicted to cocaine, and Europe got so addicted to cocaine, that it brought a violent group of people into their nation that made their railroads not working, that made their oil pipelines not working, not to mention the mining and the textiles.

Now, what they have now, well, in that railroad in the area, when we were there—and like I say, once again, we were some of the first people to be able to move around in the country. So going up there, I said, are the FARC around here and the ELN and so on? And the president of the company says, no, they are not in the immediate area. They are over there.

Now, over there was, ELN was in the north mountains about 10 miles away and the FARC were in two locations in the south mountains between 8 and 12 miles away. To me that was close. My little hometown of Grayville, Indiana, is 15 miles from downtown Fort Wayne, and I think of it as close to Fort Wayne; and when I said, are they close, I was thinking, Grayville to Fort Wayne terms to me is close, and this is half the distance. But at least they are up in the mountains.

Well, why are they up in the mountains? Two reasons. One is the Uribe government has provided protection. For example, there are now police stations in every municipality. All 1,098 in Colombia now have a Colombian national police presence, which they did not have in 1999. On that train track they have police every so many minutes with a cell phone, and they are each supposed to call in; and if they do not call in, the army goes in to find out what has happened at that point of the track.

So when Members of Congress say, why did you vote for money for pipeline protection, why did you vote for money for this, it is because we are trying to stabilize the railroad tracks and the pipelines, because if you can do that, the reason the ELN went to the hills is, thousands of these people are working for Drummond coal mine. When they are working for Drummond coal mine and getting health care and getting education and having a job, they do not want a bunch of revolutionaries around. It is not good for their lives. And so they basically fight back.

Now, let me give you a couple of other stories. We spent $4 billion in Colombia. They spent $9 billion, and that $13 billion is what has led to this change in the pipeline. It has led to a change in the ability to move around on the roads. It has led to the change that now they are going to put a second track in on that railroad which will enable us to get more coal into the United States in our southern ports and in our East Coast, low sulfur coal that is environmentally much more favorable to the United States. Because the money that we have invested and the Colombians have invested has stabilized the mountainous zones in the north Colombian zones to a greater degree than it has been for a long time.

Now the economy is growing at a 3 to 5 percent rate, not a negative growth rate like it was in 1999. There is a direct relationship between security and the ability to have economic alternatives.

Let me briefly describe what we did last—well, I said I went to Colombia 10 to 12 times, somewhere in that range; I am guessing 11. But the first time I went to Colombia was not that long after I got elected. We went in and we were the first delegation other than I think Senator SPECTER had been into Cartagena for just a brief period. But we were the first ones to go into the center of the country, into Bogota.

We were allowed to come in for 3 hours. When we landed at the airport we were to duck down, get in a basically tinted window car with machine guns coming out of it, with sharpshooters on all the roofs at the airport all along the route till we got to the embassy. We had so many police going around, anybody who was walking on the sidewalk had to go up to the side of the walls, one person basically kept walking. The police cop went up and pushed them against the wall because they were so afraid we were going to get assassinated.

Ambassador Busby, former Ambassador Busby, who I referred to earlier, who lived and did not die in the book Clear and Present Danger, said he had over $1 million price on his head if they knew he was there. It was a very dangerous place, but we felt we needed to make a statement that we were going to stand with Colombia.

The next time I went back, and the next couple of times we were able to stay finally overnight, I think, about the third or fourth trip. One of the trips we went in with the former chairman of the International Relations Committee Ben Gilman, a couple of different times as well as with then-Chairman HASTERT that we went into the hospitals because unlike other places in the country and the world, Colombians are dying.

The Colombian national police have lost the equivalent of 30,000 American police officers, given the size and proportion. They are getting shot up all the time. They are not getting shot up because somebody is robbing a bank. They are getting shot up because Americans are using cocaine. Because Americans are using cocaine, they are shooting their police. But they have been willing to fight.

This is partly what we are trying to do in Iraq. What is happening in Colombia is what we are trying to do in Iraq. Colombia has a democracy that we are trying to rescue and keep from going down the tubes, so to speak, and it looks like they are well on their way back.

But we built up their national police. Then we took vetted units in the military that had a horrible human rights track record. It has been a big battle.

We had a ban on U.S. funds going there. We got vetted units. Now they have attorneys that walk around with their different things and they have to graph, if somebody gets killed, which way they were lying so they know they did not use human rights torture.

Sometimes it can be inconvenient when you are fighting terrorists.

But quite frankly, Colombia is doing the best job and the best human rights job of fighting terrorists who do not follow human rights rules, who are more than willing to shoot you in back, are more than willing to use torture. But we have trained vetted units, and whereas in the 1990s, to be kind, the Colombian military defense establishment could not have fought their way out of a paper bag, I have a small town of, say, New Haven in my district of 14,000, I do not think their military could have defeated the New Haven police department.

And their equipment was better than the New Haven police department. They just did not know how to fight. They did not have command and control systems. They ran when they got in a fight with the FARC and it was a disaster.

We trained units who are now winning battles and it is hard to win battles with terrorists. And it is the Colombians who are fighting that we have done the training, and they are even buying equipment. We put 4 billion in, but they put 9 billion in. Even though the drug problem was our problem, not their problem, they have enough of an economy that it is working.

What we are trying to do in Iraq is what is working in Colombia. It has been an investment that has helped rebuild and establish the country of Colombia, such that the kidnappings are down like 67 percent. You can now move around the country. I started to say then after our first trip we were

able then finally to stay after visiting a hospital a couple of times, finally able to stay overnight.

□ 2100

The first time I stayed overnight in Bogota, they took us underneath the hotel just like in the movies and had all these police jumping out; and when we slept in our room, we had multiple police outside each of our doors and on the floor and the perimeter around Colombia. That was a different experience. Finally, they let us go out to eat somewhere other than the hotel. This may have been about the sixth or seventh trip. They let us go out to eat, and when we would go out to eat, we would have to go the wrong way on a one-way street. They would have to seal off the restaurant to make sure that they were not going to assassinate the American Congressmen when we went out to eat. But it was progress. We were going out to eat and we did not have as many police around the hotel, and it showed that there was a gradual progress occurring.

Then we got to go to Cartagena. Then we got to walk around town in Cartagena. Then I went to President Uribe's inauguration; and what I would call a minor setback was as I was sitting with BARNEY FRANK and we heard this big boom, Congressman FRANK said, I have never heard of a one-gun salute. And it was a bomb, mortar shells hitting the side of the presidential palace while we were all inside. We had a cadre of about 20,000 troops around; but these guys, who were getting more and more sophisticated, launched the mortar shells from about 1¼ miles away from the top of a building. As they launched those shells, they were not very accurate and they first were short. Then they hit an apartment building that killed, I think, 40 people and injured 100 or something like that. Then they launched over the palace and they hit the side of the palace where we all were.

But by that time, I think they got 20 or 25 rounds out of 110, but by that time the Colombian Air Force and Army were on their case and they stopped shooting. But that was just about 4½ years ago with the inauguration of President Uribe. So then we continued to make progress.

Now, I mentioned the ambassador could drive. This time we were able to go to Medellin. Nobody has been able to go to Medellin. We were able to go to the coal mine. Nobody has been able to go to the coal mine. We had protection. Yes, we were still in an armored vehicle, but it was a disguised armored vehicle. There were not any machine guns sticking out of it. Yes, the people around us had protection, but you did not see machine guns. And, yes, one of the police cops had a machine gun, but basically they were providing traffic guidance to try to move us. The meeting with President Uribe and others, they did not have a big army surrounding us like we were going to get killed before. You are cautious. It is still a violent country. But we are cautious in parts of our urban cities.

The plain truth is that we have made progress in Colombia in establishing freedom and democracy and giving alternatives. In Medellin, we visited an AUC demobilization center. I mentioned they were the second biggest group, the paramilitaries. 21,000 have now laid down their arms, and we are investing and with some of the money we are eradicating coca to now get these people jobs and to track them and to match them up like the floral industry that is booming in Medellin. And we there met four of the people who had been displaced people from their villages, and we also met a former armed person who had been very violent with the AUC and who has now been trained and went back to get his college degree. Things are really changing in Colombia, thanks in part to our investment.

We still have problems in coca, and the reason I wanted to show you this map is, guess what has happened. The coca has moved out here. It has moved into the jungle. But it is not terrorizing the people. Colombia now has a growing economy. They are providing us with critical things; and with that growing economy, they have asked the United States Government to buy with their money eight Blackhawk helicopters because we have their economy going again. We have stabilized it. It is still a challenge. I am disappointed we have not gotten rid of the coca as much as we thought we would with Plan Colombia, but we have made progress. We have a friend in the region.

Now, this week President Uribe and President Bush have agreed to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement that at some point will come in front of the Congress. No free trade agreement is easy. This is very critical. It was very important for President Uribe to understand that in this process he could not put out everybody in his country and understand in the United States we could not put out.

So, for example, in sugar he would have liked more free trade in sugar. I would have liked more free trade in sugar. In Fort Wayne, Indiana we have Edie's, the largest ice cream plant in the world. We have Kraft caramels up in Kendallville. Bread uses sugar. In Huntington, Indiana, Good Humor has the second biggest ice cream plant in the world. We use sugar. In the South, in Louisiana and Florida, there is a sugar lobby that wants to keep our sugar prices high; but ultimately they are very powerful and in agreement our sugar guys got some protection for a while, for a long while, quite frankly. Way too long for me.

But at the same time in Colombia they grow rice. And if they, in fact, took the rice business away from having some protection, over 15 years they will make the adjustments and you can do that. So this trade agreement is a balanced trade agreement, trying to work it through.

One of the interesting things is, to give you another kind of wrinkle on how economics work and how trade agreements work, I never thought I would be having a discussion about chicken hindquarters. Colombians tend to prefer dark meat, and Americans tend to prefer white meat. What happens in a trade agreement to say we are suddenly going to have free trade, guess what our chicken companies are going to do? We are going to dump all dark meat on Colombia under its value and put all the Colombian chicken people out of business, which a very important thing in their small villages are their chicken people. So they had to have some kind of protection for hind parts.

But guess who else wanted to have some kind of balance in handling chicken hind parts? Our corn growers. We ship incredible amounts of corn into Colombia. At lunch one of the days, next to me was the head of Archer Daniels Midland in Colombia. He was a Colombian, had been educated in the United States. And the corn that comes in from the Midwest, huge quantities, and in some areas all our corn is going down to Colombia for the chicken farms. If they do not have any chicken farms, we are not going to sell them any corn, which is, I think, our second biggest export to Colombia. We are not going to sell any corn to Colombia if we kill the chicken market. So when you work these exchanges through, both countries, I believe, in this have a balance between the political realities of Colombia and the political realities of the United States.

But here is the bottom line: free trade agreements like this with Colombia will help fuel the economy that has stabilized there more than anywhere else. With Chavez going crazy up there choking us on oil, we need to know where we are going to get oil and energy. We need to know who is going to be our friends in South America. And we need to work with countries that are there.

We also have a secondary motive here. If they grow coca rather than chickens, if they grow coca rather than getting emeralds and gold out of the mine, if they grow coca instead of selling us coal, if they grow coca instead of textiles, we die and Europe dies. We have an incentive directly with the nation of Colombia to make sure that we can make their economy work, that we can make their government successful, that we can have law and order in Colombia, because what is good for them is goods for us; what is good for us is good for them. That is the way it should work.

And I am very pleased that the Presidents of both countries have signed this agreement, and I hope that whether it is this year or next year, we can move that forward because it is extremely important to Central America, South America, and to the United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. LATOURETTE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of family reasons.

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. MCKINNEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

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

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HONDA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MATSUI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEAVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, March 2.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILCHREST, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOODE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2771. An act to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition to the Permanent-Select Committee on Intelligence and to the Committee on Financial Institutions for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, 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:

6347. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0145; FRL-7757-9] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6348. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Management and Disposal; Standards for Pesticide Containers and Containment; Notification to the Secretary of Agriculture [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0327; FRL-7749-1] (RIN: 2070-AB95) received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6349. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) and Acquisition Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) will exceed the 25 percent certification threshold against its Acquisition Program Baseline, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6350. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report of the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense to civilian sporting events in support of essential security and safety, covering the period of calendar year 2005, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2564(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6352. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2006-06, Waiving Conditions on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for Planning, Design, and Construction of a Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia for Calendar Year 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6353. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Report to Congress on Head Start Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2004,'' as required by Section 641(e) of the Head Start Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6354. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Community Food and Nutrition Program for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6355. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Energy Information Administration's report entitled ''Annual Energy Outlook 2006,'' pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6356. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 396(k)(3)(B)(iii)(V); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6357. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunications entities, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 396 (m) (2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6358. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Data Collection in Response to Section 1404 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6359. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Department's Energy Fleet Alternative Fuel Vehicle Acquisition Report, Compliance with EPAct and E.O. 13149 in Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6360. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on the benefits of enhanced demand response in electricity markets in compliance with Section 1252 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6361. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report on the steps taken along with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to establish a system to make available to all transmission system owners and Regional Transmission Organizations within the Eastern and Western Interconnections real-time information on the functional status of all transmission lines within such Interconnections, pursuant to Section 1839 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6362. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Finding of Attainment for Ajo Particulate Matter of 10 Microns or Less (PM10) Nonattainment Area; Determination Regarding Applicability of Certain Clean Air Act Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-AZ-0006; RL-8029-2] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6363. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementaion Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-CA-0014; FRL-8027-9] received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6364. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Refractory Products Manufacturing [OAR-2002-0088;

FRL-8008-02] (RIN: 2060-AM90) received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6365. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to Toxic Substances Compliance Monitoring Grants (TSCA Section 28) Regulation [OECA-2005-0082; FRL-8031-4] (RIN: 2070-AJ24) received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6366. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implemtation Plans; Georgia Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [GA-200533; FRL-8022-4] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6367. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Dearborn County Sulfur Dioxide Emission Limits [EPA-R05-OAR-2005-IN-0007; FRL-8036-3] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6368. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-AZ- 008; FRL-8022-5] received February 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6369. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2006-0086; FRL-8037-9] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6370. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Wisconsin Construction Pemit Permanency SIP Revision [EPA-R05-OAR-2005-056 3; FRL-8037-4] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6371. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New Hampshire: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R01-RCRA-2006-0062; FRL-8038-3] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6372. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State Implementation Plan Revision and Alternate Permit Program; Territory of Guam [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-0506; FRL-8030-3] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6373. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Affirmative Defense Provisions for Startup and Shutdown; Common Provisions Regulation and Regulation No. 1 [EPA-R08-OAR-2005-CO-0004; FRL-8029-7] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6374. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to the Rate of Progress Plan for the Beaumont/Port Arthur Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-TX-0003; FRL-8034-7] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6375. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives; Removal of Reformulated Gasoline Oxygen Content Requirement for California Gasoline and Revision of Commingling Prohibition to Address Non-Oxygenated Reformulated Gasoline in California [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0170; FRL-8035-2] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6376. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives; Removal of Reformulated Gasoline Oxygen Content Requirement and Revision of Commingling Prohibition to Address Non-Oxygenated Reformulated Gasoline [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0170; FRL-8035-1] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6377. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — TSCA Inventory Update Reporting Partially Exempted Chemicals List; Addition of Certain Vegtable-based Oils, Soybean Meal, and Xylitol [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2006-0025; FRL-7760-7] (RIN: 2070-AC61) received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6378. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Stationary Combustion Turbines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0490; FRL-8033-4] (RIN: 2060-AM79) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6379. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0055; FRL-8030-7] received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6380. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Electric Utility Steam Generating Units for Which Construction is Commenced After September 18, 1978; Standards of Performance for Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units; and Standards of Performance for Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Genrating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0031; FRL-8033-3] (RIN: 2060-AM80) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6381. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's actions taken to date and a timetable for further actions needed to conclude its investigation into the unjust or unreasonable charges incurred by California during the 2000-2001 electricity crisis, pursuant to Section 1824 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6382. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the second report of 2005, as required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10268; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6383. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the second report of 2005, as required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10268; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6384. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on Fiscal Year 2005 Competitive Sourcing Efforts in accordance with section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004, Pub. L. 108-199; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6385. A letter from the Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office, transmitting information concerning GAO employees who were assigned to congressional committees during fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6386. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Definition of Federal Election Activity [Notice 2006-2] received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

6387. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indian General Assistance Program 2006 Grants Administration Guidance [FRL-8024-7] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6388. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6389. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's biennial report entitled ''2004 Status of the Nation's Surface Transportation System: Condition and Performance Report,'' pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 308(e)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's plans to implement improvements to the Inland waterway navigation projects on the Ohio River at John T. Myers Locks and Dam, Indiana and Kentucky, and Greenup Locks and Dam, Ohio and Kentucky; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6391. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on the foreign aviation authorities to which the Federal Aviation Administration provided services for Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to Public Law 103–305, section 202; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6392. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Transportation Statistics Annual Report

2005, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111(j); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6393. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Availibility of Final Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Nonylphenol [FRL-OW-8035-8] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6394. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Availibility of Final Recommended Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Diazinon [FRL-OW-8035-9] received February 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6395. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil Pollution Prevention; Non-Transportation Related Onshore Facilities [EPA-HQ-OPA-2005-0003; FRL-8033-9] (RIN: 2050-AG28) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6396. A letter from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting the National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust's annual management report covering FY 2005, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231n Public Law 107–90, section 105; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 702. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–381). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 4824. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for cardiac rehabilitation and pulmonary rehabilitation services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require a licensee to notify the State, county, and public in which a facility is located whenever there is an unplanned release of fission products in excess of allowable limits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. HERGER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 4826. A bill to extend through December 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the processing of permits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4827. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 4828. A bill to provide grants to units of local government and States to hire personnel to monitor the activities of sex offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. HERSETH, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 4829. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to require the incorporation of counterfeit-resistant technologies into the packaging of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized construction, financing, or reckless permitting (on one's land) the construction or use of a tunnel or subterranean passageway between the United States and another country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 4831. A bill to confirm as authorized, valid, and enforceable certain contractual rights of water users and water users organizations under the Strawberry Valley Project, Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish an Office of Health Information Technology for the purpose of creating a national interoperable health information infrastructure, to provide loans to health care entities seeking to implement such infrastructure, and to provide exceptions to certain health anti-kickback laws to encourage the dissemination of health information technology; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 4833. A bill to require that only United States persons may control security operations at seaports in the United States or enter into agreements to conduct such security operations; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business tax credit for contributions to education scholarship organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to promote investments in mine safety; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENEY (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MACK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create Catastrophe Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tax incentives for higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 4838. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 4839. A bill to prohibit entities owned or controlled by foreign governments from conducting certain operations at seaports in the United States, and from entering into agreements to conduct such operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish requirements for appointment of the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend the Ojito Wilderness Act to make a technical correction; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. POE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 4842. A bill to ensure the security of United States ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Con. Res. 349. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H. Res. 701. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of conference reports on omnibus appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 703. A resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster and supporting continued efforts to control radiation and mitigate the adverse health consequences related to the Chernobyl nuclear power plant; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 704. A resolution congratulating the University of Maryland on the occasion of its 150th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H. Res. 705. A resolution recognizing and congratulating Apolo Anton Ohno for his historic performances in short track speedskating at the 2006 and 2002 Olympic Winter Games; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 97: Mr. FARR, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 354: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 363: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 376: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 450: Mr. DENT, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 633: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 717: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 791: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 839: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 933: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 998: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 999: Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 1053: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 1108: Mr. COSTA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1131: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1136: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1219: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1330: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1414: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1517: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 1518: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1545: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1561: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1595: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1615: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1639: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1642: Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1696: Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 1704: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1956: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

H.R. 2231: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2290: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 2348: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 2389: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2390: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2554: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 2567: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2646: Mr. PENCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2788: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 2804: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 2861: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2962: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 3072: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3096: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3127: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AKIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3352: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 3361: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3476: Ms. HART, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 3547: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3565: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3569: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3628: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3774: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3861: Mr. DICKS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3931: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 3940: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3957: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 4030: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4062: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 4063: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERWOOD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 4085: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 4139: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4156: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4166: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4201: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4211: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 4217: Mr. WELLER and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 4259: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 4298: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 4315: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4318: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 4361: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 4366: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 4407: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 4411: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4465: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SABO, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4493: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 4517: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 4537: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 4561: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 4582: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 4621: Ms. HART.

H.R. 4623: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4672: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 4706: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4715: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4716: Mr. RENZI and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 4725: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4737: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 4738: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 4746: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4749: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4751: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 4756: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 4761: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 4774: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 4777: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 4794: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4800: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 4807: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. KUHL of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 4813: Mr. HERGER.

H. J. Res. 53: Mr. TURNER.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 179: Mr. TERRY.

H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 339: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 116: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 305: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 498: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SABO.

H. Res. 521: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 526: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 566: Mr. TANNER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. CARSON.

H. Res. 578: Mr. SULLIVAN.

H. Res. 601: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 658: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 662: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 665: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. CASE.

H. Res. 673: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Res. 681: Mr. HOLT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DENT, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. KUHL of New York.

H. Res. 690: Mr. CARTER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. PAUL.

H. Res. 693: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 694: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2006 No. 24

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

We receive this day from You, our God, with all of its uniqueness. Thank You for the fresh possibilities and opportunities. Use our lawmakers today as a creative force for good. Give them the discernment to see what new thing You are doing in our day, and the willingness to receive Your guidance. Remind them that to whom much is given, much is expected. May Your love reach out through them to touch our hurting world.

Lord, increase our hunger and thirst for righteousness and freedom.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning, following the time for the two leaders, we will have a brief period for closing remarks related to S. 2271, the PATRIOT Act amendments legislation. The vote on passage of that bill is scheduled for 10 a.m. this morning. Immediately following that vote we will recess in order for the Senate to proceed to the House of Representatives for the joint meeting. The purpose of that 11 a.m. joint meeting is to hear an address by the Prime Minister of Italy. We will return to business following that address at 12 noon to continue work on the PATRIOT Act. We will have a cloture vote on the underlying conference report to accompany the PATRIOT Act legislation.

There are two additional procedural votes that may be requested from the other side of the aisle. We should not need those. I hope we do not have to proceed with those votes so we can expeditiously proceed to the cloture vote. If all of these votes are necessary, we could have three consecutive votes around noon today.

Once cloture is invoked, we wish to work out a time for the adoption of the PATRIOT Act conference report with no further delay.

In addition to the PATRIOT Act, we are working on a process to consider the LIHEAP bill introduced by the senior Senator from Maine. Yesterday I filed a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to that bill. I hope that will not be necessary, but I will continue to consult with Senators about a process that allows the Senate to vote on the underlying LIHEAP issue. In the meantime, this cloture vote would occur tomorrow unless some other agreement is worked out.

Again, I remind our colleagues to be prompt for this morning's vote so we can recess on time and proceed to the joint meeting.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I hope it is not necessary to have cloture on the LIHEAP matter. It has been cleared on our side and I understand the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is doing everything he can to have it cleared on his side. If the cloture vote is necessary, we will move forward as rapidly as possible. It is something we need to do. Both Senator FRIST and I have committed to move this bill as quickly as we can. I hope that can be done.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, could I ask, through the Chair to the Democratic leader, to express an opinion first, and that is we absolutely have to proceed with this pensions legislation. I know my distinguished colleague has come to the floor and said certain things about why we are not proceeding to conference, but it does come down to the fact that in November we passed this bill and the House passed it about a month later. At that point in time I said the conferees would be seven and five. As the Democratic leader knows, that is, after consultation—with consultation to the Democratic leader—the prerogative of the majority leader. I have been consistent with that.

We have waited a couple of months for a response and the Democratic leader has given us a response, but the response is that it is unacceptable, we need more people—because of things going on within their caucus.

I think it is time to stop—both. Everybody stop playing games and let's get to conference. It is an important issue. We had this April 15 deadline. We finished work on the floor now 3 months ago, and yet we had this bickering about the number of conferees. I know it is tough. We have been in conversation about what those numbers should be. It is going to be 7 to 5. And it is tough. The tax reconciliation bill we just did was 2 to 1. It is always tough, telling our fellow Senators that, no, you can't be on this conference report because we want a reasonable number of people.

I would make another plea that we proceed, that the other side of the aisle

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

appoint their five. We are ready to appoint our seven. We could go to conference this afternoon. We could address the issue. It is alleged either that there are other sort of motivations on our side or that we are not interested in this pension bill. It is gamesmanship and partisanship and it is wrong. It is time to get to the bill itself. We care about it. It is important to the American people. We have done the work on the Senate floor. We have the number of conferees. My seven are ready to go and I make another plea to the Democratic leader to step up and do what the American people expect, appoint conferees and go to conference.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have some remarks I was going to make on the pension conference and I will do that. But in response to my friend, the majority leader, partisanship is in the eyes of the beholder. We believe this conference is so important. It involves the jurisdiction of two committees, Finance and HELP. This is a Senate conference. It is not a Republican conference or Democratic conference, it is the Senate. The Senate is going to be represented in conference. I suggest to my friend, the majority leader—he came to the floor last week and suggested, rather than 8 to 6, which I suggested, that it would be 9 to 6.

We could resolve this very quickly. I would be happy to work with nine Republicans and seven Democrats—the two-vote majority we have agreed with. That is fine. The Senate has 55 Republicans and 45 Democrats. But I don't think it is unfair, and I don't think it has any partisanship involved. We have worked very hard from the very beginning on this bill to not have a partisan bill. I worked very hard, personally, as did Senator KENNEDY and Senator BAUCUS, to do what we could to eliminate extraneous amendments and we did that. It was not easy, but we did it. That bill got out of here very quickly. It passed; 97 Senators voted for this legislation.

Maybe it solves the problems to go 9 to 7 rather than 8 to 6. I am willing to be reasonable in this. I think I have been. But I do not think it is being unreasonable; I do not think it is being partisan. If I suggest, with two major committees on a very complex piece of legislation, that we have six Democrats representing the Senate in the conference, I don't think that is asking too much.

I have had calls from my friends downtown, people who represent interested parties. I have told my friends we are ready to go to conference—yesterday. All we want is to have a fair makeup of the conferees.

I ask the distinguished majority leader to reconsider. This 7 to 5—there is nothing set in stone that that is the way it should be. We have had conferences where we have had 27 to 23 conferees representing the Senate in a conference. So I don't think it is asking too much to have 14 Senators, involving two of the most important committees in the Senate, to go to conference with the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is apparent where we are. What I do not want to see happen is that this escalates into comments from the other side accusing us of not caring about this bill. We have led on this bill. We finished it in November. The House finished it in December. Right after that I said the ratio will be 7 to 5. It is an internal problem within their caucus that we have to address and that is what leadership is all about—in terms of picking five people and picking seven people and then proceeding to conference.

It is almost as petty that it plays into this pattern of obstruction. It is what is going on. I went through my whole opening there—we have been on this PATRIOT Act now for weeks and weeks with procedural move after procedural move after procedural move on a bill we know is going to pass overwhelmingly.

When you see what happens there, and then you see this postponement and obstruction on a pensions bill we care passionately about, that the American people care about, that hundreds of thousands of people's futures depend on, that is disturbing. We have to step above it. That is what the American people expect us to be doing.

I am concerned. The Senate Democrats are refusing to go to conference with 7 to 5. They have had 2 months to address this within their caucus. I proposed if you can't appoint five and you can't convince five people to represent you, then we will go to six and then we are going to go to nine. That will be a counterproposal. If that is unacceptable, go back to 7 to 5.

By precedent, it is the majority leader who can set the numbers, and the numbers do vary all over the place. We set it at 7 to 5 from day one and it is 7 to 5 again today. I understand there may be a legitimate dispute on the other side of the aisle. You have too many people who want to be on this conference and decide who gets to serve. But I am beginning to think—I think it is becoming apparent to outside people who are interested in this bill—that this is fitting into a pattern of more postponement, more delay, more obstruction. What I think is unfair and wrong is to try to turn that and say it is because we don't care about pension legislation.

Anyway, we could go on and on forever. We will talk more about the details of this. Let's get on with it. The American people deserve more. This is petty politics and it is time to rise above it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I said a few minutes ago, partisanship is in the eye of the beholder. Obstruction is in the eye of the beholder. I think if this were a jury out there, they would say: I heard Senator REID say he is willing to go to conference in a minute or two. What he wants is to have the conference have six Democrats and eight Republicans. Is there anything obstructionist about that? The distinguished majority leader talks about problems with the Senate Democrats. There is no problem with the Senate Democrats. We want to go to conference. But it appears to me maybe this is all a ploy not to have a bill.

It is not unreasonable, when you have the Finance Committee and the HELP Committee, to say there should be three from Finance and three from the HELP Committee. Then, to show how unreasonable this is, the majority leader says: Well, I will have nine and you have six.

I would say to a jury, if we were talking to a jury: Who is more reasonable? But it all boils down to the fact that another day has gone by and the Senate has been unable to appoint conferees to the pension reform bill. We have millions of Americans worried about their pensions. This legislation will help and we need to get it moving.

Once again, let me be very clear. We want to go to conference. We can name conferees right now and send the bill to the House so they can name their conferees.

We are not interested in delaying the bill. We support it and want it to go to conference. Delaying the conference on pension reform has real consequences.

Each day that there is a delay in naming conferees is another day that employers don't know what rules they will need to follow in funding their pension plans.

This uncertainty could lead some employers to decide to discontinue their pension plans. We have seen several companies make that decision recently. A delay in moving forward with this bill could only exacerbate this trend.

I am coming to the conclusion that maybe the majority does not want this pension reform bill.

Each day we delay is another day of uncertainty for those employers who offer so-called ''cash balance'' pension plans.

Conflicting legal decisions on the applicability of age discrimination rules on these plans have forced some sponsors to drop their pension plans. The Senate's inability to move forward with this legislation also delays improvements for workers whose employer converts to a cash balance plan.

Each day that we delay is another day that employees will be left in the dark.

Each day we delay is another day that employees will be prevented from diversifying away from employer stock in their 401(k) plans.

This change is an outgrowth of the situation surrounding the collapse of Enron where, as we speak, ex-Enron officials are in criminal courts. That change is an outgrowth of their situation, where employees were prevented from selling company stock which they held in their retirement plans. Each

day that we delay is another day that workers would not get transparent financial information on their pension plans. Each day we delay is another day that benefit protections for divorced and surviving spouses aren't made.

Each day that we delay is another day that many of our Nation's airline employees must wait to see if Congress will provide their industry the relief that will allow them to keep their pensions.

The only thing preventing us from appointing conferees is an agreement on the size of the Senate's delegation. The majority leader insisted on limiting the delegation to 12 Members, 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats.

We agree with the two-vote margin. We don't like it, but we agree.

We believe that limiting the number of Democrats to five unnecessarily shortchanges not only Democrats but the entire Senate of the expertise that will prove successful in reaching agreement with the House of Representatives on a bill that can attract a strong majority of support in the Senate.

I repeat. This is not a Senate Republican conference, it is a Senate conference.

We are not contesting the Republicans' desire to have a two-vote advantage when we get to conference, but we believe it is important to have each committee adequately represented.

The majority leader has offered to expand the delegation by one but only if he gets two additional Republican conferees. He said: I will give you one Democrat, but I want two. That is the 9-to-6 ridiculous proposal that has been made. It doesn't have to be 7 to 5. It can be 8 to 6, it can be 9 to 7. I have no problem in selecting people to go on the conference. I certainly don't think it should affect the majority leader. If he doesn't like 8 to 6, let him put another Senator on. Have it 9 to 7.

All we are asking is that a sufficient number of conference, conferees are appointed to the conference. Having 14 conferees in the ratio of 8 to 6 gives the Senate the best opportunity to bring back a bill from conference that will garner support from the Senate.

Let the RECORD be very clear. Democrats have worked closely with our Republican colleagues every step of the way on this legislation. The result has been a very strong bipartisan bill.

I hope that the majority leader will consider his opposition to our request so we can move forward with this conference.

Together, we can improve our Nation's pension system and make America a better place.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2271, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows.

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

Pending:

Frist amendment No. 2895, to establish the enactment date of the act.

Frist amendment No. 2896 (to amendment No. 2895), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time between now and 10 a.m. will be equally divided.

Who seeks time?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired.

The question now is on agreeing to the Frist amendment numbered 2896.

The amendment (No. 2896) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the Frist amendment numbered 2895, as amended.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Collins	Hutchison
Allard	Conrad	Inhofe
Allen	Cornyn	Isakson
Baucus	Craig	Johnson
Bayh	Crapo	Kennedy
Bennett	Dayton	Kerry
Biden	DeMint	Kohl
Bond	DeWine	Kyl
Boxer	Dole	Landrieu
Brownback	Domenici	Lautenberg
Bunning	Dorgan	Leahy
Burns	Ensign	Lincoln
Burr	Enzi	Lott
Carper	Feinstein	Lugar
Chafee	Frist	Martinez
Chambliss	Graham	McCain
Clinton	Grassley	McConnell
Coburn	Gregg	Mikulski
Cochran	Hagel	Murkowski
Coleman	Hatch	Nelson (FL)
Nelson (NE)	Sessions	Sununu
Pryor	Shelby	Talent
Roberts	Smith	Thomas
Salazar	Snowe	Thune
Santorum	Specter	Vitter
Sarbanes	Stabenow	Voinovich
Schumer	Stevens	Warner

NAYS—18

Akaka	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Harkin	Obama
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Cantwell	Levin	Reid
Dodd	Lieberman	Rockefeller
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The amendment (No. 2895) was agreed to.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. And under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 noon for a joint meeting of Congress.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:42 a.m., took a recess, and the Senate, preceded by the Assistant Sergeant at Arms Lynne Halbrooks, the Secretary of the Senate, Emily J. Reynolds, and the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD B. CHENEY, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address delivered by the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy.

(The address delivered by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

At 12:01 p.m., the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. MURKOWSKI.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006—Continued

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the passage vote, the Senate vote on the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199; I further ask consent that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, the Senate vote immediately on the motion to reconsider and, if agreed to, then the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I have been to the floor several times in the past few days to try to convince my colleagues that we should not be reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act without addressing the legitimate concerns of law-abiding Americans across the country. I am under no illusions that I will have more success making that argument now than I had yesterday, or the week before the recess. And I know that some of my colleagues may be wishing I would sit down and stop badgering them about this. But the stakes are too high to sit idly by while the Senate prepares to disappoint the millions of Americans who have been hoping, asking, advocating for years that we fix the PATRIOT Act.

Some may see the vote we are about to have as relatively trivial. They are mistaken. While the bill we are voting on makes only minor and, to quote the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, cosmetic changes to the PATRIOT Act, its significance is far greater. This bill is, to again quote Senator SPECTER, the ''cover'' that will allow colleagues to support the PATRIOT Act conference report that was blocked in December. A vote for the bill introduced by my friend from New Hampshire is effectively a vote to perform cosmetic surgery on that ugly conference report. Anyone who opposed that conference report should oppose S. 2271 because cosmetic changes simply don't cut it when we are talking about protecting the rights and freedoms of Americans from unnecessarily intrusive Government powers.

So I ask my colleagues to reconsider their position. The White House, along with its allies, has tried to make life uncomfortable for some of them. It has suggested they are soft on terrorism, that they don't understand the pressing threat facing this country, that they are stuck in a pre-9/11 mindset. These cynical and baseless attacks come from a playbook that the American people are by now very familiar with. Those attacks should be rejected, not accommodated. We can fight terrorism aggressively without compromising our most fundamental freedoms against Government intrusion. The Government grabbed powers it should not have when it passed the original PATRIOT Act and we should not be ratifying that power grab today. The PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report is flawed. It needs to be fixed. S. 2271 pretends to fix it but I don't think anyone is fooled, least of all our constituents. They are watching and they will want to know how a bill that is so trivial on its face protects their civil liberties. It doesn't. It should be rejected. And the Senate should get down to the serious business of legislating real fixes to the PATRIOT Act. I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, earlier this month, I joined with a majority of Senators in voting to proceed to consideration of S. 2271. I said then that the bill made modest improvements over both the original PATRIOT Act and the reauthorization proposal produced by the House-Senate conference. I said, too, that the bill included one set of changes that I strongly opposed, and that I hoped there would be an opportunity to make further improvements to the bill, the conference report, and the PATRIOT Act.

Regrettably, no sooner had the Senate voted to proceed to S. 2271 than the majority leader filled the amendment ''tree'' with sham amendments, locking out real amendments that sought to improve the law further. An amendment that I filed but was denied the opportunity to offer would have corrected one of the most egregious ''police state'' provisions regarding gag orders. Senator FEINGOLD also filed but could not offer amendments aimed at bringing the conference report more in line with the bipartisan reauthorization bill that every Member of the Senate approved last year. In light of the abuse perpetrated by the Republican leadership, I felt compelled yesterday to oppose cloture on the bill and the stifling of meaningful debate.

Today's vote is a different and more difficult matter. Because the Republican leadership obstructed efforts to improve the bill, the ''police state'' provisions regarding gag orders remain uncorrected. This is a big step backward, in my view, from both the conference report and existing law.

At the same time, the bill takes two steps forward. It modifies a provision I objected to in the conference report that would have required American citizens to tell the FBI before they exercise their right as Americans to seek the advice of counsel. Chairman SPECTER and I worked together to correct this provision; Senator SUNUNU was able to improve it further in this bill and I commend his efforts.

Another significant change provided by the Sununu bill builds upon another objection I had and an idea I shared with him to ensure that libraries engaged in their customary and traditional activities are not subject to national security letters. This is a matter I first raised and feel very strongly about. I commend Senator SUNUNU for the progress he was able to make in this regard.

The bill is intended to clarify that libraries as they traditionally and currently function are not electronic service providers, and may not be served with NSLs for business records simply because they provide Internet access to their patrons. Under this clarification, a library may be served with an NSL only if it functions as a true internet service provider, as by providing services to persons located outside the premises of the library. I expect that this will occur rarely or never and that in most if not all cases, the Government will need a court order to seize library records for foreign intelligence purposes.

The language I proposed to Senator SUNUNU in this regard was less ambiguous than that to which the Bush-Cheney administration would agree. Still, my intent, Senator SUNUNU's intent and the intent of Congress in this regard should be clear. It is to strengthen the meaning and ensure proper implementation of this provision that I will support this bill. As a supporter I trust my intent will inform those charged with implementing the bill and reviewing its proper implementation.

I will continue to work to improve the PATRIOT Act. I will work to provide better oversight of the use of national security letters and to remove the un-American restraints on meaningful judicial review. I will seek to monitor how sensitive personal information from medical files, gun stores and libraries are obtained, used, and retained. Today, I will join Senators SPECTER, SUNUNU, CRAIG, and others in introducing a bill to improve the PATRIOT Act and reauthorization legislation in several important respects. While we have made some progress, much is left to be done.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I rise today to comment on S. 2271, which I anticipate that the Senate will overwhelmingly approve today. I support the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act Conference Report, with the three amendments negotiated contained in S. 2271. It is long past time to reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act, which has been critical to our efforts to protect Americans. I support the compromise that has allowed this up-or-down vote because I think that the agreement maintains the tools necessary to fight terrorism while further strengthening safeguards to protect Americans' civil liberties just as the conference report itself does.

The conference report clarifies that the recipient of a section 215 FISA business records order or a National Security Letter, NSL, may disclose receipt to an attorney to seek legal advice or assistance and also to those necessary to comply with the request. During House-Senate negotiations, provisions were added allowing the government to request that the recipient tell the government to whom the recipient had disclosed the order or NSL. This provision makes sense because there will be times when the Government will need to know everyone who has been told about a section 215 order or NSL. For example, if there is a leak of the existence of the request, or the recipient's name, that leak may need to be investigated. And we know from the criminal conviction of Lynne Stewart that, unfortunately, sometimes it is the attorneys who are breaking the law.

Some Senators expressed concern that these provisions required all recipients to identify their attorney in all instances. This was a misreading of the language, which would have allowed the government to request the names of individuals to whom subsequent disclosure was made but did not set out a blanket requirement.

Other Senators were concerned that this provision could chill a recipient's right to counsel. It is clear under the law that the constitutional right to counsel would not be implicated or offended by the conference report provision. But in a spirit of compromise, the Administration agreed to modify the provisions such that they could not be used to request the identity of an attorney to whom receipt was disclosed. I support this amendment primarily because there is no way that the agreed-upon language would preclude the use of a grand jury subpoena or other investigative tool in the event of a subsequent leak investigation. So the government will still have tools available to investigate leaks as the need arises—even if the offending party is the recipient's attorney.

The conference report also makes it clear that the recipient of a section 215 FISA business records order can go to court and challenge the order. Some Senators raised concerns that under the conference report a recipient would have explicit rights to consult an attorney about the order and to challenge the order to produce business records, but would not have an explicit right to challenge the nondisclosure order that accompanies such a production order. I think it is likely that a court would entertain a constitutional challenge to the nondisclosure requirement, and nothing we say in a statute is going to change that one way or another. Moreover, it is important to remember that these are court orders—they are reviewed and approved by judges before they are served.

But notwithstanding my confidence that the conference report was fully consistent with Americans' civil liberties, the administration agreed to a compromise that explicitly authorizes judicial review of a section 215 nondisclosure order. I think the agreement is a good compromise—it explicitly allows challenges, but does so without risking national security. Pursuant to the agreed-upon language, a challenge could be brought any time after the first year after the judge issued the section 215 order; the challenge could only be brought in the FISA Court; and the standard of review would be the same as the standard the conference report provides for review of nondisclosure orders accompanying NSLs. The delay is perfectly appropriate and necessary to preserve valuable personnel resources—these orders are approved by judges before issuance, so it makes little sense to allow recipients to challenge the non-disclosure requirement only a week or even a day after the court issues them.

Taking the standard of review from the NSL provisions also makes sense. Not only did that standard pass both the House and Senate, but it affords the appropriate level of deference to the Executive branch's judgments on national security and diplomatic relations.

This standard provides that the FISA Court judge may set aside or modify the nondisclosure order if the judge finds that there is no reason to believe that disclosure may endanger the national security of the United States, interfere with a criminal or counterterrorism investigation, interfere with diplomatic relations, or endanger the life or physical safety of any person. If, upon the filing of a challenge to the nondisclosure order, the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the FBI Director certifies that disclosure may endanger the national security of the United States or interfere with diplomatic relations, the certification is conclusive unless made in bad faith.

Courts have long recognized that national security and diplomatic relations fall within the heartland of the executive branch's responsibility and expertise, and this standard simply recognizes that expertise. By requiring that the certification be made by a Senate-confirmed official before granting it bad-faith review, the conferees added political accountability—and I note that neither the House version nor the Senate version had this additional safeguard.

Finally, some Senators also expressed concern about the applicability of national security letters to libraries. This concern has always seemed to me to be based on a misunderstanding of the NSL statutes. There are several NSL authorities, but each authority only allows the government to request a narrow category of records from a narrow set of institutions. The statue that is generally in the news allows the FBI to request things like customer subscription records from ''wire and electronic communication service providers.'' And we have already made clear in statute what institutions qualify as ''wire and electronic communication service providers.'' The way I read the statute, and the way that experts read the statute, the FBI cannot use an NSL to learn what books you and I are checking out from the library.

But the compromise makes it crystal clear that the FBI may serve an NSL on a library only if that library is acting as a ''wire or electronic communication service provider.'' Just to be clear: we are not changing the set of entities that can be subject to NSLs; we are merely clarifying that libraries can be subject to NSLs only if they perform the functions that make an entity subject to NSLs. I can support this language because it does not create a safe haven for terrorists in libraries. If it did, I could not support the language.

It is well past time to pass this report, which passed the House with strong bipartisan support. A majority of Americans supports reauthorizing the USA PATRIOT Act, as does a strong bipartisan majority of Senators. I support this compromise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Dole	Menendez
Alexander	Domenici	Mikulski
Allard	Dorgan	Murkowski
Allen	Durbin	Murray
Baucus	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Feinstein	Obama
Biden	Frist	Pryor
Bingaman	Graham	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Roberts
Brownback	Hagel	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hatch	Salazar
Burns	Hutchison	Santorum
Burr	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Sessions
Chafee	Kennedy	Shelby
Chambliss	Kerry	Smith
Clinton	Kohl	Snowe
Coburn	Kyl	Specter
Cochran	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coleman	Lautenberg	Stevens
Collins	Leahy	Sununu
Conrad	Levin	Talent
Cornyn	Lieberman	Thomas
Craig	Lincoln	Thune
Crapo	Lott	Vitter
Dayton	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner
DeWine	McCain	Wyden
Dodd	McConnell	

NAYS—4

Byrd	Harkin
Feingold	Jeffords

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The bill (S. 2271), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2271

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

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

SEC. 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FISA ORDERS.

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

''(f)(1) In this subsection—

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

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

''(2)(A)(i) A person receiving a production order may challenge the legality of that order by filing a petition with the pool established by section 103(e)(1). Not less than 1 year after the date of the issuance of the production order, the recipient of a production order may challenge the nondisclosure order imposed in connection with such production order by filing a petition to modify or set aside such nondisclosure order, consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (C), with the pool established by section 103(e)(1).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(4) Judicial proceedings under this subsection shall be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The record of proceedings, including petitions filed, orders granted, and statements of reasons for decision, shall be maintained under security measures established by the Chief Justice of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence.

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

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURES.

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

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

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

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

(c) FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—

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

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

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

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

(d) RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (D) of section 1114(a)(3) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(3)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 5. PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR LIBRARY PATRONS.

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

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

This Act shall become effective immediately upon enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following votes in this stacked series be limited to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USA PATRIOT TERRORISM PREVENTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005—CONFERENCE REPORT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199.

Mr. ENSIGN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Akaka	Domenici	Mikulski
Alexander	Dorgan	Murkowski
Allard	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Allen	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Feinstein	Obama
Bayh	Frist	Pryor
Bennett	Graham	Reed
Biden	Grassley	Reid
Bingaman	Gregg	Roberts
Bond	Hagel	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hatch	Salazar
Bunning	Hutchison	Santorum
Burns	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Sessions
Chafee	Kennedy	Shelby
Chambliss	Kerry	Smith
Clinton	Kohl	Snowe
Coburn	Kyl	Specter
Cochran	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coleman	Lautenberg	Stevens
Collins	Lieberman	Sununu
Conrad	Lincoln	Talent
Cornyn	Lott	Thomas
Craig	Lugar	Thune
Crapo	Martinez	Vitter
DeMint	McCain	Voinovich
DeWine	McConnell	Warner
Dole	Menendez	

NAYS—13

Boxer	Durbin	Levin
Byrd	Feingold	Murray
Cantwell	Harkin	Wyden
Dayton	Jeffords	
Dodd	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Akaka	Domenici	Mikulski
Alexander	Dorgan	Murkowski
Allard	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Allen	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Feinstein	Obama
Bayh	Frist	Pryor
Bennett	Graham	Reed
Biden	Grassley	Reid
Bingaman	Gregg	Roberts
Bond	Hagel	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hatch	Salazar
Bunning	Hutchison	Santorum
Burns	Inhofe	Schumer
Burr	Isakson	Sessions
Carper	Johnson	Shelby
Chafee	Kennedy	Smith
Chambliss	Kerry	Snowe
Clinton	Kohl	Specter
Coburn	Kyl	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Stevens
Coleman	Lautenberg	Sununu
Collins	Lieberman	Talent
Conrad	Lincoln	Thomas
Cornyn	Lott	Thune
Craig	Lugar	Vitter
Crapo	Martinez	Voinovich
DeMint	McCain	Warner
DeWine	McConnell	
Dole	Menendez	

NAYS—14

Boxer	Durbin	Levin
Byrd	Feingold	Murray
Cantwell	Harkin	Sarbanes
Dayton	Jeffords	Wyden
Dodd	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 3199: The U.S. PATRIOT Terrorism Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2005:

Chuck Hagel, Jon Kyl, John McCain, Richard Burr, Conrad Burns, Pat Roberts, John Ensign, James Talent, C.S. Bond, Johnny Isakson, Wayne Allard, Norm Coleman, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Mel Martinez, John Thune, Jim DeMint, Jeff Sessions, Bill Frist, Arlen Specter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question upon reconsideration is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199, the U.S. PATRIOT Terrorism Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2005, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 28 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Akaka	Domenici	Menendez
Alexander	Dorgan	Mikulski
Allard	Ensign	Murkowski
Allen	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Frist	Obama
Bennett	Graham	Pryor
Biden	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Gregg	Reid
Brownback	Hagel	Roberts
Bunning	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchison	Salazar
Burr	Inhofe	Santorum
Carper	Isakson	Schumer
Chafee	Johnson	Sessions
Chambliss	Kennedy	Shelby
Clinton	Kerry	Smith
Coburn	Kohl	Snowe
Cochran	Kyl	Specter
Coleman	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Lautenberg	Stevens
Conrad	Lieberman	Sununu
Cornyn	Lincoln	Talent
Craig	Lott	Thomas
Crapo	Lugar	Thune
DeMint	Martinez	Vitter
DeWine	McCain	Voinovich
Dole	McConnell	Warner

NAYS—15

Bingaman	Dodd	Leahy
Boxer	Durbin	Levin
Byrd	Feingold	Murray
Cantwell	Harkin	Sarbanes
Dayton	Jeffords	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On reconsideration on this question, the yeas are 84, the nays are 15. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield my time to Senator LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I yield my 1 hour of postcloture debate to the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I yield the hour I might claim to the Democratic leader, Senator REID.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized as in morning business and that the time I use be charged against my time postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. PRYOR pertaining to the introduction of S. 2343 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to Senator LEAHY.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair inform me when I have consumed 45 minutes of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Chair.

When it comes to the conference report on the USA PATRIOT Act, the die has now been cast. The Senate has voted to reconsider the vote against cloture from last December and now has voted to limit debate on the PATRIOT Act reauthorization bill. The rules of the Senate have changed since the days of Jimmy Stewart and ''Mr. Smith Goes to Washington.'' One Senator, no matter how strongly he or she feels, cannot singlehandedly stop a bill when 60 or more of his or her colleagues are dead set on passing it. So obviously at this point, final passage of the reauthorization bill is now assured. I am disappointed in this result, obviously, but I believe this fight has been worth making and my dedication to changing the PATRIOT Act is as strong now as it has ever been.

We have made some progress since October 2001. The public understands the issues better and many of my colleagues do, too. Support for changes to the PATRIOT Act has grown over the years to the point where we actually had no objection in the Senate last year passing a pretty good bill—this was in July of 2005—a bill that made significant improvements to the PATRIOT Act. Then near the end of the year, 46 Senators actually voted to reject a conference report that took several steps backward from that bill. Even a few days ago, I was heartened when the Senator from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the foremost proponent of the conference report, actually announced he would essentially take the four amendments I had hoped to offer, the amendments I was denied the right to offer in the Senate, and combine them into a bill he will now seek to move through the Judiciary Committee and enact into law. His bill will have several cosponsors, including me. So even some of the Senators who fought for this reauthorization bill, of course, realize it falls short and will join the fight to try to fix the PATRIOT Act. That is somewhat encouraging, and I thank them for their honesty. I thank them for recognizing that the rights and freedoms of the American people are worth fighting for in the Senate, just as we ask so many of our young people to fight for them overseas.

The rules of the Senate provide that debate on this measure is now limited after the vote on cloture we took. But debate is not yet closed. I believe there is still more that needs to be said. In particular, in the time I have remaining, I want to give voice to the millions of Americans who have expressed concern about the PATRIOT Act and have asked repeatedly for it to be changed. There has been an extraordinary outpouring of public sentiment against this law, and that sentiment deserves to be heard on the floor of the Senate. So in a few minutes I am going to read some of the resolutions that have been passed and editorials that have been written and letters that have been sent. In these final hours before the PATRIOT Act is reauthorized, I want my colleagues to hear the voices of the citizens of this country. These voices cannot be stifled by votes taken here. They may have been ultimately defeated by procedural maneuvers in this body over the past few weeks, but their concerns for the liberties and freedoms are real, and they are not going away. We ignore them at our peril.

Before I turn to those voices, I want to start with the basic principle. Our Nation's strength comes not only from our mighty and our unmatched military might but from our constitutional system and our reverence for the rule of law. That is what has kept us free for over 2¼ quarter centuries in our history as a nation. Millions of patriotic Americans love this country and support our military men and women in their difficult missions abroad but worry about the fate of our Constitution here at home. Our constitutional freedoms, our American values are what make our country worth fighting for as we strive to defeat the terrorists who threaten us. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights are documents we often talk about and less often actually pick up and reread. In light of their central importance to the debate about the PATRIOT Act, I thought it would be worth reading them today.

The United States Constitution:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish the Constitution for the United States of America.

ARTICLE I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years.

Of course, this provision has been amended by the 14th amendment so I will skip that part.

The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. The Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at Least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and George three.

As per act of November 15, 1941, the apportionment, based on the Sixteenth Census (1940), the Seventeenth Census (1950), and the Eighteenth Census (1960), distribute the 435 seats in the House among the States according to the method of equal proportions. (See Senate Manual section 974).

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to fill such Vacancies.

The House of Representative shall chuse their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.

Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senators shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the First Election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three Classes. The Seats of the Senators of the first Class shall be vacated at the Expiration of the Second Year, of the second Class at the Expiration of the fourth Year, and of the third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year; so that one-third Class at the Expiration of the sixth Year; and if Vacancies happen by Resignation, or otherwise, during the Recess of the Legislature of any State, the Executive thereof may make temporary Appointments until the next Meeting of the Legislature, which shall then fill such Vacancies.

No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall chuse their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust, or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment, and Punishment, according to Law.

Section 1. The Time, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by Law appoint a different Day.

Section 5. Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections; Returns, and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present be entered on the Journal.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

Section 6. The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

No Senator or Representative shall, during the Time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil Office under the Authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the Emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no Person holding any Office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his Continuance in Office.

Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such Reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the Bill, it shall be sent, together with the Objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a Law. But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively. If any Bill shall not be returned by the President within ten Days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the Same shall be a Law, in like Manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their Adjournment prevent its Return, in which Case it shall not be a Law.

Every Order, Resolution, or Vote to which the Concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of Adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the Same shall take Effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the Rules and Limitations prescribed in the Case of a Bill.

Section 8. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Section 9. The Migration or Importation of Such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such Importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each Person.

The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

No preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Section 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

ARTICLE II

Section 1. The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of

America. He shall hold his Office during the Term of four years, and, together with the Vice-President, chosen for the same Term, be elected, as follows:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

The Electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by Ballot for two persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately chuse by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner chuse the President. But in chusing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; A quorum for this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice-President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall chuse from them by Ballot the Vice-President.

The Congress may determine the Time of chusing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

In case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office,† the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be encreased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—''I do solemly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.''

Section 2. The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment.

He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.

The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session.

Section 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary Occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in Case of Disagreement between them, with Respect to the Time of Adjournment, he may adjourn them to such Time as he shall think proper; he shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers; he shall, take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed, and shall Commission all the Officers of the United States.

Section 4. The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

ARTICLE III

Section 1. The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Section 2. The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;—to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed.

Section 3. Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.

ARTICLE IV

Section 1. Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Section 2. The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

A Person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

No Person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall, be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due.

Section 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee to ever State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

ARTICLE V

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article, and that no State without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ARTICLE VI

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof, and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land, and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

ARTICLE VII

The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the Same.

Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth.

The Bill of Rights, amendments 1 through 10 of the Constitution.

The Conventions of a number of States; having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution: RESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, two thirds of both Houses concurring, that the following Articles be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States, as Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, all or any of which Articles, when ratified by three fourths of the said Legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the said Constitution; viz.t.

AMENDMENT [I]

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

AMENDMENT [II]

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

AMENDMENT [III]

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

AMENDMENT [IV]

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Mr. President, I am going to read that one again. It is the fourth amendment. More than any other provision I am reading, this is the one that is at the heart of the debate about this USA PATRIOT Act and its provisions, and it is this provision that is particularly violated by the imminent reauthorization of this law:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

AMENDMENT [V]

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or other wise infamous crime, unless on a presentment, or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offenses to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in, any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

AMENDMENT [VI]

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

AMENDMENT [VII]

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be other-wise reexamined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

AMENDMENT [VIII]

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

AMENDMENT [IX]

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 34 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for no longer than about 20 minutes as if in morning business and that the time be charged postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. TALENT are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. TALENT. I thank my friend from Wisconsin for letting me have the floor to do this. I am happy to yield back the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Nevada has been yielded 2 hours. I already have 1 hour.

I ask 2 hours 50 minutes of that time be yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I don't think I need consent, do I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not need consent.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Vermont, under the parliamentary situation, is entitled to time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is entitled to 2 hours 54 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will speak for a while. It is my intent to then yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The Senate is going to soon vote to reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act. I am one of the authors of the original 2001 PATRIOT Act. I voted to reauthorize an improved version of the act back in July of 2005.

Obviously, I am concerned, as all Americans are, with our security. I am concerned, as is the distinguished Presiding Officer and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, as one who goes to work every day, along with thousands of others, in a building that was targeted for destruction by al-Qaida. So I am glad we are making progress. However, I have to admit to being disappointed at the missed opportunity to get it right.

The PATRIOT Act provides important and valuable tools for the protection of Americans from terrorism. These matters should be governed by law, not by whim.

Legislative action should be the clear and unambiguous legal footing for any Government powers. Former Congressman Armey, Dick Armey, the Republican leader of the House, and I insisted that sunset provisions be included in the 2001 act. Because we did that, we ended up with reconsideration and some refinement of the powers authorized in that measure.

Now the challenge of Congress is to provide the effective oversight needed

in the days ahead and to ensure that there is court review of the actions that affect the rights of Americans.

The bill contains several sunshine provisions that I proposed. I did that to ensure we would have oversight and to ensure some measure of public accountability for how our Government uses its powers.

For the first time ever, the Justice Department is going to be required to report publicly on its use of two secret surveillance tools that have come under fire from civil libertarians but also from the business community. These are the FISA business record authority and the so-called national security letters, or NSLs. The Justice Department has been declassifying this information sporadically, when politically convenient. It could offer no plausible justification for keeping the information classified, especially when comparable data regarding more sensitive surveillance techniques such as wiretapping and physical searches is routinely disclosed.

The conference between the two bodies accepted my proposal that these powers be subject to detailed, comprehensive, and unclassified audits by the Justice Department's Office of the Inspector General. Specifically, the OIG will audit the effectiveness and use, including any improper or illegal use, of the FISA business record and NSL authorities during the last several years and going forward.

In performing these audits, the OIG will examine the categories of records obtained, the importance of the information required, the manner in which it is retained and disseminated, and whether the information is used for data mining purposes. The NSL audit will be followed by a report on the feasibility of applying minimization procedures in the context of NSLs to ensure the protection of the constitutional rights of United States persons.

I have tried to describe it accurately. I realize that sounds like a bureaucratic computer wrote it. I want to be very specific because this administration sometimes does not pay attention to specific items. What we do not want is any agency of our Government feeling they can simply go and use these demands for records to go on a fishing expedition or find somebody they do not like and say: Let's just grab all their records. Let's go through all their records. Let's follow up on these records and see if there is something else we want—and just do that on and on with somebody who has no recourse, no ability to speak out. Their businesses might be ruined, their lives might be ruined, and it turns out: Whoops, sorry, we made a mistake. We are going on to somebody else. We saw after 9/11 when that happened. We saw businesses ruined, ranging from restaurants to other kinds of businesses, where: Whoops, sorry, we got the wrong person. Too bad you had no real ability to question what we were doing.

I proposed another sunshine provision. I am glad the conference accepted it. It comes from a bill I introduced in the last Congress with Senators SPECTER and GRASSLEY. It requires the FISA Court to publish its procedures and share their rules in an unclassified report. Also, it requires annual reporting of the use of so-called sneak-and-peek search warrants and FISA's emergency surveillance authorities.

Again, we give very special powers to our Government, recognizing the fact that, as long as the distinguished Presiding Officer lives, as long as I live, we will face these kinds of threats. But we want to make sure the powers we give do not become powers just unto themselves where none of us know where the check or the balance is.

The bill includes a scaled-back version of a data-mining provision that was added by a floor amendment in the House.

Most of us use e-mails. We often send medical information on ourselves, our children, our families. Maybe if you are in a business you send information you want held so you can have a competitive advantage over your competitor. A lot of that can be picked up in data-mining operations.

As contained in the current bill, the provision calls for a one-time report on pattern-based data mining by the Department of Justice. What is that expression, pattern-based data mining? They develop models based on expected behavior or profiles of criminal or terrorist activity, then they mine databases of personal information to try to identify those patterns.

It is sort of the Kevin Bacon ''six degrees of separation,'' except we assume they are not going after Kevin Bacon. It does raise concerns about profiling and individual privacy. There is a concern that if you happen to be in a restaurant somebody frequented, you are now going to be under surveillance.

Now, in addition to the sunshine provisions, I proposed we retain the sunset mechanism that worked so well in the original PATRIOT Act. Sometimes both sunshine and sunset work well together. As I said, Republican House Majority Leader Dick Armey and I insisted, in 2001, on a 4-year sunset for certain PATRIOT Act powers. If we had not done that, we would not even be having this debate today. We would not have even looked at what happened, especially with a Congress reluctant to do oversight, a Congress unwilling to question anything this administration does.

They were forced, actually, to ask questions about what is happening under the PATRIOT Act because a conservative Member of the House—Dick Armey—and a liberal Senator—myself—put in the sunset provisions so we would be forced to look at it no matter who was President, no matter who controlled the House, no matter who controlled the Senate. And thank goodness we did because if we had not done that, I guarantee you, this Congress never would have asked a question of anybody. If we had not had that, the Bush administration would have stonewalled our request for information, just as they have on so many other things.

The sunsets are the reasons we have been going through a review and renewal process over the last few months. And the improvements were hard won. The Bush administration pursued its usual strategy of demanding sweeping Executive powers, resisting checks and balances. They were long on partisan rhetoric and awfully short on bipartisan dialog. As usual, the Republican majorities in the House and the Senate did their utmost to follow the White House's directives to prevent any sudden breakout of bipartisanship. But a ray of bipartisanship slipped through the cracks, and the bill is the better for it.

It contains 4-year sunsets, not 7- or 10-year sunsets like the administration wanted. The bill no longer contains a provision that would have made it a crime merely to disclose the receipt of a national security letter. Somebody hands you a national security letter and demands documents and it's a crime if you tell anybody about it. ''Wait a minute, you just closed down my business. I can't comply with this.'' ''Tough. You can't tell anybody. You can't tell your wife. You can't tell the people who work for you.'' This is America. We finally did away with that, even though the administration strongly wanted that kind of control.

They even wanted Americans, if they were served with a national security letter and dared to seek legal advice, they had to go humbly to the FBI first and tell them they were actually going to get a lawyer—in America—to find out why they were being subpoenaed. Now, I know they like control in this administration. That went too far. So we no longer require American citizens to tell the FBI before they exercise their right as Americans to seek the advice of counsel. Sunlight is the best disinfectant. When the sunlight came in on this bill, some of these things fell.

Chairman SPECTER and I worked together on these improvements, and our efforts have produced a better bill for the protection of all Americans. In this regard, I also compliment the Senate Democratic conferees, whose efforts were extraordinary. Whether they vote for or against the final product, Senators ROCKEFELLER, LEVIN, and KENNEDY all deserve the thanks of the Senate and the American people for their hard work and steadfastness.

Late changes were achieved by Republican Senators who had joined us in resisting the conference report in December.

When terrorists strike, they do not ask whether you are Democrats or Republicans or Independents. If they want to strike Americans, they strike Americans. They do not ask what your politics are. And all Americans—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—want to stop terrorists. All Americans

oppose what they have done. So, therefore, it was regrettable that this administration—with a President who was elected on a solemn campaign pledge to be a uniter and not a divider—refused to engage both Democrats and Republicans on ways to improve the bill. They spoke to only one party, as though only one party cared about America being safe. The White House Counsel spoke to only Republican Senators. So they, in turn, negotiated to achieve what they view as improvements and what they could. It is, of course, less than what we would have liked, but I appreciate the fact they did what they could insofar as they were dealing with an administration that did not want to treat the safety of Americans in a bipartisan way.

But, therefore, the bill still falls short in several critical regards.

Let's talk about section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, the business records provision that has been so important to the libraries. Under section 215, the Government can obtain a secret order that compels access to sensitive records of American citizens. It also imposes a permanent gag on the recipient. In other words, I grabbed your records. Don't you dare tell anyone. This is America. This is America. We have had Presidents condemn other countries—and rightly so—for doing this sort of thing to their citizens, and we want to do it to our own?

Before passage of the PATRIOT Act, there were two significant limitations on the FBI's power to seize business records. First, it could be used only for a few discrete categories of travel records, such as records held by hotels, motels, vehicle rental facilities. Second, the legal standard for obtaining the order was demanding. The Government had to present specific and articulable facts giving reason to believe that the subject of the investigation was a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power.

Passed in the weeks following 9/11, the PATRIOT Act did away with these limitations. It both expanded what the FBI may obtain with a Section 215 order and it lowered the standard for obtaining it. Under current law, the Government need only assert that something—anything—is sought for an authorized investigation to protect against terrorism or espionage, and the judge will order its production. What counts as an authorized investigation is within the discretion of the Executive branch.

Now, the Senate—and I compliment those Republicans and Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee who got together on the reauthorization bill that we passed last July—the Senate reestablished a significant check on this power. Under the Senate bill, relevance to an authorized investigation is not enough. The Government must also show some connection between the records sought and a suspected terrorist or spy. This is a fundamental protection that would not hamstring the Government, but would do much to prevent overreaching in Government surveillance. I fought for it in the Senate. Chairman SPECTER and every Republican Senator voted for it. Then the Bush administration found out about that. It ordered the Republican Members of Congress to strip it out in conference, and these independent bodies—this check and balance—said: Aye, aye, sir, and stripped it out.

The current bill also falls short on its treatment of national security letters. These are, in effect, a form of secret administrative subpoena. Again, my God, they love doing things in secret. They love doing things in secret, and they tell us afterwards: Trust us. I seem to have read something recently in the press about an agreement to have another country run the operations of our ports. They said, after failing to consult Congress, trust us. We secretly looked at Dubai. We secretly looked at this, and we understand that money for the hijackers went through that country, but we have secretly looked at it and it is a good idea. Don't ask us any questions.

Well, now they have this form of secret administrative subpoena. They are issued by FBI agents without the approval of a judge or a grand jury or a prosecutor. They allow agents to obtain certain types of sensitive information about innocent Americans simply by certifying its relevance to a terrorism or espionage investigation. If the FBI agent does not like your looks, they can just come in with this secret subpoena and seize your records. Your business can be shut down on the whim of one agent—no judge, no grand jury, no prosecutor, no check and balance. And oh, by the way, we will do it secretly. Like section 215 orders, NSLs come with a permanent gag. Recipients are prohibited from telling anyone anything about it.

The bill does not allow meaningful judicial review of this gag order. It requires the court to accept as conclusive the Government's assertion that a gag order should not be lifted, unless the court determines the Government is acting in bad faith. This raises serious First Amendment and due process concerns. Fixing this provision was one of my top priorities in the conference and during my subsequent discussions with Senator SPECTER. The Bush administration's refusal to agree to this change was a significant factor in my consistent opposition to the conference report in December. And there is strong opposition to this provision from both Democrats and Republicans from the right to the left. But the administration refused to correct it. They also refused, as an alternative, to sunset the national security letter authority.

I continued to seek remediation of this provision in January and February through discussions with Senator SUNUNU and Senator SPECTER, but they were unable to achieve that result. This creates, in my view, a sham judicial proceeding within the complete control of the Government that smacks too much of a police state. It is wrong. It needs to be fixed.

I wish Americans would think: What are we giving up with the idea we might be a little more secure? Wouldn't it be a lot better to fix the mistakes that were made by the administration that allowed 9/11 to happen in the first place, to go back and find out where those mistakes were made and fix them? Wouldn't it be better to finally, years later, start actually being able to translate all the information we have picked up—something we did not do before 9/11 and today we still do not do it anywhere near enough?

Wouldn't it have been better to have done that than to say to Americans, most of whom would be law-abiding: We are going to give you this letter—which just one person decides on—and we will seize your records. You can't talk to anybody about it, and there's really nothing you can do about that. You have no real judicial way of overturning the gag order.

If we heard of other countries doing this, we would be critical and rightly so. If the Chinese did this, we would criticize them and rightly so. If the old Soviet Union did this, we would have criticized them and rightly so. Please, do not let our country go down that road. We are too good a people. We are too honest a people.

The bill's treatment of the PATRIOT Act's so-called sneak-and-peek provisions is another area of concern. Section 213 of the PATRIOT Act authorized the Government to carry out secret searches in ordinary criminal investigations. Armed with a Section 213 search warrant, FBI agents may enter and search a home or office and not tell anyone about it until weeks or months later.

It is interesting to recall that four years ago, the House Judiciary Committee took one look at the Bush administration's original proposal for sneak and peak authority and dropped it entirely from its version of the legislation. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I was able to make some improvements in the administration's proposal, but problems remained. In particular, Section 213 says that notice may be delayed only for ''a reasonable period.'' The Bush administration has abused that flexible standard and used it to justify delays in notice of a year or more. Pre-PATRIOT Act case law stated that the appropriate period of delay was no more than seven days.

The Senate voted to replace the ''reasonable period'' standard, which the Bush administration has been abusing, with a basic 7-day rule, while permitting the Government to obtain additional 90-day extensions of the delay from the court. The current bill sets a 30-day rule for the initial delay, more than three times what the Senate, and

pre-PATRIOT Act courts, deemed appropriate. The shorter period would better protect Fourth Amendment rights without in any way impeding legitimate government investigations. The availability of additional 90-day extensions means that a shorter initial time frame should not be a hardship on the Government. But our improvement has been rejected in favor of too much Government power.

The current bill is also loaded with extraneous provisions that have nothing to do with the expiring PATRIOT Act authorities or even with terrorism. The bill modifies habeas corpus law—the great writ—a highly controversial provision that is wholly improper to consider in this context. I doubt it would ever pass, if it were put to a straight up-or-down vote. But slip it in the bill and say: It is for national security. Give up your rights, Americans. It is for national security.

Many times people in this Chamber talk about Benjamin Franklin, and we think back to that time. Here is a man involved in the revolution against King George. Had he failed, he would have been hanged. Most of those around him would have been hanged. But when he has now become the Government and his friends have become the Government, replacing King George, he wanted to make sure to protect the people from the Government. As he said, those who would give up essential liberties for temporary security deserve neither liberty or security.

Habeas corpus, the one thing that every one of us can count on, the great writ, the thing that sets us apart from virtually every other country and the thing that protects us so much, was changed because a small number of Republican conferees wanted to change it. They did not want to bring it on the floor of the Senate or the House and vote on it up or down. It has nothing do to do with terrorism or even the more general tools of Federal law enforcement. It was almost a whim, let's take away these rights.

These changes were not included in the PATRIOT Act reauthorization bill of either the House or the Senate, but mysteriously, here it is, slipped in.

I recall that part in ''A Man for All Seasons'' where Sir Thomas More's protege William Roper is basically saying, the end justifies the means, and Sir Thomas More spoke of the law as something there to protect us. He said, and I am paraphrasing: All of England is planted thick with laws. And his protege said, in effect, he would cut down all those laws, if need be, to get at the devil. And Thomas More said: And what will protect you then, with all the laws cut down? Yes, I'd give the devil benefit of the law, for my own safety's sake.

I wonder if we are not doing that, especially with the sneaky way this was done. That is the only way I can describe it, sneaky. The administration said: Kick the Democratic conferees out. And the independent bodies, the House and the Senate, said: Aye-aye, sir. It violates our rules, but, yes, sir, if you want that for the White House. And then they slipped it in. Neither body's Judiciary Committee approved it. Incidentally, the U.S. Judicial Conference, at that time headed by Chief Justice Rehnquist, made up of some of the most conservative judges in the country, strongly opposed doing this.

Another extraneous provision of the bill will revive a small group of pending death penalty prosecutions for aircraft hijacking murders committed in the 1970s and 1980s. It is designed to overrule the district court decision in United States v. Safarini, which struck the death penalty for a 1986 hijacking offense on the grounds that the Federal Death Penalty Procedures Act of 1994 could not be retroactively applied to a pre-1994 crime, absent clear congressional intent to do so.

To my knowledge, Congress has never enacted death penalty legislation intended to allow the execution of a tiny number of known offenders for crimes they are alleged to have committed from one to three decades previously. Whether the Government can ultimately persuade the courts that this does not violate the letter of the ex post facto and bill of attainder clauses of the Constitution, it certainly violates their spirit. It is telling that the Department of Justice, in its testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, strongly recommended adding in a severability clause, in case this provision was ultimately held invalid by a court of law. I share the Department's skepticism regarding the constitutionality of this wrongheaded provision, and deeply regret its inclusion in the conference report.

To sum up, the bill presents a complex mixture of valuable provisions which I support and would vote for if they were individually here, significant improvements on the one hand but so many serious flaws and missed opportunities on the other. I think the final product would have been better if Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, both bodies had been allowed to work as Members of Congress, as representatives of the people instead of as puppets of the most secretive administration of the six administrations with which I have served. The Bush administration insisted on locking Democrats out of the negotiations. They did that, first, in connection with the conference and, again, after the Senate would not proceed to pass the conference report last December. When I and others tried to have conversations with the White House to improve the bill, our efforts were dismissed. Basically, they took the attitude, as long as they can get the votes they needed on the Republican side of the aisle, there is no purpose in any bipartisan effort. What a mistake.

This is a bill that has both virtues and vices. I respect those who conclude that on balance the bill's virtues outweigh its vices. And if they conclude that, then vote for it. But I believe we can and should do better. I believe America can do better. I will continue to work to improve the PATRIOT Act. I will work to provide better oversight of the use of national security letters. I will work to remove what is a gross, un-American restraint on meaningful judicial review, the sort of thing that Presidents of both parties have strongly condemned when done by other countries. I hate to see our country do it.

I will seek to monitor how sensitive personal information that they are now allowed to seize from medical files, gun stores, and libraries is obtained and used. Today, I will join Senators SPECTER, SUNUNU, CRAIG, and others in introducing a bill to improve the PATRIOT Act and reauthorization legislation in several important respects. While we have made some progress, much is left to be done.

Let me be very clear about this. There are good parts of this bill, but there are also serious bad parts. The serious bad parts are worse if you have an administration that does not believe in checks and balances and prefers to do everything in secret. We now see the administration seeking to twist the Authorization for Use of Military Force against al-Qaida into a justification for its secret, illegal wiretapping of Americans' emails and telephone calls. We see the administration claiming that it need not fulfill its constitutional responsibility to faithfully execute the laws and that it can pick and choose among the laws it will recognize. And we see an administration that continues to attack anyone that gets in their way and insists on the rule of law.

Confronted with the administration's claims of unchecked power, I do not believe that the restraints we have been able to include in this reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act are sufficient. I will continue to work to provide the tools that we need to protect the American people. I trust that Vermonters will understand that while I have repeatedly voted to extend and reauthorize the PATRIOT Act, this measure, this time, falls short of what they deserve. So I won't support it in its current form. I will continue to work to provide the oversight of checks needed on the use of Government power and seek to improve this reauthorization legislation. I know the Senate will adopt it, but it is a pale shadow of what it could be. It is not the best that the greatest democracy on Earth deserves. I will fight for the best, but I will not vote for second best.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 2 hours 24 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair, my good friend.

I yield all but 15 minutes of that time to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding the time and also for his excellent remarks and his comments on this issue.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, we pass a lot of laws in this body, but most of them don't get any public attention. Not so with the PATRIOT Act. Few pieces of legislation have the kind of public understanding and recognition the PATRIOT Act does. The PATRIOT Act has become a rallying cry for those concerned about Government overreaching, grabbing for more power than it needs, using a time of crisis to justify changes in the law it otherwise could not hope to see made.

People all over the country want us to take a step back, to reconsider, to fix the PATRIOT Act. Perhaps the strongest evidence of this is that in the past 4 years, more than 400 State and local governments have passed resolutions opposing or objecting to various aspects of the PATRIOT Act. Eight of those government bodies are State legislatures that have already passed resolutions opposing the PATRIOT Act.

In April 2003, Hawaii was the first State to adopt a statewide resolution. The next month, in May 2003, Alaska and Vermont passed resolutions. Over the course of 2004 and 2005, we saw three more resolutions in Colorado, Montana, and Maine. Finally, Idaho passed a resolution specifically to support the SAFE Act's amendments to the PATRIOT Act, and recently, on February 16, California passed a resolution on the PATRIOT Act.

I will read these resolutions. There are eight such resolutions, Alaska being the first.

A resolution:

Relating to the USA PATRIOT Act, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution of the State of Alaska, and the civil liberties, peace, and security of the citizens of our country.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

WHEREAS the State of Alaska recognizes the Constitution of the United States as our charter of liberty, and that the Bill of Rights enshrines the fundamental and inalienable rights of Americans, including the freedoms of religion, speech, assembly, and privacy; and

WHEREAS each of Alaska's duly elected public servants has sworn to defend and uphold the United States Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Alaska; and

WHEREAS the State of Alaska denounces and condemns all acts of terrorism, wherever occurring; and

WHEREAS attacks against Americans such as those that occurred on September 11, 2001, have necessitated the crafting of effective laws to protect the public from terrorist attacks; and

WHEREAS any new security measures of federal, state, and local government should be carefully designed and employed to enhance public safety without infringing on the civil liberties and rights of innocent citizens of the State of Alaska and the nation; and

WHEREAS certain provisions of the ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001'', also known as the USA PATRIOT Act, allow the federal government more liberally to detain and investigate citizens and engage in surveillance activities that may violate or offend the rights and liberties guaranteed by our state and federal constitutions;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Alaska State Legislature supports the government of the United States of America in its campaign against terrorism, and affirms its commitment that the campaign not be waged at the expense of essential rights and liberties of citizens in this country contained in the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the policy of the State of Alaska to oppose any portion of the USA PATRIOT Act that would violate the rights and liberties guaranteed equally under the state and federal constitutions; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that, in accordance with Alaska state policy, an agency or instrumentality of the State of Alaska, in the absence of reasonable suspicion of criminal activity under Alaska State law, may not

(1) initiate, participate in, or assist or cooperate with an inquiry, investigation, surveillance, or detention;

(2) record, file, or share intelligence information concerning a person or organization, including library lending and research records, book and video store sales and rental records, medical records, financial records, student records, and other personal data, even if—

Even if—

authorized under the USA PATRIOT Act;

(3) retain such intelligence information; the state Attorney General shall review the intelligence information currently held by the state for its legality and appropriateness under the United States and Alaska Constitutions and permanently dispose of it if there is no reasonable suspicion of criminal activity; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that an agency or instrumentality of the state may not,

(1) use state resources or institutions for the enforcement of federal immigration matters, which are the responsibility of the federal government;

(2) collect or maintain information about the political, religious, or social views, associations, or activities of any individual, group, association, organization, corporation, business, or partnership, unless the information directly relates to an investigation of criminal activities and there are reasonable grounds to suspect the subject of the information is or may be involved in criminal conduct;

(3) engage in racial profiling; law enforcement agencies may not use race, religion, ethnicity, or national origin as factors in selecting individuals to subject to investigatory activities except when seeking to apprehend a suspect whose race, religion, ethnicity, or national origin is part of the description of the suspect; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Alaska State Legislature implores the United States Congress to correct provisions in the USA PATRIOT Act and other measures that infringe on civil liberties, and opposes any pending and future federal legislation to the extent it infringes on Americans' civil rights and liberties.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable George W. Bush, President of the United States; the Honorable John Ashcroft, Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable Frank Murkowski, Governor of Alaska; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens, and the Honorable Lisa Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

That is the Alaska resolution.

California Senate Joint Resolution No. 10—Relative to the USA PATRIOT Act. Approved by the California Senate, introduced by Senator Figueroa.

WHEREAS, The State of California recognizes the Constitution of the United States of America as our charter of liberty, and that the Bill of Rights enshrines the fundamental and inalienable rights of Americans, including freedoms of religion, speech, and privacy; and

WHEREAS, The State of California has a distinguished history of safeguarding the freedoms of its residents; and

WHEREAS, Each of California's duly elected public servants are sworn to defend and uphold the United States Constitution and the Constitution of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, The State of California denounces and condemns all acts of terrorism, wherever occurring; and

WHEREAS, Any new security measures of Federal, State, and local governments should be carefully designed and employed to enhance public safety without infringing on the civil liberties and rights of innocent persons in the State of California and the Nation; and

WHEREAS, Certain provisions of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act, also known as the USA PATRIOT Act, allow the government greater authority to detain and investigate persons and to engage in surveillance activities that may violate or offend the rights and liberties guaranteed by our Federal and State Constitutions, including rights of due process, the right to privacy, the right to counsel, protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, and basic First Amendment freedoms; and

WHEREAS, The people of California are concerned that many provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act pose significant threats to constitutional protections; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California jointly, That the State of California supports appropriate and effective measures by the Government of the United States of America and the State of California to combat terrorism and affirms its commitment that the campaign not be waged at the expense of essential civil rights and liberties of citizens of this country contained in the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of California also urges its congressional delegation to work to repeal any provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act that limit or impinge on rights and liberties protected equally by the United States Constitution and the California Constitution and to oppose any pending and future Federal legislation to the extent that it would infringe on Americans' civil rights and liberties; and be it further

Resolved, that the State of California will ensure that no State resources be provided

for any action that would violate the United States Constitution or the Constitution of the State of California, including but not limited to, all of the following:

(1) Collecting or maintaining information about the political, religious, or social views, associations, or activities of any individual group, association, organization, corporation, business or partnership, unless the information directly relates to an investigation of criminal activities, and there are reasonable grounds to suspect the subject of the information is or may be involved in criminal conduct.

(2) Recording, filing, or sharing intelligence information concerning a person or organization, including library lending and research records, book and video sales and rental records, medical records, financial records, student records and other personal data, even if authorized under the USA PATRIOT Act.

(3) Demanding nonconsensual releases of student and faculty records from public schools and institutions of higher learning.

(4) Eavesdropping on confidential communications between lawyers and their clients.

(5) Engaging in racial profiling that enables law enforcement agencies to use race, religion, ethnicity or national origin as factors in selecting individuals to be subject to investigational activities, except when seeking to apprehend a specific suspect whose race, religion, ethnicity or national origin is part of the description of the suspect; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the majority leader of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress, the Attorney General of the United States, and to all Federal and State law enforcement agencies.

Mr. President, that is the second resolution. The third one is from Colorado. Senate Joint Resolution 05–044 concerning the State's commitment to Uphold Constitutional Rights in the Fight Against Terrorism, approved by the Colorado General Assembly.

WHEREAS, The State of Colorado is committed to upholding the fundamental and inalienable rights, including the freedoms of religion, speech, assembly and privacy, that are enshrined in the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Colorado; and

WHEREAS, Colorado's elected public servants have sworn to defend and uphold the Federal and State Constitution; and

WHEREAS, The State of Colorado denounces and condemns all acts of terrorism, wherever occurring; and

WHEREAS, The attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, and the continuing threat of terrorism underscore the need for strong and effective laws and policy to protect the American public; and

WHEREAS, The security measures taken by Federal, State, and local governments should be carefully designed and applied to enhance public safety without infringing on the civil liberties and rights of innocent people in the State of Colorado and throughout the Nation; and

WHEREAS, Certain provisions of the Federal ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act'', also known as the ''USA PATRIOT Act'', expand the power of the Federal Government to detain and investigate people in the United States and to engage in surveillance activities that may be inconsistent with the rights and liberties guaranteed by the State and Federal constitutions; now, therefore,

Be it Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

(1) That the General Assembly supports the Government of the United States in its campaign against terrorism and affirms its commitment that the campaign not be waged at the expense of the essential civil rights and liberties enshrined in the Constitution of the United States and the State of Colorado;

(2) That it is the policy of the State of Colorado to oppose any provision or application of the USA PATRIOT Act that would violate the rights and liberties guaranteed by the State and Federal Constitutions;

(3) That, in accordance with the policy of this State, no agency or instrumentality of the State should, without reasonable suspicion of criminal activity under Colorado law:

(A) Initiate, participate in, assist, or cooperate with any inquiry, investigation, surveillance, or detention; (b) Record, file, or share intelligence information concerning any person or organization, including library lending and research records, book and video store sales and rental records, medical records, financial records, student records, Internet mail and usage records, and other personal data, even if authorized under the USA PATRIOT Act; or (c), Retain such intelligence information.

(4) That no agency or instrumentality of the State should: (A) collect or maintain information about the political, religious, or social views, associations, or activities of any individual, group, organization or business entity, unless the information indirectly relates to an investigation of criminal activities and there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the subject of the information is involved in criminal conduct; or (b) Use race, religion, ethnicity or national origin as factors in selecting individuals to subject to investigatory activities, except with respect to a specific suspect whose race, religion, ethnicity, or national origin is part of the description of the suspect.

(5) The General Assembly urges the United States Congress to amend provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act and other measures that infringe on civil rights and liberties and imposes the enactment of future Federal legislation that infringes on civil rights and liberties.

Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be sent to the Honorable George W. Bush, President of the United States; the Honorable Alberto Gonzalez, Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable Bill Owens, Governor of Colorado; and the members of Colorado's congressional delegation.

Now we go to Hawaii's resolution, the first one to pass. Senate Concurrent Resolution Reaffirming the State of Hawaii's Commitment to Civil Liberties and the Bill of Rights Approved by the Hawaii State legislature.

WHEREAS The Hawaii State legislature is committed to upholding the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights and the Hawaii State Constitution and its Bill of Rights (Article I, Sections 1 through 22); and

WHEREAS The State of Hawaii has a distinguished history of safeguarding the freedoms of its residents; and

WHEREAS The State of Hawaii is comprised of a diverse and multi-ethnic population, and has experienced firsthand the value of immigration to the American way of life; and

WHEREAS The residents of Hawaii during World War II experienced firsthand the dangers of unbalanced pursuit of security without appropriate checks and balances for the protection of basic liberties; and

WHEREAS The recent adoption of the USA PATRIOT Act and several executive orders may unconstitutionally authorize the Federal Government to infringe upon fundamental liberties in violation of due process, the right to privacy, the right to counsel, protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, and basic first amendment freedoms, all of which are guaranteed by the constitutions of Hawaii and the United States; and

WHEREAS The citizens of Hawaii are concerned that the actions of the Attorney General of the United States and the United States Justice Department are significant threats to constitutional protections; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2003, the House of Representatives concurring, that the State of Hawaii urges its congressional delegation to work to repeal any sections of the PATRIOT Act or recent executive orders that limit or violate fundamental rights and liberties protected by the constitutions of Hawaii and the United States; and

Be It Further Resolved that to the extent legally possible, no State resources—including law enforcement funds and educational administrative resources—may be used for unconstitutional activities, including but not limited to the following under the USA PATRIOT Act:

(1) Monitoring political and religious gatherings exercising their First Amendment Rights;

(2) Obtaining library records, bookstore records, and Web site activities without proper authorization and without notification;

(3) Issuing subpoenas through the United States Attorney's Office without a court's approval or knowledge;

(4) Requesting nonconsensual releases of student and faculty records from public schools and institutions of higher learning; and

(5) Eavesdropping on confidential communications between lawyers and their clients.

Be It Further Resolved that certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to Hawaii's delegation in the United States Congress.

Now Idaho.

Stating findings of the Legislature concerning adoption of the SAFE Act to limit certain provisions of the PATRIOT Act in order to protect liberties of citizens of the United States and urging the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to support the SAFE Act: House Joint Memorial No. 7, approved by the Idaho State legislature.

We, memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate in the State of Idaho assembled in the First Regular Session of the Fifty-eighth Idaho Legislature, do hereby respectfully represent that:

WHEREAS, as citizens of the State of Idaho strongly believe that basic civil liberties must be preserved and protected, even as we seek to guard against terrorists and other threats to national security; and

WHEREAS, there are some principles of our democracy which are so fundamental to the rights of citizenship that they must be preserved to guard the very liberties we seek to protect; and

WHEREAS, legislation known as the SAFE Act has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to adopt amendments to

the PATRIOT Act which would address some of the most problematic provisions of that act; and

WHEREAS, the SAFE Act amends the PATRIOT Act to modify the provisions regarding the roving wiretaps to require that the identity of the target be given and that the suspect be present during the time when surveillance is conducted; and

WHEREAS, the SAFE Act revises provisions governing search warrants to limit the circumstances when the delay of notice may be exercised and to require reports to the Congress when delays of notice are used; and

WHEREAS, the SAFE Act requires specific and articulable facts to be given before business records are subject to investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

WHEREAS, the SAFE Act provides that libraries shall not be treated as communication providers subject to providing information and transaction records of library patrons; and

WHEREAS, it is appropriate that the legislature of the State of Idaho, on behalf of the citizens of Idaho, express support of the efforts of Senator Larry Craig to adopt the SAFE Act, and encourage full support of the Idaho congressional delegation.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by members of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-eighth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that the Idaho legislature endorses the efforts to amend the PATRIOT Act to ensure that it works well to protect our security, but that it does not unnecessarily compromise essential liberties of the citizens of the United States. We urge the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to support legislation introduced by Senator Larry Craig, known as the SAFE Act.

Mr. President, the Maine Resolution, Joint Resolution Memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to Ensure the Protection of Civil Liberties and the Security of the United States Approved by the Maine State Legislature.

We, your Memorialists, the Members of the One Hundred and Twenty-first legislature of the State of Maine now assembled in the Second Special Session, most respectfully present the petition of the President of the United States and the United States Congress, as follows.

WHEREAS, the State of Maine recognizes that the Constitution of the United States is our charter of liberty and that the Bill of Rights enshrines the fundamental and inalienable rights of Americans, including the freedoms of religion, speech, assembly, and privacy; and

WHEREAS, each of Maine's duly elected public servants have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of Maine; and

WHEREAS, the State of Maine denounces and condemns all acts of terrorism, wherever occurring; and

WHEREAS, attacks against Americans such as those that occurred on September 11, 2001 have necessitated the crafting of effective laws to protect the public from terrorist attacks; and

WHEREAS, any new security measures of Federal, State, and local governments should be carefully designed and employed to enhance public safety, without infringing on the civil liberties and the rights of any citizens in the State of Maine and the Nation; and

WHEREAS, matters relating to immigration are primarily Federal in nature; and

WHEREAS, certain provisions of the ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001,'' commonly referred to as the USA PATRIOT Act, allow the Federal Government more liberally to detain and investigate citizens and engage in surveillance activities that may violate or offend the rights and liberties guaranteed by our State and Federal Constitutions; now therefore,

Be It Resolved: That we, Your Memorialists, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to inform the President of the United States and the United States Congress that the Maine State Legislature supports the government of the United States of America in its campaign against terrorism and affirms its commitment that the campaign not be waged at the expense of essential civil rights and liberties of citizens of this country contained in the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights; and be it further

Resolved: That the Maine State Legislature urges that the Federal Government to continue to exercise its jurisdiction over immigration matters and encourages the Federal Government to work cooperatively with the States to provide assistance and training to protect our country; and be it further

Resolved: That laws passed by the United States Congress to specifically combat the threat of international terrorism should not be used in conducting domestic law enforcement; and be it further

Resolved: That the Maine State legislature implores the United States Congress to review the provisions in the USA PATRIOT Act and other measures that may infringe on civil liberties and ensure any pending and future Federal liberties.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Legislature calls upon our United States Representatives and Senators to monitor the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act and related federal actions and, if necessary, repeal those sections of the USA PATRIOT Act and related federal measures that may infringe upon fundamental rights and liberties as recognized in the United States Constitution and its amendments; and be it further resolved that official copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable George W. Bush, President of the United States, the Honorable John Ashcroft, Attorney General of the United States; the Honorable John E. Baldacci, Governor or the State of Maine; Richard Cheney, President of the United States Senate; Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; and each member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

Mr. President, Montana:

A Joint Resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana supporting the Montana Constitution, the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights; encouraging various actions in support of fighting terrorism and protecting civil rights and civil liberties; requesting the Attorney General of Montana to compile and disseminate relevant information regarding actions taken by the Federal Government under the USA PATRIOT Act; and encouraging Montana's congressional delegation to support and ensure the civil rights of all Montanans and citizens of the United States, which includes allowing the USA PATRIOT Act to expire.

WHEREAS, the citizens of Montana recognize the Constitution of the United States as our charter of liberty and that the Bill of Rights enshrines the fundamental and inalienable rights of Americans, including the freedoms of religion, speech, assembly, and privacy; and

WHEREAS, each of Montana's duly elected public servants has sworn to defend and uphold the United States Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of Montana denounce and condemn all acts of terrorism by any entity, wherever the acts occur; and

WHEREAS, terrorist attacks against Americans, such as those that occurred on September 11, 2001, have necessitated the crafting of effective laws to protect citizens of the United States and others from terrorist attacks; and

WHEREAS, any new security measures of federal, state, and local governments should be carefully designed and employed to enhance public safety without infringing on the civil liberties and rights of innocent citizens of Montana and the United States; and

WHEREAS, certain provisions of the ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001'', also known as the USA PATRIOT Act, allow the federal government to more liberally detain and investigate citizens and to engage in surveillance activities that may violate or offend the rights and liberties guaranteed by our state and federal constitutions.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the 59th Montana Legislature supports the government of the United States in its campaign against terrorism and affirms the commitment of the United States that the campaign not be waged at the expense of essential civil rights and liberties of citizens of this country that are protected in the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that it is the policy of the citizens of Montana to oppose any portion of the USA PATRIOT Act that violates the rights and liberties guaranteed under the Montana Constitution or the United States Constitution, including the Bill of Rights.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in accordance with Montana state policy, in the absence of reasonable suspicion of criminal activity under Montana law, the 59th Montana Legislature exhorts agents and instrumentalities of this state to not:

(1) initiate or participate in or assist or cooperate with an inquiry, investigation, surveillance, or detention under the USA PATRIOT Act if the action violates constitutionally guaranteed civil rights or civil liberties;

(2) record, file, or share intelligence information concerning a person or organization, including library lending and research records, book and video store sales and rental records, medical records, financial records, student records, and other personal data, even if authorized under the USA PATRIOT Act, if the action violates constitutionally guaranteed civil rights or civil liberties; or

(3) retain any of the intelligence information described in subsections (1) and (2) of this clause if the information violates constitutionally guaranteed civil rights or civil liberties.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Attorney General of Montana is encouraged to review intelligence information currently held by the state, assess the legality and appropriateness of holding the information under the United States Constitution and Montana Constitution, and permanently dispose of all such information to which there is not attached a reasonable suspicion of criminal activity.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 59th Montana Legislature admonishes every agency and instrumentality of the state to not:

(1) use state resources or institutions for the enforcement of federal immigration matters that are the responsibility of the federal government;

(2) collect or maintain information about the political, religious, or social views, associations, or activities of any individual, group, association, organization, corporation, business, or partnership unless the information directly relates to an investigation of criminal activities and there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the subject of the information was, is, or may be involved in criminal conduct; or

(3) engage in racial profiling.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that state and local law enforcement agencies should not use race, religion, ethnicity, or national origin as factors in selecting individuals to subject to investigatory activities, except when seeking to apprehend a specific suspect whose race, religion, ethnicity, or national origin is part of the description of the suspect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 59th Montana Legislature requests:

(1) public schools and institutions of higher learning within Montana to provide notice to each individual whose education records have been obtained by law enforcement agents pursuant to section 507 of the USA PATRIOT Act; and

(2) each public library within Montana to post in a prominent place within the library a notice to library users as follows: ''WARNING: Under Section 215 of the federal USA PATRIOT Act (Public Law 107–56), records of the books and other material you borrow from this library may be obtained by federal agents. Federal law prohibits librarians from informing you if records about you have been obtained by federal agents. Questions about the law and policy that allows federal agents to obtain and use information about your activities in this library should be directed to: U.S. Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530''.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 59th Montana Legislature encourages the Attorney General of Montana to periodically seek from federal authorities the following information in a form that facilitates an assessment of the effect of federal antiterrorism efforts on the residents of Montana:

(1) the name of each resident of Montana who has been arrested or otherwise detained by federal authorities as a result of terrorism investigations since September 11, 2001, the location of each detainee, the circumstances that led to each detention, the charges, if any, lodged against each detainee, and the name of counsel, if any, representing each detainee;

(2) the number of search warrants that have been executed in Montana pursuant to section 213 of the USA PATRIOT Act and without notice to the subject of the warrant;

(3) the extent of electronic surveillance carried out in Montana under powers granted in the USA PATRIOT Act;

(4) the extent to which federal authorities monitor political meetings, religious gatherings, or other activities within Montana that are protected by the First Amendment;

(5) the number of times that education records have been obtained from public schools and institutions of higher learning in Montana under section 507 of the USA PATRIOT Act;

(6) the number of times that library records have been obtained from libraries in Montana under section 215 or section 505 of the USA PATRIOT Act; and

(7) the number of times that records of the books purchased by store patrons from bookstores in Montana have been obtained under section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 59th Montana Legislature requests the Attorney General of Montana to compile and transmit to each member of the Legislature, at least once every 6 months, a summary of the information obtained pursuant to the legislative requests made in this resolution and, based on the information and any other relevant information, to include an assessment of the effect of federal antiterrorism efforts on the residents of Montana.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 59th Montana Legislature desires that all public libraries adopt policies that ensure the regular destruction of records, when the records are no longer needed, that may be used to identify the name of a book borrower or the name of any Internet user.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in order to protect intellectual privacy rights, the 59th Montana Legislature advises all persons in local businesses and institutions, particularly booksellers, to refrain whenever possible from keeping records that can be used to identify the name of any purchaser and to regularly destroy sales records maintained by the business or institution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 59th Montana Legislature urges the Montana delegation in the United States Congress to:

(1) correct provisions in the USA PATRIOT Act and other administrative measures that infringe on civil liberties by supporting the sunset provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, slated to be reviewed by Congress in 2005, and ultimately allow the USA PATRIOT Act to expire; and

(2) support passage of the Security and Freedom Ensured Act of 2003 and the End Racial Profiling Act of 2004.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 59th Montana Legislature urges the Montana Congressional Delegation to vigorously oppose any pending and all future federal legislation if the legislation infringes on the civil rights and civil liberties of American citizens. Federal legislation that the Montana Congressional Delegation is encouraged to oppose includes but is not limited to the Domestic Security Enhancement Act of 2003, also known as Patriot Act II.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Secretary of State send a copy of this resolution to President George W. Bush, the Attorney General of the United States, Governor Brian Schweitzer, Senator Max Baucus, Senator Conrad Burns, and Representative Dennis Rehberg.

Mr. President, now we turn to Vermont.

Joint resolution strongly urging the President to revise executive orders and policies, and for Congress to amend provisions of the U.S.A. Patriot Act, which seriously erode fundamental civil liberties.

Approved by: Vermont State Senate.

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2001, for the first time since the War of 1812, the continental United States was subjected to an attack from abroad when terrorists commandeered four commercial airliners and destroyed the World Trade Center in New York City and caused significant damage to the Pentagon, and

WHEREAS, in response to these tragic and devastating events, which cost nearly 3,000 innocent American lives, Congress adopted the U.S.A. Patriot Act (Public Law 107–56) which is intended to enable the federal government to act more authoritatively in preventing future attacks, and

WHEREAS, while the prevention of future terrorist attacks is a critical national priority, it is equally important to preserve the fundamental civil liberties and personal freedoms which were enshrined in the Bill of Rights over 200 years ago, and which have been preserved through a constant vigilance and outcry against periodic threats to their existence, and

WHEREAS, while sunset review dates were attached to certain provisions, the final bill remains, perhaps, the most severe legislative attack on civil liberties since the passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts in the 1790s, and

WHEREAS, under the auspices of both the U.S.A. Patriot Act and related executive orders, persons from the Middle East and South Asia have been unjustly targeted for interrogation and possible deportation, and

WHEREAS, the ability of the Central Intelligence Agency to engage in domestic spying activities, with tragic repercussions, fortunately halted in the 1970s, but is now being revived pursuant to sections 223 and 901 of the Act, and

WHEREAS, section 213 greatly lowers the threshold required for a court to issue a search warrant, and

WHEREAS, section 216 nearly eliminates judicial supervision of telephone and internet surveillance, and

WHEREAS, section 411 gives the U.S. Attorney General extraordinarily broad authority to designate domestic groups as ''terrorist organizations,'' and

WHEREAS, both sections 411 and 412 subject noncitizens to indefinite detention or deportation even if they have not committed a crime, and

WHEREAS, several sections of the bill, including 215, 218, 358, and 508, permit law enforcement authorities to have broad access to sensitive mental health, library, business, financial, and educational records despite the existence of previously adopted state and federal laws which were intended to strengthen the protection of these types of records, and

WHEREAS, there has been an especially strong outcry in Vermont against the ability of federal authorities, under section 215 of the Act, to obtain judicially-issued warrants for library or bookstore patron records based on minimal information, and the accompanying prohibition on librarians and bookstore personnel from revealing any information regarding the request, and

WHEREAS, this provision runs directly counter to the intent of the Vermont General Assembly to protect the privacy of a library patron's records as codified in Title 3 §317(c)(19) of the Vermont Statutes Annotated, and the code of ethics of the American Library Association, and Whereas, both the Fletcher Free Library Commission and the Vermont Library Association have expressed their strongest possible concerns that the U.S.A. Patriot Act undermines constitutionally-guaranteed rights and the privacy of library patrons, and

WHEREAS, Congressman Bernard Sanders has announced his intention to sponsor legislation to exempt libraries and booksellers from the disclosure requirements of the U.S.A. Patriot Act, and

WHEREAS, a number of municipal legislative bodies, including the Burlington City Council, have expressed their deep concerns relative to the U.S.A. Patriot Act's historic degradation of civil liberties, and

WHEREAS, the law gravely threatens the civic values, personal freedoms, and rights that constitute the foundation of our national existence, now therefore be it Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives: That the General Assembly strongly urges the President and members of the executive branch to review and revise executive orders and policies which have been adopted since September 11, 2001, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the General Assembly strongly urges the United States Congress to

revise the U.S.A. Patriot Act in order to restore and protect our nation's fundamental civil liberties, and, in particular, to enact Representative Sanders' proposal to exempt libraries and bookstores from the provisions of the Act, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the General Assembly requests that the office of the Vermont Attorney General offer legal support to any public library which is subject to a federal suit or administrative enforcement action for refusing to comply with the provisions of the Act related to library patrons' records, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to each member of the Vermont Congressional Delegation, and to Keith M. Fiels, Executive Director of the American Library Association, in Chicago.

There you have it. Those are the eight State government resolutions, but more than 400 total resolutions and ordinances have been passed, the rest by local, city, and county governments. In fact, on December 13, just 3 days before the first cloture vote on the conference report, the town of Coupeville, WA, became the 400th community or State to pass a resolution to reflect its citizens' concerns about the impact of the PATRIOT Act on constitutional rights. And since then four additional communities have passed resolutions, not to mention the California State resolution I just read.

Let me read a few of these county and city resolutions. I can do more later. Why don't we begin with the four passed in my State of Wisconsin.

Douglas County, this is one of the northern most counties in the State.

Resolution by the Douglas County Board of Supervisors, Subject U.S.A. PATRIOT Act, approved by Douglas County Board of Supervisors.

WHEREAS, Douglas County, Wisconsin, recognizes the Constitution of the United States of America to be the supreme law of the land, which all public servants are sworn to uphold, superceding all administrative rules, local ordinances, state statutes and federal laws, and

WHEREAS, Douglas County, Wisconsin, recognizes that the Bill of Rights, as represented in Exhibit H–5–03, embodies the rights of citizenship that have made the United States of America the land of freedom for more than 200 years, and

WHEREAS, Douglas County, Wisconsin, and the United States have benefited greatly through the constitutional rights and liberties afforded their diverse citizenry, in freedom of speech and assembly, equality before the law and the presumption of innocence, access to counsel and due process in judicial proceedings, and protection from unreasonable searches and seizures, and

WHEREAS, Douglas County, Wisconsin, affirms its strong opposition to terrorism, and further affirms that any efforts to end terrorism not be waged at the expense of our civil rights and liberties, and

WHEREAS, in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack, in an effort to unite and strengthen America, and to combat terrorism, Congress passed the USA Patriot Act, and

WHEREAS, it has become apparent that the USA Patriot Act weakens the constitutional protections for every United States citizen as follows:

(1) First Amendment rights, which guarantee ''freedom of religion, of speech, to peaceably assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances,'' are compromised by USA Patriot Act, Sections 802 and 215;

(2) Fourth Amendment protections, which guarantee the ''right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures,'' are compromised by USA Patriot Act Sections 203, 206, 213, and 218; and

(3) Fifth Amendment protections of due process and attorney-client confidentiality are compromised.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Douglas County Board of Supervisors expresses deep concern over any compromise of constitutional freedoms which protect civil rights and liberties for all people of the United States.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Douglas County Board of Supervisors affirms its strong opposition to terrorism, but also affirms that any efforts to end terrorism should not be waged at the expense of fundamental civil rights and liberties, and that a threat to one person's constitutional rights is a threat to the rights of all.

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Douglas County Board of Supervisors requests that United States representatives and senators closely monitor implementation of the USA Patriot Act, as well as Executive Orders issued pursuant to the Act, and actively work to repeal those Sections of the USA Patriot Act that threaten the essential civil rights and liberties of all Americans.

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED, that any enhancement to the USA Patriot Act, such as USA Patriot Act II (aka Domestic Security Act of 2003), be forestalled until such time as enhancements or changes are done in full view of American citizens.

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED, that upon passage, a copy of this resolution shall be provided to Governor James Doyle, Senator Robert Jauch, Representative Frank Boyle, each Wisconsin congressional delegate, United States Attorney General John Ashcroft, Secretary of State Colin Powell, and President George W. Bush.

Next, a resolution from the northwestern part of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, WI, a resolution of the City of Eau Claire, WI, approved by the Eau Claire City Council.

WHEREAS, the City of Eau Claire and its citizens being governed by the United States Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Wisconsin; and

WHEREAS, the City of Eau Claire acknowledges that both the United States and Wisconsin Constitutions guarantee her citizens freedom of speech, freedom to peaceably assemble, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, freedom of religion, freedom to petition the government for grievances and protection of the rights of the accused; and

WHEREAS, the City of Eau Claire is home to a diverse population, including citizens of other nations, whose contributions to the community are vital to its charter and function; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Eau Claire, while a strong opponent of terrorism and a strong proponent for the safety and security of its citizens, believes that efforts to maintain and enhance public safety and security should not infringe on the essential civil rights and liberties of the people of Eau Claire; and

WHEREAS, the City of Eau Claire recognizes and honors all those who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America, and has with gratitude for their supreme sacrifice memorialized those in the Armed Forces who have died in battle to secure and protect these same cherished rights and liberties; and

WHEREAS, sections of the USA PATRIOT Act now threaten these fundamental rights and liberties; and

WHEREAS, many citizens of Eau Claire, surrounding communities, and other communities across the nation are concerned that the USA PATRIOT Act threatens the civil rights and liberties of citizens of the United States and other nations by

so broadly defining ''domestic terrorism'' that any citizens who use direct action to further their political causes are vulnerable to prosecution as ''domestic terrorists'' (Sec. 802 of the USA PATRIOT Act);

authorizing federal agents to conduct covert searches of a person's home or office without notice of the execution of a search warrant until after the search has been completed, in some cases up to 90 days later (Sec. 213 of the USA PATRIOT Act);

requiring the surrender of ''any tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents and other items)'' and without limits as to the parties from whom the seizure of the above-mentioned tangible things can be required (Sec. 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act);

authorizing the government to install tracking devices on Internet Service Providers which are capable of intercepting all forms of Internet activity, e-mail messages, web page activity and Internet telephone communications whether the client is targeted in an investigation or not (Sec. 216 of the USA PATRIOT Act);

allowing searches to take place without probable cause of criminal conduct (Sec 218 of the USA PATRIOT Act); and

authorizing the United States Attorney General to detain indefinitely non-citizens on immigration violations and to arrest material witnesses not charged with any crime (Sec 412 of the USA PATRIOT Act).

WHEREAS, the City of Eau Claire recognizes that to date some 236 cities, towns, counties and states in the United States of America have passed resolutions, ordinances or ballot initiatives protecting the civil liberties of their residents;

Therefore, we the City Council of Eau Claire, Wisconsin, acting in the spirit of liberty, and to preserve those liberties guaranteed by the Constitutions of the United States of America and the State of Wisconsin, do hereby request that local, state, and federal law enforcement continue to preserve residents' freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and privacy;

1. Rights to counsel and due process in judicial proceedings; and protection from unreasonable searches and seizures, detentions and racial profiling;

2. The Wisconsin Congressional delegation actively work for the repeal of those portions of the Act and its extensions, including ''Patriot Act II'' and national security letters, that violate the rights and liberties guaranteed by the United States Constitution; and

3. The City Clerk communicate this resolution to all City and County departments and employees, Wisconsin's Congressional delegation, the Governor and Attorney General of the State of Wisconsin, and the President and Attorney General of the United States.

Now to the south-central part of the State, our State Capital, Madison, WI, a Resolution to Defend the Bill of Rights and Civil Liberties, approved by the Madison City Council.

WHEREAS, the City of Madison recognizes the Constitution of the United States of America to be the supreme law of the land, which all public servants are sworn to uphold, superceding all administrative rules, local ordinances, state statutes and federal laws;

WHEREAS, the City of Madison has a long and proud tradition of upholding the free exercise and enjoyment of the inalienable rights granted to all persons by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Constitution of the United States of America;

WHEREAS, the City of Madison greatly benefits from the many contributions of its highly diverse population, which includes citizens from around the world, and is vital to our city's unique character;

WHEREAS, the City of Madison affirms its strong opposition to terrorism, but also affirms that any efforts to end terrorism not be waged at the expense of essential civil rights and liberties of the people of Madison, the United States and the World;

WHEREAS, the provisions of the USA Patriot Act expands the authority of the federal government to detain and investigate citizens and non-citizens and engage in electronic surveillance of citizens and non- citizens and threatens civil rights and liberties guaranteed under the United States Constitution;

WHEREAS, the City of Madison recognizes that such infringement of the constitutionally guaranteed rights of any person, under the color of law, is an abuse of power, a breach of the public trust, a misappropriation of public resources, a violation of civil rights and is beyond the scope of governmental authority;

IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the City of Madison remains firmly committed to the protection of civil rights and civil liberties for all people. The City of Madison will completely avoid discrimination in every function of city government, and vigorously uphold the constitutionally protected rights of all persons to peacefully protest and express their political views without any form of governmental interference.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Madison joins communities across the nation in expressing concern that the USA PATRIOT Act threatens civil rights and liberties guaranteed under the United States Constitution.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, and is the policy of the City of Madison, to forbid in the absence of probable cause of criminal activity:

1. Any initiation of, participation in, assistance or cooperation with any inquiry, investigation, surveillance or detention; and

2. The recording, filing and sharing of any intelligence information concerning any person or organization, even if authorized by federal law enforcement, acting under new powers granted by the USA PATRIOT Act or Executive Orders. This includes collection and review of library lending and research records, as well as book and video store sales and/or rental records; and

3. The retention of intelligence information.

Information that is currently held shall be thoroughly and carefully reviewed by the City Attorney or other appropriate City official to be designated by the Mayor, for its legality and appropriateness, using the United States and Wisconsin Constitutions. Any information that was collected is permanently disposed of if there is no probable cause of criminal activity; and

4. Enforcement of immigration matters, which are entirely the responsibility of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. No city service will be denied on the basis of citizenship; and

5. Profiling based on race, ethnicity, citizenship, religion, or political values.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that any state or federal law enforcement agencies working within the City of Madison comply with the policies and procedures of the Madison Police Department, and regularly report to the Mayor the extent and manner in which they have acted under the USA PATRIOT Act or new Executive Orders. This includes the names of any detainees held in the Madison area, or any Madison residents detained elsewhere. The Mayor will then publicly report to the Common Council.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Clerk communicate this resolution to all city departments, the Governor and Attorney General of the State of Wisconsin, the President and Attorney General of the United States of America and to call upon our congressional representatives to actively work to repeal the USA PATRIOT Act.

IT IS FINALLY RESOLVED THAT, this Resolution shall be severable if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this Resolution is declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be contrary to the Constitution of the United States of America or the State of Wisconsin. If the applicability thereof to any agency, person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Resolution and applicability thereof to any other agency, person or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Finally, our largest city, Milwaukee, WI. Resolution Affirming the Protection of Citizens' Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. Approved by: Milwaukee City Council.

Whereas, The city of Milwaukee denounces terrorism and acknowledges that Federal, state and local governments have a responsibility to protect the public from terrorist attacks and uphold:

1. Freedom of speech, religion, assembly and privacy,

2. The right to counsel and due process in judicial proceedings, and

3. Protection from unreasonable searches, seizures and detention; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Common Council believe that there is no inherent conflict between national security and the preservation of liberty—Americans can be both safe and free; and

WHEREAS, Federal, state and local governments should protect the public from terrorist attacks, such as those that occurred on September 11, 2001, but should do so in a rational and deliberative fashion in order to ensure that security measures enhance the public safety without impairing constitutional rights or infringing on civil liberties; and

WHEREAS, the City of Milwaukee is grateful for the supreme sacrifice of military veterans and law enforcement officers who have died in protecting this country's cherished rights and liberties; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Congress passed the USA PATRIOT Act on October 26, 2001 with little debate, following the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001; and

WHEREAS, sections of the USA PATRIOT Act and several Executive Orders, now threaten fundamental rights and liberties, which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the State of Wisconsin and the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights; the sections of the Act which threaten these human rights and liberties include:

Section 213 which permits law enforcement to perform searches with no one present and to delay notification of the search of a citizen's home.

Section 215 which permits the FBI Director to seek records from bookstores and libraries including books of patrons based on minimal evidence of wrongdoing and prohibits librarians and bookstore employees from disclosing the fact that they have been ordered to produce such documents.

Section 218 which dilutes the ''probable cause'' requirement before conducting secret searches or surveillance to obtain evidence of a crime.

Section 215, 218, 358, and 508 which permit law enforcement authorities to have broad access to sensitive mental health, library, business, financial and educational records despite the existence of previously adopted state and federal laws which were intended to strengthen the protection of these types of records; and

WHEREAS, the City of Milwaukee has a commitment to uphold the human rights of all persons in Milwaukee and the free exercise and enjoyment of any and all rights and privileges secured by our constitutions and laws of the United States, the State of Wisconsin and the Charter of the City of Milwaukee; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, that the Common Council expresses its support of protection of citizens' human rights and civil liberties and opposition to those provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act that threaten those rights and liberties; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Common Council recognizes the crucial distinctions between:

Legal and peaceful demonstrations and protests, which are protected by the U.S. and Wisconsin constitutions and laws.

Acts of protest involving civil disobedience of minor law infractions such as disorderly conduct.

Acts of terrorism, which would involve serious threats or violence, such as kidnapping or serious bodily injury to a civilian population; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Common Council affirms its commitment to uphold civil rights and civil liberties and therefore expresses its opposition to:

(a) investigation of individuals or groups of individuals based on their participation in activities protected by the First Amendment, such as political advocacy or the practice of religion, without reasonable suspicion of criminal activity, and

(b) racial, religious or ethnic profiling; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Common Council calls upon Wisconsin's federal legislators to monitor the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act and related federal actions and to actively work for the repeal of those sections of the USA PATRIOT Act that unduly infringe upon fundamental rights and liberties as recognized in the U.S. Constitution; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Common Council urges Wisconsin's federal legislators to support and co-sponsor the Security and Freedom Ensured Act of 2003 (SAFE Act) and urges Congressman F. James Sensenbrenner, chair of the House Judiciary Committee, to schedule hearings on the SAFE Act; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City of Milwaukee opposes any unfunded federal mandates instructing local police to attempt to enforce the complex civil immigration laws of the U.S. to the detriment of their primary law enforcement duties, as articulated by the Boston Police Commissioner: ''turning all police officers into immigration agents . . . will discourage immigrants from coming forward to report crimes and suspicious activity, making our streets less safe as a result''; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City of Milwaukee remains committed to the protection of civil rights and civil liberties for all people and will uphold the constitutionally protected rights of all people to peacefully express their political views without governmental interference and that officers of the Milwaukee Police Department be trained consistent with the above principles; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Common Council opposes requests by federal authorities that, if granted, would cause agencies of

the City of Milwaukee to exercise powers or cooperate in the exercise of powers in violation of any city ordinance or the laws or Constitution of the State of the United States; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That in order to assess the effect of antiterrorism initiatives on the residents of the City of Milwaukee, the Common Council calls upon federal officials to make periodic reports, consistent with the Freedom of Information Act; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City of Milwaukee joins 43 million Americans, 250 communities in 37 states across the nation and the National League of Cities as of February 24, 2004 in expressing concern that existing elements of the USA PATRIOT Act threaten civil rights and liberties guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. President, I shared with my colleagues the resolutions of all eight States in this country, all the way from Alaska to Maine, that express deep concerns about provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act. This was our opportunity to respond to the voices of those legislatures and the people of those States, to their heartfelt concerns about the degradation of their civil liberties. Many of these are not liberal States. Many of these are some of the reddest of the red States, to put it into common parlance, and they are some of the strongest States when it comes to the question of whether someone's library records or business records should be obtainable on no showing whatever—whatever—that someone is connected either to terrorism or any kind of wrongdoing at all. That is American common sense, whether you are standing in Maine, Wisconsin, or Alaska.

I only shared 4 of the 400 resolutions from city councils and county governments that essentially say the same thing. But I did share four from all over my State of Wisconsin where I believe the sentiment is strong that there simply is no reason why we cannot get the balance right, why we can't always err on the side of more government power, where the feeling is that somehow we are capable in this Congress and in this Government and in this country of getting the terrorists and stopping the terrorists, but also protecting the fundamental rights on which this country is founded.

It is not just my words. I happen to have been the only person to vote against the original USA PATRIOT Act in this Senate. But what I have begun to share is the fact that hundreds and hundreds of governmental units across this country have passed resolutions by the elected representatives in those communities or in those States, saying, wait, there are problems with the USA PATRIOT Act and they must be fixed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199, the PATRIOT Act, occur at 3 p.m. tomorrow, with no further intervening action or debate. I further ask that the time until 2:30 be equally divided, with 1 hour of the time controlled by the minority to be under the control of Senator FEINGOLD and that the time between 2:30 and 3 p.m. be equally divided between the majority leader and the Democratic leader or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I want the record to be spread with my appreciation to Senator FEINGOLD for working with us. Because of his agreeing to give up part of the time, it is going to make it more convenient for Members who have other things they would like to be doing, including another matter to vote on as soon as we finish this. So I want the record to indicate that I speak for many Senators in expressing appreciation to Senator FEINGOLD for working with us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, yesterday I opposed cloture on S. 2271, the USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006. Although I support Senator SUNUNU's bill, I voted against ending debate on it because Members of the Senate should have the right to offer amendments to this legislation, which implicates some very weighty constitutional and civil liberty issues. Today, I voted in support of S. 2271 on its merits because I believe it improves the PATRIOT Act conference report. I will continue to work with Senators FEINGOLD, SPECTER, and others to make more improvements such as those included in the bipartisan Senate PATRIOT Act reauthorization bill, which passed unanimously last July.

GOLDEN GAVEL AWARD

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I wish to take a brief moment to acknowledge an important feat of one of our Members. At approximately 5 o'clock today, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN, reached his 100th hour of presiding. Senator COBURN will be the second Senator in the 109th Congress to receive the Golden Gavel Award.

Most Members will agree that the best way to learn about Senate procedure is to preside over the Senate Chamber. Senator COBURN has done so with distinction. He has done so with honor and with a firm but fair gavel. In addition to his regular presiding time, Senator COBURN has volunteered to preside and fill in on those late nights and weekends when we are in dire need of help in the Chair. We all thank him for that.

The Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Oklahoma. We thank him for his service and congratulate him on this outstanding achievement.

AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, each year roughly 24,000 children in the United States are born with an autism spectrum disorder. Over my short lifetime in medicine, the last 30 years, it has been remarkable to see the increase in autism spectrum disorder, a disorder which we don't understand today. We have made progress, but we don't understand it. The symptoms are tragic in many ways. They can be severe, or they have the spectrum from mild to severe. Autistic infants display abnormal reactions to various sensory stimuli, whether it is light or touch or smells, where touches can be experienced as being very painful, smells can be experienced as being very unpleasant. Loud noises and bright lights may cause reactions that involve a range of emotions, including weeping.

As the child grows older, they sometimes avoid cuddling or touching even close family members—again, this is a broad spectrum—many times preferring to stay alone, to play by themselves. By adolescence, these symptoms can become unbearably acute. You can imagine the impact this has on parents who become bewildered. Some lose hope. It is more common than childhood cancer today.

A lot of people don't realize that the incidence and prevalence of this has increased to the point that it surpasses childhood cancer. It can tear apart families—even the strongest families. The reason I bring it to the floor today is, I spent a good part of today talking to various people whose families have been affected. My own family has been affected by it. And as a physician, a doctor, as somebody who has devoted the majority of his adult life not to politics but to healing, I do believe that that combination of physician and legislator gives me certain responsibilities but also certain opportunities to push the frontiers of health, especially when we don't know the cause, the etiology.

That is why 6 years ago I sponsored the Children's Health Act of 2000. That was the first bill that looked at a whole spectrum of childhood diseases, one of which was autism. The legislation directed the National Institutes of Health to expand, to intensify, and to coordinate research into autism—this very complex, very poorly understood disorder. Progress has been made, but now the time has come to reauthorize that legislation.

Under the Children's Health Act, the NIH established the interagency coordinating committee to coordinate all autism-related activities at the Health

and Human Services Agency. The committee represents a broad range of interests, including parents, doctors, and researchers engaged with this disease. The NIH also created eight Centers of Excellence in autism research across the country to conduct basic clinical research into the cause, diagnosis, early detection, prevention, control, and treatment of autism. These eight centers have shown and demonstrated true success.

In 2001, NIH spent about $56 million on autism-related research. Three years later, that number went up to $100 million. What is especially remarkable is what the private sector, through philanthropy and organizations, has done in complementing and supplementing those funds. Unfortunately, we still don't know what causes autism, but we know that we must find a cure. It is time for us to reauthorize the autism provisions in the Children's Health Act. I look forward to working with my colleagues to do that. Children are our Nation's most precious resource. We must continue to push for a sustained investment and commitment to curing this heartbreaking disorder.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL VISIT TO INDIA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as I am sure all of my colleagues are aware, President Bush arrives today in India, where he will meet with Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh. As the President observed on February 22, ''We have an ambitious agenda with India. Our agenda is also practical. It builds on a relationship that has never been better. India is a global leader, as well as a good friend, and I look forward to working with Prime Minister Singh to address other difficult problems such as HIV/AIDS, pandemic flu, and the challenge posed by Iran's nuclear ambitions. My trip will remind everybody about the strengthening of an important strategic partnership. We'll work together in practical ways to promote a hopeful future for citizens in both our nations.''

One of the most important items of business between the United States and India is the agreement for these two great democracies to cooperate on civil nuclear energy, which President Bush and Prime Minister Singh announced this past July. I have previously spoken in support of this initiative. I am hopeful that we will soon reach an agreement on the details of the plan and look forward to the Senate's consideration of the legislation that will implement the agreement.

The civil nuclear agreement with India is important for a number of reasons, ranging from improving global nonproliferation efforts to lessening India's demand on fossil fuels. I would like to emphasize that India and the United States have common interests in preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and related materials. Indeed, India has repeatedly made the hard decision to stand with the United States in seeking a peaceful solution to Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions.

However, it would be a mistake to confine the significance of the President's mission to India to nuclear issues. India is not only the world's largest democracy but a rapidly growing consumer market for American goods and services. Unlike some other developing economies, India's growth is not confined to heavy industry geared for the export market. Because India's economic dynamo is being driven from the bottom up, satisfying the needs of a rising middle class points to a balanced, healthy commercial relationship with the United States.

President Bush's visit to India is an opportunity to advance our partnership across the full range of issues: expanded cooperation on economic growth and development; mutual commercial opportunities, combating international terrorism; and a full field of cooperation on space, agriculture, energy and the environment, and high technology. I wish him the greatest success in all of these areas.

DAY IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to reflect on a momentous day in American history. On this day in 1780, Pennsylvania became the first State in our Nation to abolish slavery. The Gradual Abolition Act was an important first step in our Nation's history toward greater equality for all Americans.

Last month, 226 years later, we celebrated Black History Month. And, we have much to celebrate since 1780. The accomplishments of African-Americans and their tremendous sacrifices have strengthened our great Nation and we recognize their enormous contributions to our diverse culture.

In 1870, the 15th amendment to the Constitution granted African-American men the right to vote by declaring that the ''right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.''

It would be almost a century, however, for the true spirit of the 15th amendment to be fully realized. Through the use of literacy tests, poll taxes, and other means, African-Americans were effectively disenfranchised in many parts of the Nation. Significant numbers of Black Americans across the country were not registered to vote until the Voting Rights of Act of 1965 was enacted.

Organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, have continued the effort to gain true equality for African-Americans. In my home State of Oregon, the Portland chapter of the NAACP was founded in 1914. It remains the oldest continually chartered chapter west of the Mississippi River.

As we continue to make strides in the battle for equality, we remember the tremendous accomplishments of African-Americans. But the struggle is not over. We can always do better. We must continue to fight to fulfill the legacy of the civil rights movement and ensure that all Americans have equal rights and opportunities.

PROSECUTION IS NOT PREVENTION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is sometimes argued that ''prosecution is prevention'' when it comes to gun violence. While I agree that our gun laws should be strictly enforced, prosecuting criminals is only part of the solution to our Nation's problems with guns. True prevention involves reducing the likelihood of death or injury before an incident occurs. In addition, it is important to recognize that prosecution has little or nothing to do with the thousands of accidental shootings and gun suicides that occur each year. Unfortunately, we have still not done enough to prevent dangerous guns from falling into the hands of potential criminals, children, and others who may intentionally or unintentionally use them to harm themselves or others.

Physicians for Social Responsibility, or PSR, is a leading public policy organization made up of more than 24,000 medical and public health professionals which has been active in the fight to solve the problem of gun violence in our Nation. PSR is one of many groups who view gun violence as a ''preventable public health epidemic.'' As it states on its Web site:

> Public health practice focuses resources on prevention, rather than a traditional criminal justice, ''after the fact'' method of reacting to violence through arrest, conviction and incarceration of violent offenders. Just as public health policy recognizes that immunizing a patient against the measles is far superior to treating a patient already infected, the same logic can be applied to guns.

If we are serious about preventing gun violence, we must first reduce the ability of criminals to acquire dangerous firearms. One way of doing this is by requiring background checks on all firearms sold in the United States, instead of only those that are sold by licensed dealers as is prescribed under current Federal law. According to the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, ''two out of every five guns acquired in the United States, including guns bought at gun shows, through classified ads, and between individuals, change hands without a background check.'' The Coalition to Stop Gun Violence also estimates that ''extending criminal background checks to all gun transactions

in the United States could prevent nearly 120,000 additional illegal gun sales every year.''

Prevention of unintentional shooting and suicide by children requires that proactive steps be taken to reduce access to dangerous firearms. A study published last year in the Journal of the American Medical Association found that the risk of unintentional shooting or suicide by minors using a gun can be reduced by 61 percent when ammunition in the home is locked up. Simply storing ammunition separately from the gun reduces such occurrences by more than 50 percent.

Prosecution of gun violence perpetrators alone is not an effective means of preventing injury or death caused by guns, although opponents of commonsense gun safety legislation argue that it is. Unfortunately, our gun safety laws do not include many proactive measures that would reduce the likelihood that a gun is used to kill or injure. I hope my colleagues will join me in working to address this problem.

HONORING COACH EDWARD THOMAS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am proud to say that I have recently discovered, almost literally in my own backyard, an Iowan who has received an honor of national significance. Mr. Edward Thomas, the head football coach at Aplington-Parkersburg High School, is the recipient of the 2005 NFL High School Coach of the Year award. He was honored with tickets to Super Bowl XL as well as monetary awards for himself and his football program.

Coach Thomas has been coaching for 34 years, 31 of those at Aplington-Parkersburg. His overall record at Aplington-Parkersburg is 249 wins and 58 losses. He has guided his teams to the State playoffs 15 times, winning 2 State titles and has won 15 conference or district championships during that time. In his 34 years of coaching, he has won such awards as the National Federation High School Football Coach of the Year in 2004, Northeast Iowa Coach of the Year 5 times and was inducted into the Iowa High School Football Coaches' Association Hall of Fame in 1990. With an enrollment of almost 300 at Aplington-Parkersburg, Coach Thomas has produced 4 active NFL players—Detroit Lions defensive end Jared DeVries, Jacksonville Jaguars guard Brad Meester, Kansas City Chiefs center Casey Wiegmann and Green Bay Packers defensive end Aaron Kampman.

Coach Thomas also teaches life lessons and Christian principles while emphasizing the adversity and teamwork of football as a reflection of life in the real world. As Aaron Kampman put it, ''He strives to make men better through the game of football.'' Kampman also stated, ''You get goosebumps playing for the guy, the essence of playing under the lights on Friday night he brought that to the forefront.''

While the Aplington-Parkersburg Falcons are rivals to my hometown team, the Dike-New Hartford Wolverines, I am very proud that an Iowan has been honored in this way. I offer my sincere congratulations to Coach Thomas on this most prestigious honor and wish him continued success.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

KIMMIE MEISSNER

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Kimmie Meissner, a great Olympian and the pride of Bel Air, MD. We in Maryland are so proud of Kimmie. Sixth at the Olympics at the age of 16 is a monumental achievement.

Like many of my colleagues, I was glued to the television set to watch our U.S. athletes in Torino. I was so impressed with Kimmie's performance, I only wish I could have been there to lead the applause for our hometown girl. She may have come in sixth in Torino, but she came in first in the hearts of the people of my great State.

But Kimmie's accomplishments didn't begin in Torino. She began her figure skating career 10 years ago at the age of 6. At the age of 6. She has been a true student athlete for almost her entire life, balancing her school work with her training. Kimmie goes to Fallston High School in Harford County every day, and when school is over she drives to Delaware to train for her second shift as a competitive figure skater.

Kimmie shows maturity far beyond her years, both on and off the ice. She supports the Leukemia Society and the Johns Hopkins Hospital Children's Center, taking time out of her life to visit with sick young people.

On the ice, Kimmie couldn't have a better attitude. She says her motto is, ''enjoy what you do; do what you enjoy.'' I can think of few young people who have such a thoughtful approach to life. At 16 years old, she has the brightest future of anyone of our Olympic skaters, and I can't wait for the Vancouver Olympics in 2010.

March is Women's History Month and the time when we celebrate the achievements and struggles of women in America. Frequently, we point to those who have come before us and who have paved the way for current advances. But it is only right and proper that in this 2006 Women's History Month, we salute young women like Kimmie and the honor she brought the United States with her talent, skill, and sportsmanship.

Thank you, Kimmie, for making us so proud. Thank you for representing all that is good and true about America's young people. And though I cannot tell a salchow from an axel, let alone a loop from a lutz, even I could recognize your grit, grace, and promise of an even more glittering future.•

TRIBUTE TO REGINA RUSH-KITTLE

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a dedicated public servant and a groundbreaker in her field, Lieutenant Regina Rush-Kittle. On March 3, Lieutenant Rush-Kittle will receive the Officer of the Year award from the Connecticut Association of Women Police.

Regina Rush-Kittle's long and distinguished law enforcement career began in 1983. After graduating from the University of Connecticut with a degree in political science, Lieutenant Rush-Kittle served as a correctional officer at a high security correctional institution for 2 years. She then joined the Middletown Police Department, becoming the first African-American female police officer on the force. She served as a patrol officer for 2 years prior to being accepted into the Connecticut State Police Academy.

Regina Rush-Kittle has been a trailblazer for African-American women in Connecticut law enforcement. After serving as the first African-American woman on the Middletown police force, she went on to become the first African-American woman to attain the rank of sergeant in the Connecticut State Police Department. Most recently, after scoring number one on both the lieutenants exam and master sergeants exam, Regina Rush-Kittle was promoted to lieutenant, the first African-American female to attain that rank in the department's 100-year history. Her current assignment as commander of the Bethany barracks makes her the first African-American woman in State history to command a barracks.

Lieutenant Rush-Kittle's tireless commitment to her community, her State, and her country extends beyond her achievements in Connecticut law enforcement. She is a long-serving Marine and Army Reservist. In 2003, she was deployed to Kuwait for a year, serving with the 804th Medical Brigade out of Fort Devens, MA. Upon her return in February 2004, she attained the rank of sergeant major, taking on responsibilities far beyond the normal obligations to serve 1 weekend per month and 2 weeks in the summer. Despite being eligible for retirement from the Reserves, Lieutenant Rush-Kittle continues to serve.

Regina Rush-Kittle is an outstanding citizen who goes above and beyond to protect her fellow citizens, her State, and her country. I commend her for her continued dedication, and congratulate her, her husband William, and her two children Jorrell and Gianna on this wonderful occasion.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 449. An act to facilitate shareholder consideration of proposals to make Settlement

Common Stock under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act available to missed enrollees, eligible elders, and eligible persons born after December 18, 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1096. An act to establish the Thomas Edison National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey as the successor to the Edison National Historic Site.

H.R. 1259. An act to award a congressional gold medal on behalf of the Tuskegee Airmen, collectively, in recognition of their unique military record, which inspired revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces.

H.R. 1728. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of Ste. Genevieve County in the State of Missouri as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2872. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Speaker on February 16, 2006, appointed the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Vice Chairman.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1096. An act to establish the Thomas Edison National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey as the successor to the Edison National Historic Site; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1259. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress, collectively, to the Tuskegee Airmen in recognition of their unique military record, which inspired revolutionary reform in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1728. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating portions of Ste. Genevieve Country in the State of Missouri as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2872. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Louis Braille; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5813. A communication from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae) management report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2005; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5814. A communication from the Chief Operating Officer/President, Resolution Funding Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Resolution Funding Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2005 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5815. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency and related measures blocking property of persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5816. A communication from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulation H and Y—Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Market Risk Measure; Securities Borrowing Transactions'' ((RIN1557–AC–90) (Docket No. R–1087)) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5817. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Market Risk Measure; Securities Borrowing Transactions'' (RIN1557–AC90) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5818. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Delegation of Insuring Authority To Direct Endorsement Mortgages; Announcement of Information Collection Effective Date'' ((RIN2502–AG87) (FR–4169–F–04)) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5819. A communication from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's Fiscal Year 2007 Capital Investment and Leasing Program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5820. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report relative to compliance during calendar year 2005 with the Government in Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5821. A communication from the Director, Office of Budget and Management, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Budget and Management's 2006 Federal Financial Management Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5822. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Governors, United States Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's calendar year 2005 report relative to the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5823. A communication from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Institution's competitive sourcing activities for fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5824. A communication from the Director, Insurance Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Acquisition Regulation: Technical Amendments'' (RIN3206–AJ20) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5825. A communication from the Director, Strategic Human Resources Policy Division, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Excepted Service—Temporary Organizations'' (RIN3206–AJ70) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5826. A communication from the Director, Strategic Human Resources Policy Division, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Environmental Differential Pay for Asbestos Exposure'' (RIN3206–AK64) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5827. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revised Regulations Governing Small Power Production and Cogeneration Facilities'' (Docket No. RM05–36–000) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5828. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules Concerning Certification of the Electric Reliability Organization; and Procedures for the Establishment, Approval, and Enforcement of Electric Reliability Standards'' (Docket No. RM05–30–000) received on February 27, 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5829. A communication from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's report relative to its competitive sourcing efforts for fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5830. A communication from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Fiscal Year 2002 Report on the Community Food and Nutrition Program (CFNP); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5831. A communication from the Principal Deputy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the impact of the improvements to compensation and benefits made by title VI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5832. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Title 10, U.S. Code 2464 requiring notification of Congress the first time a weapon system or other item of military equipment is determined to be a commercial item; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5833. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Competitive Sourcing Report for Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5834. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Danger Pay to government civilian employees working in Dushanbe, Tajikistan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5835. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 06–35–06–43); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LOTT, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 2349. An original bill to provide greater transparency in the legislative process.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. DAYTON):

S. 2342. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 2343. A bill to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide relief to the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita by placing manufactured homes in flood plains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2344. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the employer subsidy payment provisions under the Medicare prescription drug program to State Pharmaceutical Assistance Programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 2345. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt passenger vehicles eligible for the alternative motor vehicle credit and the credit for qualified electric vehicles from the limitation on depreciation for luxury automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 2346. A bill to amend the Ojito Wilderness Act to make a technical correction; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 2347. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the tax credit for holders of qualified zone academy bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2348. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require a licensee to notify the Atomic Energy Commission, and the State and county in which a facility is located, whenever there is an unplanned release of fission products in excess of allowable limits; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LOTT:

S. 2349. An original bill to provide greater transparency in the legislative process; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 2350. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DAYTON):

S. 2351. A bill to provide additional funding for mental health care for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TALENT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. SUNUNU):

S. Res. 386. A resolution honoring the Pre-Negro Leagues and Negro Leagues baseball players and executives elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 103

At the request of Mr. TALENT, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 103, a bill to respond to the illegal production, distribution, and use of methamphetamine in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 241

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 241, a bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that funds received as universal service contributions and the universal service support programs established pursuant to that section are not subject to certain provisions of title 31, United States Code, commonly known as the Antideficiency Act.

S. 333

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 333, a bill to hold the current regime in Iran accountable for its threatening behavior and to support a transition to democracy in Iran.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to establish the Mark O. Hatfield-Elizabeth Furse Scholarship and Excellence in Tribal Governance Foundation, and for other purposes.

S. 503

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to expand Parents as Teachers programs and other quality programs of early childhood home visitation, and for other purposes.

S. 558

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 558, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special compensation and to eliminate the phase-in period under current law with respect to such concurrent receipt.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer health benefits plans to individuals who are not Federal employees, and for other purposes.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 877, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 1035

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1035, a bill to authorize the presentation of commemorative medals on behalf of Congress to Native Americans who served as Code Talkers during foreign conflicts in which the United States was involved during the 20th century in recognition of the service of those Native Americans to the United States.

S. 1257

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1257, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify that persons may bring private rights of actions against foreign states for certain terrorist acts, and for other purposes.

S. 1440

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1440, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for cardiac rehabilitation and pulmonary rehabilitation services.

S. 1605

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 1605, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect public safety officers, judges, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes.

S. 1791

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified timber gains.

S. 1951

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1951, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help individuals with functional impairments and their families pay for services and supports that they need to maximize their functionality and independence and have choices about community participation, education, and employment, and for other purposes.

S. 1998

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1998, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections relating to the reputation and meaning of the Medal of Honor and other military decorations and awards, and for other purposes.

S. 2008

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2008, a bill to improve cargo security, and for other purposes.

S. 2134

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2134, a bill to strengthen existing programs to assist manufacturing innovation and education, to expand outreach programs for small and medium-sized manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 2157

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2157, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the Purple Heart to be awarded to prisoners of war who die in captivity under circumstances not otherwise establishing eligibility for the Purple Heart.

S. 2253

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2253, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to offer the 181 Area of the Gulf of Mexico for oil and gas leasing.

S. 2287

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2287, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and permanently extend the expensing of certain depreciable business assets for small businesses.

S. 2314

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2314, a bill to suspend the application of any provision of Federal law under which persons are relieved from the requirement to pay royalties for production of oil or natural gas from Federal lands in periods of high oil and natural gas prices, to require the Secretary to seek to renegotiate existing oil and natural gas leases to similarly limit suspension of royalty obligations under such leases, and for other purposes.

S. 2322

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2322, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly.

S. 2327

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2327, a bill to require the FCC to issue a final order regarding white spaces.

S. 2333

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2333, a bill to require an investigation under the Defense Production Act of 1950 of the acquisition by Dubai Ports World of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 79

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 79, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that no United States assistance should be provided directly to the Palestinian Authority if any representative political party holding a majority of parliamentary seats within the Palestinian Authority maintains a position calling for the destruction of Israel.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 2343. A bill to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide relief to the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita by placing manufactured homes in flood plains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, this week marks the 6-month anniversary of when Hurricane Katrina ravaged the gulf coast, destroying lives and dreams along the way. Thousands upon thousands of homes were also ruined, and today they remain simply a heap of debris.

I saw this devastation firsthand a few weeks ago when, as a member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, we traveled to Gulfport and New Orleans for field hearings to see what resources are necessary to help the region recover from the largest natural disaster in our history.

In fact, this photograph was taken by one of the press people who was on that trip. So we saw this scene firsthand. Alison Vekshin of Stephens Media took this photo.

I remind my colleagues that Hurricane Katrina completely destroyed 205,330 homes in Louisiana. It completely destroyed 68,729 homes in Mississippi. And 363 homes were completely destroyed in Alabama. For many of these families who lost everything, a place to live would offer opportunity for them to go back to work and begin rebuilding their lives.

I was told by local and State leaders that housing is the catalyst to get businesses open, to get people back to work, to pump money back into the local economy, and to restore the infrastructure that once existed.

Many people along the gulf coast who lost their houses have also lost hope. In Arkansas, we have a place called Hope where 10,777 manufactured homes sit on an airfield.

These homes—ordered by FEMA and paid for by FEMA—now sit in a FEMA-leased site, only to be restricted from use in the gulf region because of a FEMA-imposed rule that prevents them from being located in a floodplain.

FEMA is now accepting bids to gravel the area where the homes are sitting on dirt, costing taxpayers another $4 to $7 million. In addition, FEMA is buying a specially designed jack for each corner of each home to prevent sagging and further damage.

These manufactured homes epitomize FEMA's ineptitude in planning, communication, and response. Taxpayers have now spent an estimated $475 million for these homes to sit gridlocked in bureaucracy, even as evacuees are evicted from hotel rooms and thousands of others struggle to find affordable housing.

Congressman MIKE ROSS of Arkansas asked FEMA to waive the floodplain restriction that stands in the way between the homeless and a home. But FEMA refused, citing that manufactured homes are ''sitting ducks'' for the next natural disaster. These homes, I have to remind my colleagues, were built to high wind zone 3 specifications, so while they may not withstand the next hurricane—although they may—they will not tumble over during a storm.

Now, we are telling FEMA to let hope travel to where it is needed most, from

Arkansas to Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama.

My legislation, the Hope Housing Act of 2006, allows manufactured homes bought for Katrina and Rita victims to be located in floodplains, protects FEMA from responsibility if the homes are subsequently flooded, and directs FEMA to publicize this change so people will know they are available.

This is a one-time change that I believe is necessary in the face of what I hope will be a one-time disaster. We have people without homes and homes without people. Let's allow the homes to go where they are needed so the people in New Orleans and the gulf coast can return to their communities and help rebuild them. The alternative seems to be to let them sit and deteriorate in Hope, Arkansas.

Mr. President, 6 months is too long to allow this nonsense to continue. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense solution that allows hurricane victims a little hope and opportunity for their future.

The bottom line is that basically FEMA ordered these homes, paid for these homes, and now they are storing these homes, but their own regulation will not allow them to use them where they are most needed. So what our legislation does is allow FEMA to put these homes down where they are needed to try to get the economic cycle in New Orleans and the gulf coast area going again because right now the cycle is broken. They do not have people down there to work the jobs. They do not have people down there to be consumers. And the reason they do not have people is because they do not have a place to live.

So I urge my colleagues to consider helping in this effort. The Hope Housing Act of 2006 is a very commonsense solution for this very critical need.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 2345. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt passenger vehicles eligible for the alternative motor vehicle credit and the credit for qualified electric vehicles from the limitation on depreciation for luxury automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a bill I introduced today that may be cited as the ''America's Business Choice Act'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2345

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''America's Business Choice Act''.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION FROM DEPRECIATION LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN ALTERNATIVE AND ELECTRIC PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 280F(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN ALTERNATIVE MOTOR VEHICLES AND QUALIFIED ELECTRIC VEHICLES.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any motor vehicle for which a credit is allowable under section 30 or 30B.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (C) of section 280F(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (ii) and by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 2347. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the tax credit for holders of qualified zone academy bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today, I am reintroducing, with Senator ROCKEFELLER, a bill to make some small but important changes to the Qualified Zone Academy Bond, QZAB, program.

The QZAB program helps qualifying schools renovate and update school buildings. Schools issue special bonds to finance the cost of renovation. Purchasers of the bonds receive a Federal tax credit in lieu of interest on the bond, thus helping to reduce the cost to the school. Most States are now using this program to modernize their school facilities. The QZAB program expired in 2005, but the Tax Reconciliation bill that will soon be considered by a conference committee extends the program.

We are proposing to make modest changes in the QZAB program to make it even more useful to schools across the country. Our bill would expand the pool of bond purchasers to include all taxpayers, both individuals and other entities. Currently, only financial institutions can buy QZABs, which precludes pension funds and mutual funds from purchasing QZABs.

Our bill would also allow QZABs to be ''stripped'' so the purchaser could then sell separately the principal portion of the bond and the tax credit. This will encourage the development of a secondary market for the bonds and reduce the discount costs making more of the proceeds available for school-related expenses. It will also open the market to nonprofit entities such as public employee pension funds.

The bill revises the allocation formula to the States to better align with Title I, the program for disadvantaged students. Current law requires that allocations be made on the basis of a State's population living below poverty. This change simplifies and updates by tying funding to the formula used to distribute Title I funding for disadvantaged students.

Unused bonding authority would be reallocated to other States. A few States have not used their allocations, and their bonding authority has lapsed. However, the demand in many States now far exceeds their allocation. Allowing funds to be reallocated would maximize the potential of the QZAB program.

Finally, our bill would allow QZABs to be used for new construction and to purchase land for school buildings. We believe QZABs have been proven to be a cost-effective method for financing school renovation. With this additional flexibility, States can effectively reduce their construction backlogs.

School districts across the country have praised the QZAB program for helping them to address serious problems in their buildings. This is a good program. We can make it even better by enacting these small reforms. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important measure.

By Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2348. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require a licensee to notify the Atomic Energy Commission, and the State and county in which a facility is located, whenever there is an unplanned release of fission products in excess of allowable limits; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, less than 2 months ago, it was announced by Exelon Nuclear that an environmental monitoring program discovered higher than normal concentrations of tritium in the groundwater near the Nuclear Generating Station in Braidwood, IL.

Indications are that this tritium plume is the result of an accidental radioactive wastewater release that occurred approximately 6 to 8 years ago, and now the tritiated water has migrated underground into several drinking wells of nearby residents.

While most of the issues associated with this situation are still under investigation, one issue is clear. Community residents, particularly the State and local officials responsible for the safety and health of their constituents, did not receive full or immediate notification of this contamination—either from Exelon, or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC, the Federal agency with oversight over nuclear plant operations.

I was surprised to learn, that while Federal law requires State and local officials to be notified immediately upon a ''declared emergency,'' Federal law does not require State and local officials to be notified of any other accidental, unplanned, or unintentional radioactive substance releases that may occur if those releases do not immediately rise to a public health or safety threat. And while those incidents must be documented with the NRC and made available to the public, accessing that information is contingent upon the public and State and local officials actually knowing that these incidents ever occurred.

When radioactive substances are released into the environment outside of normal operating procedures, notifying State and local officials should not be a courtesy; it should be the law.

That's why today I am introducing the Nuclear Release Notice Act of 2006, a bill designed to expand the public's right to know when radioactive substances are released from a reactor. Specifically, the bill is designed to accomplish the following: (1) to ensure that the licensees notify State and local officials at the same time the NRC is notified regarding unplanned incidents that occur at local nuclear power plants; (2) to add State and local reporting requirements not just on incidents regarding fissionable material releases, but on all unplanned radioactive substance releases that are outside of normal operating limits; (3) to add State and local reporting requirements when releases exceed not just NRC limits for normal operation, but also when they exceed other Federal limits and standards for groundwater and other types of contamination; (4) to ensure than any repeat unplanned releases of radioactive substances—even if within allowable limits—that occur more than twice within 2 years are reported to State, local and NRC officials—so that we all know when poor maintenance, malfunctions of poor design are going unfixed; and (5) to provide that violations of this provision could result in the revocation of the operating license of the licensee.

As energy demand throughout the Nation increases in the coming decades, we will be challenged in how best to meet these consumption demands without sacrificing the environment. That means using all of our energy resources fully and wisely, including wind, solar, and other important renewable power-generating resources.

Moreover, as Congress considers policies to address air quality and the deleterious effects of carbon emission's on the global ecosystem, it is reasonable—and realistic—for nuclear power to remain on the table for consideration. Illinois has 11 nuclear power plants—the most of any State in the country—and nuclear power provides more than half of Illinois' electricity needs.

The people of Illinois—and all residents who live near nuclear power plants—have a right to know when actions are taken that might affect their safety and well-being. This bill furthers this commonsense goal, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DAYTON):

S. 2351. A bill to provide additional funding for mental health care for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation today to double the funding for veterans mental health care over the next 5 years.

Our brave veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan have faced unspeakable horrors. They have seen people killed and wounded, experienced the stress of urban warfare, and endured other traumatic events. These experiences undoubtedly take their toll. However, it can take months or even years for these events to impact a person's mental health.

The need for this legislation is clear. Just today, the Washington Post reported that more than one in three soldiers and Marines who have served in Iraq later sought help for mental health problems. And we already know that the Veterans' Administration treated almost 19,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans for post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, between 2002 and 2005. These numbers will continue to increase.

This legislation will help ensure that the VA has the resources necessary to treat veterans with mental illness. First, it authorizes the VA to spend at least $3.6 billion in 2007—up from $2.8 billion in 2006—and increases funding to $5.6 billion by 2011. Second, it requires an annual report about progress in implementing milestones from the VA Mental Health Strategic Plan.

This bill is supported by AMVETS and Disabled American Veterans.

It is imperative that we make a long-term commitment to provide mental health services to our veterans, who have sacrificed so much for us. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 386—HONORING THE PRE-NEGRO LEAGUES AND NEGRO LEAGUES BASEBALL PLAYERS AND EXECUTIVES ELECTED TO THE NATIONAL BASEBALL HALL OF FAME CLASS OF 2006

Mr. TALENT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. SUNUNU) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 386

Whereas African Americans began to play baseball in the late 1800s on military teams, college teams, and company teams, and eventually found their way onto professional teams with White players;

Whereas the racism and ''Jim Crow'' laws that forced African American players from their integrated teams by 1900 compelled those dedicated players to form their own ''barnstorming'' teams that traveled throughout the United States and offered to play any team willing to challenge them;

Whereas, in 1920, the Negro National League was created under the guidance of Andrew ''Rube'' Foster, a former player, manager, and owner of the Chicago American Giants, at a meeting held at the Paseo YMCA in Kansas City, Missouri;

Whereas soon after the Negro National League was formed, rival leagues were assembled in eastern and southern States, bringing the thrills and innovative play of African American ballplayers to major urban centers and rural countrysides throughout the United States, Canada, and Latin America;

Whereas, from the 1920s to the 1960s, over 30 communities located throughout the United States were home to teams in 1 of the 6 Negro Leagues;

Whereas the Negro Leagues maintained a high level of professional skill and became centerpieces for economic development in their communities;

Whereas, in 1945, the Brooklyn Dodgers of Major League Baseball recruited Jackie Robinson from the Kansas City Monarchs, making Robinson the first African American in the modern era to play on a Major League Baseball roster;

Whereas the integration of Major League Baseball, which soon followed the signing of Jackie Robinson, prompted the decline of the Negro Leagues because the Major Leagues began to recruit and sign the best African American ballplayers;

Whereas it has been recognized by numerous baseball authorities that many of the greatest players ever to play the game of baseball played in the Negro Leagues, rather than Major League Baseball;

Whereas, on February 27, 2006, the National Baseball Hall of Fame announced that Ray Brown, Willard Brown, Andy Cooper, Frank Grant, Pete Hill, Biz Mackey, Effa Manley, Joe Mendez, Alex Pompez, Cum Posey, Louis Santop, Mule Suttles, Ben Taylor, Cristobal Torriente, Sol White, J.L. Wilkinson, and Jud Wilson had been elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006;

Whereas less than 1 percent of all professional baseball players have been honored with induction into the National Baseball Hall of Fame;

Whereas we congratulate Ray Brown, an ace starter for the Homestead Grays who—

(1) ranks among the top Negro Leagues pitchers in total wins and winning percentage; and

(2) pitched a perfect game in 1945 as well as a one-hitter in the 1944 Negro World Series;

Whereas we congratulate Willard Brown, an outfielder with the Kansas City Monarchs who—

(1) lead the Negro American League in home runs and batting average during numerous seasons; and

(2) was considered by many to be the Negro American League version of Josh Gibson;

Whereas we congratulate Andy Cooper, a pitcher with the Detroit Stars and Kansas City Monarchs who—

(1) had a knack for changing the speed of his pitches;

(2) was the all-time leader in every Detroit Stars pitching category;

(3) was among the top 10 leaders in career wins, strikeouts, shutouts, and winning percentage in Negro Leagues history; and

(4) later in his career became the manager of the Kansas City Monarchs and lead them to 3 pennants;

Whereas we congratulate Frank Grant, a second baseman with tremendous range and a strong arm who—

(1) hit over .300 in 4 seasons with White minor league teams until the color lines forced him out of the league in 1886;

(2) played for top-rated African American teams until 1903; and

(3) who displayed a unique blend of speed and power in the International League that allowed him to turn 1 out of every 4 base hits into extra bases;

Whereas we congratulate Pete Hill, a premier outfielder who—

(1) played brilliantly for the Cuban X-Giants, Philadelphia Giants, Chicago Leland Giants, and the Chicago American Giants before the formation of the Negro Leagues;

(2) during his 1911 season as an American Giant, hit safely in 115 out of 116 games; and

(3) was rated the fourth best outfielder in the renowned 1952 Pittsburgh Courier player-voted poll of the best players of the Negro Leagues;

Whereas we congratulate Biz Mackey, a strong-armed catcher who—

(1) ended his career with a lifetime batting average well over .300;

(2) ranked among the top Negro Leaguers in lifetime total bases, RBIs, and slugging percentage; and

(3) later managed the Baltimore Elite Giants and the Newark Eagles who, under his skill and leadership, won the Negro World Series in 1946;

Whereas we congratulate Effa Manley, the co-owner of the Newark Eagles, who—

(1) has become the first woman elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame; and

(2) in addition to her efforts in baseball, played an active role in the Civil Rights Movement by promoting such causes as Anti-Lynching Day at Ruppert Stadium, which is the home of the Eagles;

Whereas we congratulate Jose Mendez, a right-handed pitcher who—

(1) earned a winning percentage of just under .700 during his memorable career as a member of the Cuban Stars, All Nations, and Kansas City Monarchs; and

(2) managed the Kansas City Monarchs to successive pennants from 1923–1925, during which time he compiled a 20–4 pitching record with 7 saves;

Whereas we congratulate Alex Pompez, a successful team owner who—

(1) owned the Cuban Stars of the Eastern Colored League and then the New York Cubans of the Negro National League; and

(2) signed the first Puerto Rican, Dominican, Venezuelan, and Panamanian players of the circuit;

Whereas we congratulate ''Cum'' Posey, owner of the Homestead Grays, who—

(1) won the Negro National League pennant 8 times between 1937 and 1945; and

(2) assembled teams that were home to 11 of the 18 Negro Leaguers currently in the Hall of Fame;

Whereas we congratulate Louis Santop, a power-hitting catcher who—

(1) played for several of the greatest African American teams of the pre-Negro Leagues era, including the Philadelphia Giants, New York Lincoln Giants, and the Brooklyn Giants;

(2) hit over .320 while slugging tape-measure homeruns during his tremendous career in the Negro Leagues; and

(3) was rated by Rollo Wilson as the first string catcher on his all-time Black baseball team;

Whereas we congratulate Mule Suttles, a hard-hitting first baseman and outfielder who—

(1) played spectacularly for the St. Louis Stars, Chicago American Giants, Birmingham Black Barons, Newark Eagles, and other Negro League teams; and

(2) was 1 of the most powerful home run hitters in the Negro Leagues, ranking third all-time among Negro Leaguers in home runs and RBI;

Whereas we congratulate Ben Taylor, a pitcher who—

(1) transitioned into a top-ranked first baseman and clean-up hitter for the Indianapolis ABC's at the start of his career;

(2) served as an extremely successful player-manager from 1923-1929; and

(3) exclusively managed the Washington Potomacs, the Baltimore Black Sox, and the Atlantic City Bacharach Giants until 1940;

Whereas we congratulate Cristobal Torriente, a 5-tool outfielder who—

(1) played most of his games for the Cuban Stars and Chicago American Giants;

(2) earned an incredible lifetime batting average of over .330; and

(3) is 1 of the all-time offensive leaders in Negro Leagues history, ranking in the top 20 all-time in home runs, RBIs, and total bases;

Whereas we congratulate Sol White, a tremendously gifted baseball player who—

(1) played all infield positions during his 25-year baseball career;

(2) was a member of the best African American independent teams of the pre-Negro Leagues era, including the Philadelphia Giants, which he helped found in 1902 as playing manager;

(3) hit .359 in the White minor leagues during 5 seasons before the color line was established; and

(4) made a timeless contribution to baseball by authoring his book, ''Sol White's Official Base Ball Guide'', the first history of Black baseball before 1900;

Whereas we congratulate J.L. Wilkinson, an creative and innovative team owner who—

(1) owned the Kansas City Monarchs, the All Nations club, and 1 of the first professional women's teams in the United States;

(2) was a pioneer of night baseball and various ballpark promotions;

(3) was the only White owner of the Negro National League when it was chartered in 1920; and

(4) ran the longest running franchise in Negro National League history during which his teams won an unprecedented 17 pennants and 2 World Series;

Whereas we congratulate Jud Wilson, an intense first and third baseman who—

(1) ranks among the top 10 all-time in home runs, RBIs, hits, total bases, slugging average, and batting average in the Negro Leagues;

(2) holds a lifetime batting average over .340;

(3) earned from fans the nickname Boojum, after the sound that his line drives made when slamming off the fences; and

(4) played on pennant-winning teams as a member of the Baltimore Black Sox, Philadelphia Stars, and Homestead Grays;

Whereas those baseball legends will be inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame on July 30, 2006, in Cooperstown, New York, joining former Negro Leagues players Ernie Banks, Hank Aaron, Jackie Robinson, Larry Doby, Monte Irvin, Roy Campanella, ''Satchel'' Paige, Willie Mays, Bill Foster, ''Buck'' Leonard, ''Bullet'' Rogan, ''Cool Papa'' Bell, Hilton Smith, ''Smokey'' Joe Williams, Josh Gibson, ''Judy'' Johnson, Leon Day, Martin Dihigo, Oscar Charleston, ''Pop'' Lloyd, Ray Dandridge, ''Rube'' Foster, ''Turkey'' Stearnes, and Willie Wells, as members of the National Baseball Hall of Fame; and

Whereas we congratulate the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, the only public museum in the Nation that exists for the exclusive purpose of interpreting the experiences of the players in the Negro Leagues, founded in 1990 by Negro Leagues legend Buck O'Neil, Horace Peterson, former Kansas City Monarchs outfielder Al ''Slick'' Surratt, and other former Negro Leagues players, for the tireless efforts of the museum to preserve the evidence of honor, courage, sacrifice, and triumph in the face of segregation of those African Americans who played in the Negro Leagues through its comprehensive collection of historical materials, important artifacts, and oral histories of the participants in the Negro Leagues and the impact that segregation had in the lives of the players and their fans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Ray Brown, Willard Brown, Andy Cooper, Frank Grant, Pete Hill, Biz Mackey, Effa Manley, Joe Mendez, Alex Pompez, Cum Posey, Louis Santop, Mule Suttles, Ben Taylor, Cristobal Torriente, Sol White, J.L. Wilkinson, and Jud Wilson on being elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006;

(2) commends the National Baseball Hall of Fame and the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum for their efforts to ensure that these legends of baseball receive the recognition due to players of their caliber; and

(3) respectfully requests the Enrolling Clerk of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the National Baseball Hall of Fame; and

(B) the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2898. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2898. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2320, to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes: which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REDUCTION OF ENERGY PRICES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Energy Price Reduction Act of 2006''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) high energy prices place an artificial drag on the economy of the United States;

(2) high energy prices disproportionately hurt poor and fixed income families and individuals, such as the elderly;

(3) according to the most recent census, there are more than 3,600,000 elderly people in the United States;

(4) families and individuals in the United States should not be forced to choose between paying for home heating or cooling and food or medication;

(5) high energy prices make manufacturing in the United States less competitive;

(6) according to the American Chemistry Council, ''Because the current gas pressures are most intense in North America, U.S. exports are relatively more expensive on the world market.'';

(7) according to the American Gas Association, ''because of the extremely tight balance between current production and strong demand, U.S. homes and businesses pay more for natural gas than nearly anyone in the world,'' and ''[o]ne of the best ways to bring natural gas prices down for everyone is to enable producers to expand the areas where they can work, and move the natural gas via pipelines to consumers.''; and

(8) the increased production and transmission of energy in a safe and environmentally sound manner is essential to the well-being of the people of the United States.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) BIOREFINERY.—The term ''biorefinery'' means a facility that produces a renewable fuel (as that term is defined in section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)).

(3) CURRENT.—The term ''current'' means, with respect to a resource management or forest plan for an energy project, a plan that has been amended or otherwise updated during the most recent 10-year period.

(4) ENERGY PROJECT.—The term ''energy project'' means a project involving the exploration, production, generation, transmission, or distribution of an energy resource.

(5) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means land owned or administered by the Secretary concerned.

(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(7) PERMIT.—The term ''permit'' means any permit, license, approval, variance, or other form of authorization that a refiner is required to obtain—

(A) under any Federal law; or

(B) from a State or Indian tribal government agency delegated authority by the Federal Government, or authorized under Federal law, to issue permits.

(8) REFINER.—The term ''refiner'' means a person that—

(A) owns or operates a refinery; or

(B) seeks to become an owner or operator of a refinery.

(9) REFINERY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''refinery'' means—

(i) a facility at which crude oil is refined into transportation fuel or other petroleum products; and

(ii) a coal liquification or coal-to-liquid facility at which coal is processed into synthetic crude oil or any other fuel.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''refinery'' includes—

(i) an expansion of a refinery; and

(ii) a biorefinery.

(10) REFINERY EXPANSION.—The term ''refinery expansion'' means a physical change in a refinery that results in an increase in the capacity of the refinery.

(11) REFINERY PERMITTING AGREEMENT.—The term ''refinery permitting agreement'' means an agreement entered into between the Administrator and a State or Indian tribe under subsection (f).

(12) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

(13) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land managed by the Bureau of Land Management (including land held for the benefit of an Indian tribe).

(14) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(d) ENERGY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES ON FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An applicant for an energy project Application for Permit to Drill on Federal land, including an energy project right-of-way, shall submit to the Secretary concerned a complete application.

(2) DEADLINE FOR SECRETARIAL RESPONSE.—Notwithstanding any other procedural law, not later than 120 days from the date on which the Secretary receives an application under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) approve the application; or

(B) provide the applicant with an explanation that identifies deficiencies in the application that preclude approval, including—

(i) inconsistency with an applicable resource or forest management plan;

(ii) inconsistency with the substantive requirements of applicable laws (including regulations) or the terms of applicable leases or rights-of-way; or

(iii) site-specific environmental impacts significant enough to require an environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(3) SUBMISSION OF MODIFIED APPLICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of receipt of an application modified to satisfactorily address deficiencies identified in paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the application without additional analysis.

(4) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—A reviewing court shall accord a rebuttable presumption to the determination of the Secretary concerned that an energy project, as mitigated, does not have a significant environmental impact.

(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any challenge to a decision involving an oil and gas lease shall be brought within the time limitations described in section 42 of the Act of February 25, 1920 (30 U.S.C. 226–2), regardless of the grounds of the challenge.

(e) REDUCTION OF METHANE EMISSIONS.—

(1) METHANE REDUCTION PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall solicit applications from eligible public entities, as determined by the Administrator, for grants under the Natural Gas STAR Program of the Environmental Protection Agency to pay the Federal share of the cost of projects relating to the reduction of methane emissions in the oil and gas industries.

(B) PROJECT INCLUSIONS.—To receive a grant under subparagraph (A), the application of the eligible entity shall include—

(i) an identification of 1 or more technologies used to achieve a reduction in the emission of methane; and

(ii) an analysis of the cost-effectiveness of a technology described in clause (i).

(C) LIMITATION.—A grant to an eligible entity under this paragraph shall not exceed $50,000.

(D) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(E) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph $1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(2) EFFICIENCY PROMOTION WORKSHOPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in conjunction with the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, shall conduct a series of technical workshops to provide information to officials in oil- and gas-producing States relating to methane emission reduction techniques.

(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph $1,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(f) STREAMLINING OF REFINERY PERMITTING PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the Governor of a State or the governing body of an Indian tribe, the Administrator shall enter into a refinery permitting agreement with the State or Indian tribe under which the process for obtaining all permits necessary for the construction and operation of a refinery shall be streamlined using a systematic interdisciplinary multimedia approach as provided in this section.

(2) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—Under a refinery permitting agreement—

(A) the Administrator shall have authority, as applicable and necessary, to—

(i) accept from a refiner a consolidated application for all permits that the refiner is required to obtain to construct and operate a refinery;

(ii) in consultation and cooperation with each Federal, State, or Indian tribal government agency that is required to make any determination to authorize the issuance of a permit, establish a schedule under which each agency shall—

(I) concurrently consider, to the maximum extent practicable, each determination to be made; and

(II) complete each step in the permitting process; and

(iii) issue a consolidated permit that combines all permits issued under the schedule established under clause (ii); and

(B) the Administrator shall provide to State and Indian tribal government agencies—

(i) financial assistance in such amounts as the agencies reasonably require to hire such additional personnel as are necessary to enable the government agencies to comply with the applicable schedule established under subparagraph (A)(ii); and

(ii) technical, legal, and other assistance in complying with the refinery permitting agreement.

(3) AGREEMENT BY THE STATE.—Under a refinery permitting agreement, a State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall agree that—

(A) the Administrator shall have each of the authorities described in paragraph (2); and

(B) each State or Indian tribal government agency shall—

(i) in accordance with State law, make such structural and operational changes in the agencies as are necessary to enable the agencies to carry out consolidated project-wide permit reviews concurrently and in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies; and

(ii) comply, to the maximum extent practicable, with the applicable schedule established under paragraph (2)(A)(ii).

(4) INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator and a State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall incorporate an interdisciplinary approach, to the maximum extent practicable, in the development, review, and approval of permits subject to this subsection.

(B) OPTIONS.—Among other options, the interdisciplinary approach may include use of—

(i) environmental management practices; and

(ii) third party contractors.

(5) DEADLINES.—

(A) NEW REFINERIES.—In the case of a consolidated permit for the construction of a new refinery, the Administrator and the State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall approve or disapprove the consolidated permit not later than—

(i) 360 days after the date of the receipt of the administratively complete application for the consolidated permit; or

(ii) on agreement of the applicant, the Administrator, and the State or governing body of the Indian tribe, 90 days after the expiration of the deadline established under clause (i).

(B) EXPANSION OF EXISTING REFINERIES.—In the case of a consolidated permit for the expansion of an existing refinery, the Administrator and the State or governing body of an Indian tribe shall approve or disapprove the consolidated permit not later than—

(i) 120 days after the date of the receipt of the administratively complete application for the consolidated permit; or

(ii) on agreement of the applicant, the Administrator, and the State or governing body of the Indian tribe, 30 days after the expiration of the deadline established under clause (i).

(6) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal agency that is required to make any determination to authorize the issuance of a permit shall comply with the applicable schedule established under paragraph (2)(A)(ii).

(7) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any civil action for review of any permit determination under a refinery permitting agreement shall be brought exclusively in the United States district court for the district in which the refinery is located or proposed to be located.

(8) EFFICIENT PERMIT REVIEW.—In order to reduce the duplication of procedures, the Administrator shall use State permitting and monitoring procedures to satisfy substantially equivalent Federal requirements under this title.

(9) SEVERABILITY.—If 1 or more permits that are required for the construction or operation of a refinery are not approved on or before any deadline established under paragraph (5), the Administrator may issue a consolidated permit that combines all other permits that the refiner is required to obtain other than any permits that are not approved.

(10) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this subsection affects the operation or implementation of otherwise applicable law regarding permits necessary for the construction and operation of a refinery.

(11) CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—Congress encourages the Administrator, States, and tribal governments to consult, to the maximum extent practicable, with local governments in carrying out this subsection.

(12) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

(13) EFFECT ON LOCAL AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection affects—

(A) the authority of a local government with respect to the issuance of permits; or

(B) any requirement or ordinance of a local government (such as a zoning regulation).

(g) FISCHER-TROPSCH FUELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In cooperation with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Fischer-Tropsch industry representatives, the Administrator shall—

(A) conduct a research and demonstration program to evaluate the air quality benefits of ultra-clean Fischer-Tropsch transportation fuel, including diesel and jet fuel;

(B) evaluate the use of ultra-clean Fischer-Tropsch transportation fuel as a mechanism for reducing engine exhaust emissions; and

(C) submit recommendations to Congress on the most effective use and associated benefits of these ultra-clean fuel for reducing public exposure to exhaust emissions.

(2) GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Administrator shall, to the extent necessary, issue any guidance or technical support documents that would facilitate the effective use and associated benefit of Fischer-Tropsch fuel and blends.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The program described in paragraph (1) shall consider—

(A) the use of neat (100 percent) Fischer-Tropsch fuel and blends with conventional crude oil-derived fuel for heavy-duty and light-duty diesel engines and the aviation sector; and

(B) the production costs associated with domestic production of those ultra clean fuel and prices for consumers.

(4) REPORTS.—The Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives—

(A) not later than October 1, 2006, an interim report on actions taken to carry out this subsection; and

(B) not later than December 1, 2007, a final report on actions taken to carry out this subsection.

(h) REPEAL.—The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users is amended by striking section 1948 (Public Law 109–59; 119 Stat. 1514).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 1, 2006, at 4 p.m., in executive session to consider certain pending military nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 1, 2006, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on '' consideration of regulatory relief proposals.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 1 at 9:30 a.m.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony regarding the state of the economies and fiscal affairs in the territories of Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to hold an oversight hearing on the status of the Yucca Mountain Project on Wednesday, March 1 at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 1, 2006 at 3 p.m. for a hearing on ''Fighting the AIDS Epidemic of Today: Reauthorizing the Ryan White CARE Act.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, March 1, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing titled ''The Department of Homeland Security's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2007.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, March 1, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a joint oversight hearing with the House Committee on Resources on the Settlement of Cobell v. Norton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Judicial Nominations'' on Wednesday, March 1, 2006 at 2 p.m. in the Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness List

Panel I: The Honorable LARRY CRAIG, United States Senator, [R–ID]; The Honorable MIKE CRAPO, United States Senator, [R–ID].

Panel II: Norman Randy Smith to be the United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit; Patrick Joseph Schlitz to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate for a hearing entitled, ''The Nomination of Eric Thorson to be Inspector General of the Small Business Administration'' on Wednesday, March 1, 2006, beginning at 2 p.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 1, 2006 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed briefing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 1, 2006, at 2:30 p.m., in open session to receive testimony on Army

transformation and the future combat systems acquisition strategy in review of the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years Defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISASTER PREVENTION AND PREDICTION

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Disaster Prevention and Prediction be authorized to meet on March 1, 2006, at 2:30 p.m., on Winter Storms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education and Early Childhood Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 1, 2006, at 10 a.m., for a hearing on ''Protecting America's Competitive Edge Act (S. 2198): Helping K–12 Students Learn Math and Science Better.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 1, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to receive testimony on Active component, Reserve component, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 1 at 2:30 p.m. The purpose of the hearing is to review the roll of the Forest Service and other Federal agencies in protection the Health and Welfare of foreign guest workers carrying out tree planting and other service contracts on National Forest System Lands, and to consider related Forest Service guidance and contract modifications issued in recent weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY, AND HOMELAND SECURITY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, BORDER SECURITY AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security and the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship be authorized to meet to conduct a joint hearing on ''Federal Strategies to End Border Violence'' on Wednesday, March 1, 2006 at 9 a.m. in Dirksen 226.

Panel I: The Honorable Paul K. Charlton, United States Attorney, District of Arizona, Phoenix, AZ; David Aguilar, Chief of Border Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC; and Marcy Forman, Director of Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

Panel II: The Honorable Larry A. Dever, Sheriff of Cochise County, AZ; The Honorable Wayne Jernigan, Sheriff of Valverde County, TX; Lavogyer Durham, Manager of El Tule Ranch, Falfurrias, TX; and T.J. Bonner, President of the National Border Patrol Council, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, Campo, CA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE PRE-NEGRO AND NEGRO LEAGUES PLAYERS AND EXECUTIVES

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 386, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 386) honoring the Pre-Negro Leagues and Negro Leagues baseball players and executives elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about a historic event that occurred on Monday. The National Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown elected 17 pre-Negro Leagues and Negro Leagues baseball players and executives to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006.

Many of baseball's most noted stars of the past century got their beginnings in the Negro Leagues. Greats such as Hank Aaron, Ernie Banks, Roy Campanella, Larry Doby, Willie Mays, Satchel Paige, and, of course, Jackie Robinson brought their fast-paced and highly competitive brand of Negro Leagues baseball eventually to the Major Leagues. In fact, there are a lot of people who think that much of the fast-paced style of baseball today is owing to the influence of the Negro League's brand of baseball.

Before these greats of the game were given the opportunity to showcase their skills at the Major League level, many African-American ballplayers with equal skill were never allowed to share the same field as their White counterparts. Instead, such players played from the 1920s to the 1960s in over 30 communities located throughout the United States on teams in one of six Negro Baseball Leagues, including Kansas City and St. Louis in my home State of Missouri.

The history of this is interesting. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, African Americans began to play on military baseball teams, college teams, company teams. The teams were integrated in those days. Many African Americans eventually found their way onto professional teams with White players. But racism and Jim Crow laws drove the African-American players from their integrated teams in the early 1900s, forcing them to form their own ''barnstorming'' teams which would travel around the country playing anyone willing to challenge them.

But then, in 1920, the Negro National League, which was the first of the Negro Baseball Leagues, was formed under the guidance of Andrew ''Rube'' Foster—a former player, manager, and owner of the Chicago American Giants—and was formed at a meeting held at the Paseo YMCA in Kansas City, MO. Soon after the Negro National League was formed, rival leagues formed in Eastern and Southern States and brought the thrills and the innovative play of the Negro Leagues to major urban centers and rural countrysides throughout the United States, Canada, and Latin America.

For more than 40 years, the Negro Leagues maintained a high level of professional skill and became centerpieces for economic development in their communities. The Negro Leagues constituted the third biggest Black owned and run business in the country in those days. They brought jobs and economic activity to many of the cities around the United States. They played in front of crowds of 10,000 20,000 30,000 40,000, and 50,000 people. And those crowds were integrated. White and Black fans came to watch the Negro Leagues, and they sat together.

In 1945, Major League Baseball's Brooklyn Dodgers recruited Jackie Robinson from the Kansas City Monarchs, which, of course, made Jackie the first African American in the modern era to play on a Major League roster. That historic event led to the integration of the Major Leagues and ironically prompted the decline of the Negro Leagues because, of course, Major League teams began to recruit and sign the best African-American ballplayers.

On Monday of this week, the National Baseball Hall of Fame took a first step in righting a historic wrong when it recognized the distinguished careers of 17 pre-Negro League ballplayers and executives, people who were never given the opportunity to compete in Major League Baseball with their White counterparts. Oh, they often played them, and very often, in barnstorming games or exhibition-type matches, the Negro League players and teams would play the best players of the Major Leagues, and those must have been great baseball games to see.

But the Hall of Fame elected those 17 players and executives to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006. The players elected on Monday were Ray Brown, Willard Brown, Andy Cooper, Frank Grant, Pete Hill, Biz Mackey, Effa Manley—the first woman

elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame, and more on that in just a minute—Joe Mandez, Alex Popez Cum Posey, Louis Santop, Mule Suttles, Ben Taylor, Cristobal Torriente, Sol White, J.L. Wilkinson, and Jud Wilkinson. These legends, not just of the Negro Leagues but of our national pastime, will now join the less than 1 percent of all professional baseball players who have been honored with induction into the National Baseball Hall of Fame, and they will be inducted on July 30, 2006.

One of the more historic moments of Monday's selection was the selection of Effa Manley, who was the co-owner of the Newark Eagles. She became the first woman ever elected to the Hall of Fame. In addition to her efforts in baseball, she played an active role in the civil rights movement and promoted such causes as Anti-Lynching Day at Ruppert Stadium, which was the home of the Newark Eagles.

Among those elected, several have ties to my home State of Missouri, and it will surprise no one in the Senate that I decided to feature them in my remarks.

Willard Brown was an outfielder with the Kansas City Monarchs who often led the Negro American League in home runs and batting average. He was considered by many to be the Negro American League's version of the great Josh Gibson.

Andy Cooper was a pitcher with the Detroit Stars and Kansas City Monarchs who had a knack for changing the speed of his pitches. He is among the top ten leaders in career wins, strikeouts, shutouts, and winning percentage in Negro Leagues history. Later in his career he became the manager of the Kansas City Monarchs, leading them to three pennants.

Jose Mendez was a right handed pitcher for the Cuban Stars, All Nations, and Kansas City Monarchs who had a career winning percentage just under .700 in the Negro National League. He managed the Kansas City Monarchs to successive pennants from 1923–1925.

Mule Suttles was a first baseman and outfielder for the St. Louis Stars, Chicago American Giants, Birmingham Black Barons and the Newark Eagles. He was one of the most powerful home run hitters in the Negro Leagues, ranking third all-time among Negro Leaguers in home runs and RBIs.

Cristobal Torriente was a five-tool outfielder with a lifetime batting average over .330 primarily with the Cuban Stars and Chicago American Giants. For those who don't know what a five-tool outfielder is it means he could hit for average, hit for power, run with speed, field with above average skill and display enough arm strength to throw out the fastest players at home plate. He is one of the all-time offensive leaders in Negro Leagues history, ranking in the top 20 all-time in home runs, RBIs and total bases. The record books would have been different had these players been allowed to play in Major League baseball.

J.L. Wilkinson was the owner of the Kansas City Monarchs, the All Nations club and one of the first professional women's teams in the United States. He was a pioneer of night baseball, various ballpark promotions, and was the Negro National League's only white owner when it was chartered in 1920. His Kansas City Monarchs were the longest running franchise in Negro National League history and they won an unprecedented 17 pennants, and two World Series.

I congratulate all 17 players and executives elected this week, as well as their families and friends. This is an honor long overdue and is sure to lead to a great celebration this summer in Cooperstown. It will be a dramatic moment when these figures are inducted in the Hall of Fame. However, it saddens me that this summer's historic induction ceremony did not take place during the lifetime of these baseball greats. I can only wish that they were still alive today to witness baseball's long overdue recognition of their contributions on and off the field.

There is another aspect of this selection process which is disappointing and bittersweet for many of us because one of the legends of Negro Leagues did not receive the necessary votes to be elected to the Hall of Fame. That legend is John Jordan ''Buck'' O'Neil. Buck's illustrious baseball career spans seven decades and has made him a foremost authority of the game and one of its greatest ambassadors. Buck is in his 90s now, and still active, still a leader in baseball and a leader in remembering the Negro Leagues and establishing the Negro League's Baseball museum.

I would like to tell you a little about Buck O'Neil the man and Buck O'Neil the player. I had intended to introduce this Resolution earlier this week, but was so disappointed by the exclusion of Buck from those selected that I began to have second thoughts about the process for selecting this class of inductees. I had a conversation with Buck yesterday and he told me that going forward with this Resolution was important not only to recognize this historic event—I mean important in a practical way to the Negro League's baseball museum and the remberance of the Negro Leagues, and to recognize the achievement of these 17 players and executives—but because it was the right thing to do. Buck O'Neil has always been about doing the right thing. No matter what door has been slammed in his face he always picks himself up and does what is right and what is most important to him. In this case what is most important to him is his true love for the Negro Leagues, the Negro Leagues players and the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, which he helped to found and which he has been so active in promoting in Kansas City.

In yesterday's Kansas City Star, columnist Joe Posnanski had this to say about the injustice that occurred to Buck O'Neil on Monday:

All his life, Buck O'Neil has had doors slammed in his face. He played baseball when the major leagues did not allow black players. He was a gifted manager at a time when major league owners would not even think of having an African American lead their teams. For more than 30 years, he told stories about Negro Leagues players and nobody wanted to listen. Now, after everything, he was being told that the life he had spent in baseball was not worthy of the Hall of Fame. It was enough to make those around him cry. But Buck laughed. ''I'm still Buck,'' he said. ''Look at me. I've lived a good life. I'm still living a good life. Nothing has changed for me.''

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of Mr. Posnanski's article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TALENT. I thought I would take a few moments of the Senate's time to talk a little bit about Buck's record. I think the Senate would agree with me it would have fully justified his induction.

Buck O'Neil the player was a first baseman and Manager for the Kansas City Monarchs from 1937 through 1955. Buck's achievements as a player include leading his team to a Negro American league title and a date with the Homestead Grays in the 1942 Negro World Series. In the series Buck hit .353 and led the Monarchs to a four game sweep of the powerhouse Homestead Grays. Buck sport a career batting average of .288, including four .300-plus seasons. He won batting titles in 1940 and 1946, hitting .345 and .353 respectively. He was named to the East-West All-Star Classic in 1942, 1943 and 1949 and barnstormed with the Satchel Paige All-Stars during the 1930s and 1940s playing countless games against the likes of the Bob Feller All-Stars. I would have given a lot to have seen one of those games.

In 1948, Buck succeeded Frank Duncan, as manager of the Monarchs, and continued to manage them until 1955. As the manager of the Monarchs, he sent more Negro league veterans to the Majors than any other manager in baseball history including Ernie Banks, Elston Howard, Connie Johnson, Satchel Paige and Sweet Lou Johnson. He lead the Monarchs to league titles in 1948, 1950, 1951 and 1953 and managed the West squad in the East-West All-Star game in 1950, 1952, 1954 and 1955. By the way, the West won all four of these contests.

In 1956, Buck was hired by the Chicago Cubs as a scout. Six years later he became the first African American to coach in the Major Leagues with the Cubs. As a scout he discovered such superstars as Lou Brock, one of my all-time favorite Cardinals, and Joe Carter. Lou called him on Monday by the way, expecting Buck would have been inducted, while everybody was waiting to see the results of the vote. In 1988, after more than 30 years with the Cubs, he returned home to Kansas City to scout for the Kansas City Royals.

Today Buck serves as chairman of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum he helped found in 1990. The work of Buck O'Neil and the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum led the Hall of Fame to hold this special election of Negro Leagues and Pre-Negro Leagues players.

In fact, his work after he had retired from the game as a coach may be even more significant to the history of baseball than his exploits as a player and a manager. Nobody has done more to build that museum and to call the rest of us to remember the significance of the Negro baseball league.

It was significant on so many different levels: A triumph of the human spirit, tremendous sportsmanship, tremendously high quality of play, vitally important to the Black community of the time, and it led directly to the integration of the Major Leagues, which was the first in a series of mjor civil rights landmarks in the modern era that has led to the progress we have achieved today.

I believe there is no one who meets the criteria for induction into the National Baseball Hall of Fame more than Buck. The combination of his statistics on the field as a player, his years as a scout discovering some of the best players of their generation, his years as a manager and coach, including breaking the color barrier as the first African-American coach in the Major Leagues, and his years of tireless advocacy on behalf of the Negro Leagues and its players equals a résumé built for election to Cooperstown. I hope that the Baseball Hall of Fame will take appropriate action to correct this oversight.

Finally, I would like to congratulate everyone at the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, who worked so very hard for so many years to make this special election a reality. Their tireless advocacy on behalf of these baseball legends is another reason why the Senate should pass legislation that would give a national designation to the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, the only public museum in the Nation that exists for the exclusive purpose of interpreting the experiences of the players in the Negro Leagues.

I highly recommend a visit to the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum for anybody who is in Kansas City. Whether you are a baseball fan or not, you will be moved by what you see there. You will be encouraged and inspired in every way by seeing how those players confronted the injustices of their times, and with great spirit and energy and joy even overcame those obstacles.

In closing, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, for his assistance and his support of both the resolution which we introduced today in honor of those athletes who were elected on Monday and also S. Con. Res. 60, which is the national designation resolution. I hope the Senate will swiftly pass our resolution to honor these future Hall of Famers—I guess they are Hall of Famers designees now—for their contributions on the field and for their courage, sacrifice and triumph in the face of segregation.

EXHIBIT 1

INJUSTICE, AND THEN A GUTLESS COMMITTEE CLAMS UP

(By Joe Posnanski)

The living voice of the Negro Leagues did not even blink when the door was slammed in his face one more time. Buck O'Neil just nodded and smiled a little when he was told that he did not get enough votes to be elected into the Baseball Hall of Fame.

''All right,'' he said. ''That's the way the cookie crumbles.''

That's the way baseball crumbles. Monday, an 11-member committee of academics and authors (a 12th member, author Robert Peterson, died two weeks ago) gathered in a room in Tampa and voted 17 deceased Negro Leagues players and executives into the Hall of Fame. Seventeen. To give you an idea of how overwhelming that number is . . . only 18 Negro Leaguers are actually in the National Baseball Hall of Fame. It took 30 years of work—most of that Buck O'Neil's hard work—to get those 18 players inducted.

But even while doubling the Negro Leagues' Hall of Fame population, the committee could not muster the necessary nine votes for Buck O'Neil, who is 94 and has done more in his life for Negro Leagues baseball than anyone else. One committee member said O'Neil likely fell one vote short. The balloting was secret.

When the voting was finished, no one had the guts to explain why Buck O'Neil was kept out. He was an All-Star player in the Negro Leagues. He was a successful manager for the Kansas City Monarchs. He sent more Negro Leagues players to the major leagues than anyone. He was the first black coach in the major leagues. For the past 50 years, he has been—as author Jules Tygiel calls him in Shades of Glory, the Negro Leagues book commissioned by the Hall of Fame—''the primary spokesperson for the legacy of the Negro Leagues.''

In fact, two sources said months ago that the Hall of Fame would have a special Negro Leagues vote with the intention of getting Buck O'Neil in. One hall official said, ''I don't think the Hall of Fame is complete without him.''

Thus, for the first time ever, the hall handed over the voting to a panel of baseball historians and scholars with no affiliation to the major leagues or the hall. This was an extraordinary move for the Hall of Fame. They usually protect the hall the way tigers protect their cubs. There was not one former player on the committee and not one person who actually observed the Negro Leagues. The committee was given no boundaries—they were told to vote for as many people as they saw fit.

They certainly voted free. By dumping 17 persons into the Hall of Fame, they matched the number of persons inducted into the hall the past seven years. But when it came to why Buck was left out, no one was talking.

''I don't think the individuals are going to be willing to discuss their individual votes,'' said Fay Vincent, who served as a nonvoting chairman of the committee. ''We agreed we would not do that.''

In other words, they decided to hide. After this travesty, you could not blame them. On Monday, when it appeared that O'Neil was short the votes he needed, Vincent apparently made a frantic plea to the committee to consider O'Neil's lifetime achievements and not just his playing days. According to the committee member, he sounded almost desperate.

His words held no sway with this committee. They left him out without a word of explanation. They did, however, vote in Andy Cooper, who was (see if this sounds familiar) a fine player and manager for the Kansas City Monarchs. He died in 1941. The book Shades of Glory is 422 pages long, including acknowledgements. Cooper is mentioned exactly zero times.

The committee also voted in Effa Manley, the first woman inductee into the Baseball Hall of Fame. Her credentials? She co-owned the Newark Eagles with her husband, Abe, for 14 seasons. The team won one championship. Also, she was outspoken. Also, her biographer, Jim Overmyer, was on the committee.

And so on. The injustice of Monday's vote left a trail of disbelief and anger throughout the baseball community, but especially in Kansas City. It had no visible effect on Buck O'Neil, though. He began his Monday morning with a 5:30 a.m. call from a radio show. He came to the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum at 10 a.m. and by then he had received more than a dozen congratulatory calls.

Everyone seemed sure he was going to get voted in.

Buck himself was not so sure. ''I've been on committees like this,'' he said. ''I know that anything can happen.'' Still, he spent much of Monday morning calling friends in his hometown of Sarasota, Fla., telling them that he would visit if the vote went his way. A camera crew filmed his every move. A half-dozen reporters followed him around.

O'Neil had been told he would hear something by 11 a.m., but the phone would not ring. Rumors swirled that things were not going well in Tampa, but no one wanted to believe it. While Buck O'Neil waited, Hall of Fame player Lou Brock—whom O'Neil had scouted and signed—called and said he was excited. Soon it was 11:30 and then noon, and the call from the hall had not come.

''You know something?'' Buck said all of a sudden. ''I could play. I was no Josh Gibson. But I could play.'' It was his only sign of cracking. One of the few criticisms of O'Neil's Hall of Fame case leading into the vote had been that, while he was a good player, he was not a Hall of Fame-caliber player. The criticism did not take in account his countless other contributions to baseball, but you could see that Buck was hurting a little.

At 12:30, there was no word, and a pall had fallen over the museum. Buck seemed to sense that the vote was going against him. He said, ''I'll be fine either way.''

At 12:34, Bob Kendrick, the marketing director of the Negro Leagues Museum, asked everyone to leave the room, and he said, ''Buck, we didn't get enough votes.''

All his life, Buck O'Neil has had doors slammed in his face. He played baseball at a time when the major leagues did not allow black players. He was a gifted manager at a time when major league owners would not even think of having an African-American lead their teams. For more than 30 years, he told stories about Negro Leagues players and nobody wanted to listen.

Now, after everything, he was being told that the life he had spent in baseball was not worthy of the Hall of Fame. It was enough to make those around him cry. But Buck laughed. ''I'm still Buck,'' he said. ''Look at me. I've lived a good life. I'm still living a good life. Nothing has changed for me.''

A few minutes later, when he was told that 17 persons had made it, he shouted: ''Wonderful.''

That's Buck O'Neil. Who else would respond that way to such a shameful vote? No one. I don't know what the July day will be like when 17 persons long dead—10 of the 17 have been gone for more than 50 years—get

inducted into the Hall of Fame. It's hard to believe it will be much of a celebration. Who will speak for the dead?

''I don't know,'' Buck O'Neil said. ''I wonder if they'll ask me to speak.''

Would he really speak at the Hall of Fame after he wasn't voted in?

''Of course,'' Buck said. ''If they asked me.''

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 386) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 386

Whereas African Americans began to play baseball in the late 1800s on military teams, college teams, and company teams, and eventually found their way onto professional teams with White players;

Whereas the racism and ''Jim Crow'' laws that forced African American players from their integrated teams by 1900 compelled those dedicated players to form their own ''barnstorming'' teams that traveled throughout the United States and offered to play any team willing to challenge them;

Whereas, in 1920, the Negro National League was created under the guidance of Andrew ''Rube'' Foster, a former player, manager, and owner of the Chicago American Giants, at a meeting held at the Paseo YMCA in Kansas City, Missouri;

Whereas soon after the Negro National League was formed, rival leagues were assembled in eastern and southern States, bringing the thrills and innovative play of African American ballplayers to major urban centers and rural countrysides throughout the United States, Canada, and Latin America;

Whereas, from the 1920s to the 1960s, over 30 communities located throughout the United States were home to teams in 1 of the 6 Negro Leagues;

Whereas the Negro Leagues maintained a high level of professional skill and became centerpieces for economic development in their communities;

Whereas, in 1945, the Brooklyn Dodgers of Major League Baseball recruited Jackie Robinson from the Kansas City Monarchs, making Robinson the first African American in the modern era to play on a Major League Baseball roster;

Whereas the integration of Major League Baseball, which soon followed the signing of Jackie Robinson, prompted the decline of the Negro Leagues because the Major Leagues began to recruit and sign the best African American ballplayers;

Whereas it has been recognized by numerous baseball authorities that many of the greatest players ever to play the game of baseball played in the Negro Leagues, rather than Major League Baseball;

Whereas, on February 27, 2006, the National Baseball Hall of Fame announced that Ray Brown, Willard Brown, Andy Cooper, Frank Grant, Pete Hill, Biz Mackey, Effa Manley, Joe Mendez, Alex Pompez, Cum Posey, Louis Santop, Mule Suttles, Ben Taylor, Cristobal Torriente, Sol White, J.L. Wilkinson, and Jud Wilson had been elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006;

Whereas less than 1 percent of all professional baseball players have been honored with induction into the National Baseball Hall of Fame;

Whereas we congratulate Ray Brown, an ace starter for the Homestead Grays who—

(1) ranks among the top Negro Leagues pitchers in total wins and winning percentage; and

(2) pitched a perfect game in 1945 as well as a one-hitter in the 1944 Negro World Series;

Whereas we congratulate Willard Brown, an outfielder with the Kansas City Monarchs who—

(1) lead the Negro American League in home runs and batting average during numerous seasons; and

(2) was considered by many to be the Negro American League version of Josh Gibson;

Whereas we congratulate Andy Cooper, a pitcher with the Detroit Stars and Kansas City Monarchs who—

(1) had a knack for changing the speed of his pitches;

(2) was the all-time leader in every Detroit Stars pitching category;

(3) was among the top 10 leaders in career wins, strikeouts, shutouts, and winning percentage in Negro Leagues history; and

(4) later in his career became the manager of the Kansas City Monarchs and lead them to 3 pennants;

Whereas we congratulate Frank Grant, a second baseman with tremendous range and a strong arm who—

(1) hit over .300 in 4 seasons with White minor league teams until the color lines forced him out of the league in 1886;

(2) played for top-rated African American teams until 1903; and

(3) who displayed a unique blend of speed and power in the International League that allowed him to turn 1 out of every 4 base hits into extra bases;

Whereas we congratulate Pete Hill, a premier outfielder who—

(1) played brilliantly for the Cuban X-Giants, Philadelphia Giants, Chicago Leland Giants, and the Chicago American Giants before the formation of the Negro Leagues;

(2) during his 1911 season as an American Giant, hit safely in 115 out of 116 games; and

(3) was rated the fourth best outfielder in the renowned 1952 Pittsburgh Courier player-voted poll of the best players of the Negro Leagues;

Whereas we congratulate Biz Mackey, a strong-armed catcher who—

(1) ended his career with a lifetime batting average well over .300;

(2) ranked among the top Negro Leaguers in lifetime total bases, RBIs, and slugging percentage; and

(3) later managed the Baltimore Elite Giants and the Newark Eagles who, under his skill and leadership, won the Negro World Series in 1946;

Whereas we congratulate Effa Manley, the co-owner of the Newark Eagles, who—

(1) has become the first women elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame; and

(2) in addition to her efforts in baseball, played an active role in the Civil Rights Movement by promoting such causes as Anti-Lynching Day at Ruppert Stadium, which is the home of the Eagles;

Whereas we congratulate Jose Mendez, a right-handed pitcher who—

(1) earned a winning percentage of just under .700 during his memorable career as a member of the Cuban Stars, All Nations, and Kansas City Monarchs; and

(2) managed the Kansas City Monarchs to successive pennants from 1923–1925, during which time he compiled a 20–4 pitching record with 7 saves;

Whereas we congratulate Alex Pompez, a successful team owner who—

(1) owned the Cuban Stars of the Eastern Colored League and then the New York Cubans of the Negro National League; and

(2) signed the first Puerto Rican, Dominican, Venezuelan, and Panamanian players of the circuit;

Whereas we congratulate ''Cum'' Posey, owner of the Homestead Grays, who—

(1) won the Negro National League pennant 8 times between 1937 and 1945; and

(2) assembled teams that were home to 11 of the 18 Negro Leaguers currently in the Hall of Fame;

Whereas we congratulate Louis Santop, a power-hitting catcher who—

(1) played for several of the greatest African American teams of the pre-Negro Leagues era, including the Philadelphia Giants, New York Lincoln Giants, and the Brooklyn Giants;

(2) hit over .320 while slugging tape-measure homeruns during his tremendous career in the Negro Leagues; and

(3) was rated by Rollo Wilson as the first string catcher on his all-time Black baseball team;

Whereas we congratulate Mule Suttles, a hard-hitting first baseman and outfielder who—

(1) played spectacularly for the St. Louis Stars, Chicago American Giants, Birmingham Black Barons, Newark Eagles, and other Negro League teams; and

(2) was 1 of the most powerful home run hitters in the Negro Leagues, ranking third all-time among Negro Leaguers in home runs and RBI;

Whereas we congratulate Ben Taylor, a pitcher who—

(1) transitioned into a top-ranked first baseman and clean-up hitter for the Indianapolis ABC's at the start of his career;

(2) served as an extremely successful player-manager from 1923-1929; and

(3) exclusively managed the Washington Potomacs, the Baltimore Black Sox, and the Atlantic City Bacharach Giants until 1940;

Whereas we congratulate Cristobal Torriente, a 5-tool outfielder who—

(1) played most of his games for the Cuban Stars and Chicago American Giants;

(2) earned an incredible lifetime batting average of over .330; and

(3) is 1 of the all-time offensive leaders in Negro Leagues history, ranking in the top 20 all-time in home runs, RBIs, and total bases;

Whereas we congratulate Sol White, a tremendously gifted baseball player who—

(1) played all infield positions during his 25-year baseball career;

(2) was a member of the best African American independent teams of the pre-Negro Leagues era, including the Philadelphia Giants, which he helped found in 1902 as playing manager;

(3) hit .359 in the White minor leagues during 5 seasons before the color line was established; and

(4) made a timeless contribution to baseball by authoring his book, ''Sol White's Official Base Ball Guide'', the first history of Black baseball before 1900;

Whereas we congratulate J.L. Wilkinson, an creative and innovative team owner who—

(1) owned the Kansas City Monarchs, the All Nations club, and 1 of the first professional women's teams in the United States;

(2) was a pioneer of night baseball and various ballpark promotions;

(3) was the only White owner of the Negro National League when it was chartered in 1920; and

(4) ran the longest running franchise in Negro National League history during which his teams won an unprecedented 17 pennants and 2 World Series;

Whereas we congratulate Jud Wilson, an intense first and third baseman who—

(1) ranks among the top 10 all-time in home runs, RBIs, hits, total bases, slugging average, and batting average in the Negro Leagues;

(2) holds a lifetime batting average over .340;

(3) earned from fans the nickname Boojum, after the sound that his line drives made when slamming off the fences; and

(4) played on pennant-winning teams as a member of the Baltimore Black Sox, Philadelphia Stars, and Homestead Grays;

Whereas those baseball legends will be inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame on July 30, 2006, in Cooperstown, New York, joining former Negro Leagues players Ernie Banks, Hank Aaron, Jackie Robinson, Larry Doby, Monte Irvin, Roy Campanella, ''Satchel'' Paige, Willie Mays, Bill Foster, ''Buck'' Leonard, ''Bullet'' Rogan, ''Cool Papa'' Bell, Hilton Smith, ''Smokey'' Joe Williams, Josh Gibson, ''Judy'' Johnson, Leon Day, Martin Dihigo, Oscar Charleston, ''Pop'' Lloyd, Ray Dandridge, ''Rube'' Foster, ''Turkey'' Stearnes, and Willie Wells, as members of the National Baseball Hall of Fame; and

Whereas we congratulate the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, the only public museum in the Nation that exists for the exclusive purpose of interpreting the experiences of the players in the Negro Leagues, founded in 1990 by Negro Leagues legend Buck O'Neil, Horace Peterson, former Kansas City Monarchs outfielder Al ''Slick'' Surratt, and other former Negro Leagues players, for the tireless efforts of the museum to preserve the evidence of honor, courage, sacrifice, and triumph in the face of segregation of those African Americans who played in the Negro Leagues through its comprehensive collection of historical materials, important artifacts, and oral histories of the participants in the Negro Leagues and the impact that segregation had in the lives of the players and their fans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Ray Brown, Willard Brown, Andy Cooper, Frank Grant, Pete Hill, Biz Mackey, Effa Manley, Joe Mendez, Alex Pompez, Cum Posey, Louis Santop, Mule Suttles, Ben Taylor, Cristobal Torriente, Sol White, J.L. Wilkinson, and Jud Wilson on being elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006;

(2) commends the National Baseball Hall of Fame and the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum for their efforts to ensure that these legends of baseball receive the recognition due to players of their caliber; and

(3) respectfully requests the Enrolling Clerk of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the National Baseball Hall of Fame; and

(B) the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 2. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business for up to 30 minutes, with the first 15 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, the final 15 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee, and the Senate then resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199, the PATRIOT Act; I further ask that the debate until the final passage vote be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today the Senate passed the PATRIOT Act amendments bill, and we are now considering the PATRIOT Act conference report. Early today, by a vote of 84 to 15, the Senate overwhelmingly invoked cloture on the conference report. Under an agreement just reached, we will be voting on the PATRIOT Act conference report tomorrow at 3 p.m. Following that vote, we will have a cloture vote with respect to the LIHEAP bill. The remaining schedule for tomorrow will depend on the outcome of that vote, and we will alert Members of the schedule following that cloture vote.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator DURBIN for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to indicate that I am pleased we could work out a time for the vote tomorrow. I want to be very clear that not only have I not given up any of my rights under the bill, as I understand it, given the rules postcloture, I actually have more time for debate than I otherwise would have to oppose this unwise legislation. In terms of convenience for Members, I am pleased about that. It will be important to continue the debate tomorrow prior to 3 o'clock. I thank the leaders for the ability to achieve that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent request, I wish to speak to a resolution which was just passed, but prior to that time, I would like to commend my colleague from the State of Wisconsin for his dogged determination to have the Senate actually consider an amendment—a substantive amendment—to the PATRIOT Act. He has been more than cooperative in suggesting he would limit the time of that debate to 15 minutes, but he has been stopped every time he has come to the floor and made that request by the majority.

I may disagree with the Senator from Wisconsin, but I am going to stand here and fight for as long as I can that he have this opportunity. Why is the Senate afraid of debate? Why is the Senate afraid of deliberation? What is so frightening about having two Senators present a point of view and then have the Senate vote? It almost sounds like the reason the Senate was created, but the Senator from Wisconsin has been waiting, trying his best to get 15 minutes, day after day, as the majority refuses to give it to him.

As I have said repeatedly, I think there is merit to this PATRIOT Act, as amended with Senator SUNUNU's efforts and the efforts of many, including myself, but I am going to defend the right of the Senator from Wisconsin to come to the floor any time he wants, as a Senator representing his State and as a coequal Member of this Chamber, and offer an amendment. The majority should not be so frightened of debate, not so frightened of a vote that they would deny the Senator this opportunity.

HONORING THE LEGENDARY STARS OF THE NEGRO LEAGUES AND PRE-NEGRO LEAGUES BASEBALL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the last few moments, we adopted a resolution which is historic in nature. It relates to the Negro Leagues and pre-Negro Leagues baseball in America. Anyone who loves baseball as I do and followed the great documentary prepared by Ken Burns on the history of baseball must have been struck by how much the history of baseball is associated with the resolution of the issue of race in America.

For too long, baseball, similar to much of America, was segregated. Now that it has become an integrated sport, we have seen some tremendous athletes—Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, White Americans, those from other countries—coming together to make it a more exciting sport than it has ever been.

I think we realize now what was lost for so many decades, while those who labored in Black baseball, the Negro Leagues, were relegated to second-class status despite the fact their talents were as good or sometimes better than those who played on all White baseball teams.

Jerry Izenberg, a sports writer for the Newark Star Ledger, wrote of the stars of Negro Leagues Baseball:

> They took America's game and weaved a kind of magic with it that most of America never bothered to see—not for lack of talent and surely not because of the way they played it—with a fire in the belly and joy in the skills that motivated them.
>
> America loved baseball, but segregation turned America blind. The psyche of the White men who owned Major League Baseball and most of those who played the game couldn't get past the matter of skin color.

One of the greatest players ever, the legendary Satchel Paige, spent most of his career in the Negro Leagues. In his Hall of Fame induction speech in 1971 he said:

> Oh, we had men by the hundreds who could have made the big leagues, by the hundreds, not by the fours, twos or threes.

'' . . . Ain't no maybe so about it,'' Satchel Paige said.

I did have the honor to meet him one day. He was in Springfield watching a baseball game. I still remember it. He was seated next to Minnie Minoso, whom I will refer to a little later in these remarks.

Most of those players never got that chance. But now, 17 more players and 5 executives from the Negro Leagues and pre-Negro Leagues baseball are getting some long overdue recognition.

This week, a special commission appointed by Major League Baseball acted to heal another of segregation's scars by voting to induct the 17 into the Baseball Hall of Fame.

I am pleased to join baseball fans around the world in congratulating these new Hall of Famers:

Negro Leagues baseball players Ray Brown, Willard Brown, Andy Cooper, Biz Mackey, Mule Suttles, Cristobal Torriente, and Jud Wilson;

Pre-Negro Leagues players Frank Grant, Pete Hill, Jose Mendez, Louis Santop, and Ben Taylor;

Negro Leagues club owners Alex Pompez, Cum Posey, and J.L. Wilkinson;

And pre-Negro Leagues team owner and baseball writer Sol White.

Also among the new Hall of Famers is Effa Manley, co-owner with her husband of the Newark Eagles and the first woman to join the Hall of Fame. Effa Manly was White, but she married a Black man and chose to pass herself off as Black. She was active in the civil rights movement and promoted Anti-Lynching Day at Eagles games in the 1940s.

Similar to many, I am surprised—I am really disappointed—that two names were not on the list I just read. Of the 39 Negro Leagues and pre-Negro Leagues stars considered for inclusion in the Hall of Fame this week, only two are still living: Mini Minoso and Buck O'Neil. I can't explain why neither one was selected.

No matter how the committee voted, Minnie Minoso and Buck O'Neil will always be Hall of Famers to baseball fans in Chicago and around the world. Let me tell you about them.

Saturnino Orestes Armas ''Minnie'' Minoso is one of the most popular players in Chicago White Sox history—a seven-time All-Star and three-time Golden Glove winner.

He was nicknamed ''the Cuban comet,'' the first Black Latino in the major leagues starting in 1949 with the Cleveland Indians. Two years later, he became the first White Sox to break the color line.

He hit a home run in his first at-bat with the White Sox and went on to be named American League Rookie of the Year in 1951, leading the league in stolen bases and triples. Over his career, he led the league in being hit by pitches 10 different times—an indication, I am afraid, of how difficult it was to break the racial lines.

In the words of Orlando Cepeda, who once played for the St. Louis Baseball Cardinals:

> Minnie Minoso is to Latin ballplayers what Jackie Robinson is to Black ballplayers.

He paved the way for generations of Latin superstars, from Roberto Clemente to Juan Marichal to Sammy Sosa.

In 1983, the White Sox retired Minnie Minoso's No. 9 uniform, and in 2004, he was honored with a life-sized sculpture at U.S. Cellular Field, home of the world champion Chicago White Sox. At the unveiling ceremony, he said:

> If God takes me tomorrow, I'm happy because my statue is here. How many people in the Hall of Fame have statues in the ball parks?

John ''Buck'' O'Neil should be a familiar name to those who remember the Ken Burns documentary. Buck O'Neil was the Black baseball player they went to time and time again to talk about life in the Negro Leagues. He was the unofficial ambassador for Negro Leagues baseball in the Ken Burns documentaries.

He was a standout first baseman and successful manager for the Kansas City Monarchs from 1937 to 1955. Years later, as a scout for the Chicago Cubs, Buck O'Neil signed future Hall of Famers Ernie Banks and Lou Brock to their first major league contracts.

Think about that. Buck O'Neil from the Negro Leagues signed Ernie Banks, Mr. Cub, to the Chicago Cubs. My message to the Tribune publishing company, which owns the Chicago Cubs, is: Can you think of a better batter to throw out a pitch for a game in Wrigley Field than Buck O'Neil, the only surviving baseball player from the Negro Leagues, and his man that he scouted for that team, Ernie Banks? It just doesn't get any better.

With the Cubs, Buck O'Neil also became the first African-American coach in the Major Leagues. At age 94, he is the driving force in preserving Negro League history—94 years old. He is the cofounder and chairman of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, which he and a handful of other Negro Leaguers started in a $200-a-month room in 1990.

Buck O'Neil has probably done more than anyone to see that the stories of great Black ball players before Jackie Robinson are not forgotten. Without his tireless efforts, it is unlikely a special committee would have ever started to right the wrong of segregated baseball. So it strikes many of us as ironic that Buck wasn't chosen to enter Cooperstown. He greeted the news with typical Buck O'Neil grace and optimism when he said:

> Before I wouldn't even have had a chance but this time I had that chance. . . . I was on the ballot, man.

Isn't that a great quote, from a man 94 years of age, who could have been given that moment in history to be the only surviving member of the Negro Leagues to actually physically be there as he was admitted to the Cooperstown Hall of Fame?

He added something. He said:

> You think about this. Here I am, the grandson of a slave. And here the whole world was excited about whether I was going in the Hall of Fame or not. We've come a long, long ways. Before, we never even thought about anything like that. America, you've really grown, and you're still growing.

The story of Black baseball is amazing. During its golden years, Negro Leagues Baseball was the Nation's third-largest Black-owned business.

The leagues included such storied franchises as the Chicago American Giants, the Kansas City Monarchs, the Homestead Grays, the Atlanta Black Crackers, the Newark Eagles, and the New York Black Yankees.

Among its stars were the legendary Satchel Paige, Josh Gibson, called ''the black Babe Ruth'', William ''Buck'' Leonard, the ''black Lou Gehrig,'' the acrobatic William ''Judy'' Johnson, and James ''Cool Papa'' Bell. Cool Papa Bell was so fast, it was said that he could turn off the light and be in bed before the room got dark. Even Jesse Owens declined to race against him.

The roots of black baseball stretch back to 1867. That year—2 years after the Civil War ended—the National Baseball Players Association was created. The new league banned any team that included even one Black player.

In 1887, the first Black baseball team, the Cuban Giants, was formed to give talented black players in New York a chance to play ball. Their success inspired other Black teams to form.

Many of the teams were hugely popular. One Sunday in 1911, the Chicago Cubs drew 6,000 paying fans, the White Sox had 9,000 fans, while the black team, the Chicago American Giants, drew 11,000 fans.

In 1920, the owner of the Chicago American Giants, Rube Foster, and other team owners met in Kansas City to form the Negro National League.

Foster hoped that the victor in the Negro championship would one day play the major league winner and that the color line in baseball would eventually be erased entirely.

That dream was crushed in 1919, with the appointment of Major League Baseball's first commissioner, Kenesaw Mountain Landis, who forbade White ball clubs from playing against Black clubs, even in exhibition games.

Negro Leagues players were paid little. They suffered long bus rides, exhausting schedules, and second-and third-rate motels. Other times, they relied or Black churches and fans' homes for a place to sleep. They played year round. When it got cold in the states, they headed south to play in Cuba or the Dominican Republic.

The color line was nearly broken in 1943 when Chicago Cubs owner Bill Veeck planned to buy the Philadelphia Phillies and hire Satchel Paige, Josh Gibson and other Negro League stars, but Landis learned of the plan first and sold the team to someone else.

The following year, Landis died. The new commissioner, former Kentucky Governor Happy Chandler, famously declared: ''I'm for the Four Freedoms.

If a Black . . . can make it on Okinawa and Guadalcanal . . . he can make it in baseball.'' But the Major League owners disagreed and voted against integration 15-to-1.

In 1945, Brooklyn Dodgers owner Branche Rickey signed a shortstop from the Kansas City Monarchs to play for the Dodgers' farm club. As a lieutenant in the Army, Jack Roosevelt Robinson risked a court-martial by refusing to sit in the back of a military bus. In 1947, he was called up to play for the Dodgers. Baseball's color line was finally erased.

Soon after, the Negro Leagues began to falter financially as they lost more and more of their best players to the majors. The league folded in 1960.

Before the vote this week, only 18 of the Negro League's more than 2,600 players had been voted into the Hall of Fame.

Among those pushing for recognition of other deserving Negro Leaguers was former Baseball Commissioner Fay Vincent. Vincent's interest in Negro Leagues ball was heightened after he met Alfred ''Slick'' Surratt, a Negro Leaguer who served in World War II and was wounded at the Battle of Guadalcanal, and then barred from playing Major League baseball when he returned home.

In 1991, at the urging of former St. Louis Cardinals catcher and baseball broadcaster Joe Garagiola, Vincent arranged a trip to Cooperstown for 75 Negro League players. At a formal dinner, he apologized to the players for the way baseball had snubbed them. He later told a reporter from USA Today: ''I really thought I was repeating an old line, but it turned out that it was the first time that someone—from Major League Baseball—had done that.'' When he handed out a commemorative medallion of the event, he said, ''about a third of [the players] were crying.''

In 2000, Major League Baseball commissioned a $250,000 study of African-American players from 1860 to 1960. The result is the most thorough statistical record of the Negro Leagues ever compiled. It includes statistics culled from Black-owned newspapers as well as stats from games that matched barnstorming White players—including Babe Ruth and Dizzy Dean—against Negro Leaguers.

The league then appointed a special commission of 12 historians and scholars to sift through the record and select players who should be considered for the Hall of Fame. The first list included 39 names. From those 39 players, the committee this week selected the 17 new Hall of Famers.

It wasn't just on the field that Negro Leagues Baseball differed from White baseball. At Major League games Black and White fans were separated by chicken-wire fences—''one of the powerful symbols of racism,'' in Buck O'Neil's words. But during Negro League games, Blacks and Whites sat side by side.

In July, when the Hall of Fame's class of 2006 is formally inducted, more of the legends of Black baseball will finally take their rightful place at Cooperstown, to be honored side by side with the rest of the best who ever played America's game. As Buck O'Neil said, ''America is growing.''

We congratulate the families of all of the new Hall of Famers, and we remain hopeful that Buck O'Neil and Minnie Minoso will soon join them in Cooperstown.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate is adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:36 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 2, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXPUNGEMENT RESTORES MOST FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment at comments made earlier this month by Maryland Gov. Robert Ehrlich that he would veto a bill that would restore voting rights to felons.

Disenfranchisement is a problem plaguing society. Nationally, more than four million Americans are not allowed to vote as a result of laws that prohibit voting by felons or ex-felons. In 48 states, with the exception of Maine and Vermont, and the District of Columbia prisoners cannot vote. In 36 states, felons on probation or parole are disenfranchised and in 11 states, a felony conviction can result in a lifetime sanction long after the completion of a sentence. Unfortunately disenfranchisement is not a color-blind problem. This fundamental obstacle to participation in our democracy is aggravated by racial disparities within the criminal justice system, resulting in an estimated 13 percent of black men unable to vote. In 10 states with the highest Hispanic populations, including California, Latinos are as much as three times more likely to lose their right to vote from felony disenfranchisement than the population at large.

The denial of black and Latino ex-felons from membership and participation in our electorate is a glaring disgrace to a country that prides itself on its equitable criminal justice system. It is said that once prisoners have ''paid their debt to society,'' they are free to reenter it. But are they truly free? The answer is no if some of their fundamental rights aren't restored at the conclusion of their sentence. Not only are some ex-felons not allowed to vote, but employers hesitate to contract workers with criminal records and participation in certain housing and training programs is elusive to them as well. It is shameful and unfair to punish ex-felons even after they have served their sentence. We must avail to these citizens every opportunity to regain their dignity so they do not return to a life of crime. The unfortunate alternative is for society to continue to be victimized by ex-offenders who, having given up all hope of employment, resort to careers in crime.

It is my belief that expungement allows for a fresh start for reformed ex-prisoners. That is why I have reintroduced. H.R. 662, the Second Chance for Ex-Offenders Act of 2005, which would permit the expungement of federal records for certain nonviolent criminal offenses. Gov. Ehrlich's comments that fully restoring voting rights to felons is inappropriate are in and of themselves egregious. If we continue to deny all ex-felons the right to vote and continue to punish them even after they have served their time, then what debt have they paid to society during their incarceration? What message are we sending not only to ex-offenders but the world as we continue to tout ourselves as the leader of the free, Democratic world, if we do not allow some of our citizens the right to vote?

Currently, some states have reformed their laws to allow ex-offenders to become active participants in their government. Several states, such as Kentucky and Illinois, permit the expungement of the records of certain ex-offenders who have violated state laws. Voting rights advocates and legislators are pushing for such initiatives in Virginia. In the governor's great state of Maryland, dozens of House Democrats have co-sponsored legislation that would allow about 150,000 ex-felons to vote this year and the state Democratic Party has endorsed the proposal. To unilaterally turn a deaf ear to constituents, advocacy groups and fellow lawmakers is an offense to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Gov. Ehrlich comes to realize the type of damage his vow to forbid restoration of voting rights to ex-prisoners has done to disadvantaged communities in his state. It is his vow that I find inappropriate.

TRIBUTE TO ALICE GRAY

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sadness today to honor my friend Alice Gray who died on February 10, 2006, at the age of 88. Surrounded by family and friends, she passed away peacefully in her Santa Rosa home. Known throughout Sonoma County for her leadership in the civil rights movement, Alice's strength, motherly warmth, and common sense were a hallmark of her style.

Originally from Longview, Texas, Alice moved to California during World War II to join her husband Gilbert who was working in the shipyards in Marin City. In 1950 the family moved to Santa Rosa where there were few other black people, and Alice and Gilbert soon became community activists.

In 1954 they co-founded the Sonoma Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and led pickets to integrate local businesses. Alice also helped establish the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Club in Sonoma, the Marin Rod and Gun Club, and the Community Baptist Church which has been led by the Reverend James Coffee for 45 years.

In 1992 Alice and Gilbert launched the Gray Foundation, with an initial contribution of $150,000, to provide funds to students with the desire to further their education and serve their community. The Grays declared, ''The Gray Foundation is our effort to reverse unemployability, declining social values and violent self-fear. We seek to put our resources behind our words (put up or shut up) . . . As a people, we have to put our growing resources to use in support of our heroes/sheroes, our heritage, as well as persons and places of learning. We must listen and learn from each the traditions of self-help and self-reliance that once gave our people strength.''

The Foundation's programs embody that philosophy, from its scholarships for high school graduates to In Partnership, a unique enrichment program at Brook Hill Elementary School which focuses on the development of tools that young children will need for school success. Its theme is ''Students Taking an Active Role'' (the children are known as ''STARS'') and includes the South Park Grandmothers'' Club whose members, including Alice, went regularly to the school to be there for at-risk kids.

Alice's husband Gilbert passed away in 1997 after 62 years of marriage. She remained active, including a drive to Los Angeles with her grandson Curtis last fall to attend the 18th annual California NAACP Convention. Always a high-spirited driver (called ''wheeling'' by the family), she drove for 100 miles on the trip, her first time behind the wheel since her husband's death. At the Convention, she met with the new president, Bruce Gordon, and many old friends from all over the state such as Willie Brown and Mervyn Dymally. She and Curtis attended seminars, including one on same sex marriage. Both of them were overwhelmed at the concluding banquet where Curtis was given the honor of doing an invocation and all 450 attendees sang Happy Birthday to Alice.

Alice is survived by 7 great, great grandchildren, 28 great grandchildren, 32 grandchildren, 5 siblings, numerous nieces and nephews, eight of her nine children—Ann Gray Byrd, William Gray, Dorothy Woodward, Ida Johnson, James Gray, Charles Gray, Aubrey Gray, Robert Gray—and many close friends and admirers.

Mr. Speaker, it was the Alice's and Gilbert's desire that ''the Gray Foundation serve as an example to others so that they, too, will put up, because we cannot afford to shut-up and still survive.'' Alice Gray herself was a shining example of someone who ''put up'', inspiring so many with her actions and her heart. I will miss my friend but know that her message of hope and compassion will continue to spread throughout the community and beyond.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPHINE CATHRINE GAJDA

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding resident of the Third Congressional District of Illinois, Josephine Cathrine Gajda, upon her retirement. Over the years, Josephine has been a distinguished contributor to the community, as well as an exemplary mother. Her love of nature, reading,

and visiting with her grandchildren embody genuine and honorable values.

After graduating from St. John of God Elementary School and Lourdes High School, Josephine's experience in child care, banking, and at Dominick's enabled her to serve the community and its residents. During this time, she also nurtured and raised five children (Cheryl, Stephen, David, Kristen, and Melissa) and is currently the grandmother of six grandchildren (Zack, Andrew, Dakota, Emily, Kristina, and Nicholas).

Josephine's patience, kindness, and ability proved to be invaluable in the workplace, but also at home. As an outstanding parent, she imparted these important values to her children and grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to stand with me today and take this opportunity to recognize Josephine Catherine Gajda for her many achievements, and wish her well in retirement. As Josephine truly sets an example to the Third District, we also thank her for her role in making our community a better place to live.

HONORING PRAVEEN CHAUDHARI

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize a good friend and leader in the advanced research community, the retiring director of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, Dr. Praveen Chaudhari.

I am deeply proud to represent BNL and its dedicated employees. I have thoroughly enjoyed my working relationship with Dr. Chaudhari, who is a world-class physicist running a world-class research facility. It is an honor and privilege for me to recognize his numerous accomplishments, steadfast dedication and hard work throughout a distinguished research career dedicated to the advancement of science.

Dr. Chaudhari entered the field of physics by earning a B.S. from the Indian Institute of Technology as well as an M.S. and Sc.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He applied this knowledge to research and the publication of over 150 technical papers and 20 patents throughout 36 years as an IBM scientist, manager, and recipient of numerous honors for his contributions to innovative scientific technology.

Through three years at the helm of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, Dr. Chaudhari persevered over many challenges while making tremendous progress in advanced energy research and technology. His tenacity and firm resolve have proven to be among BNL's most invaluable assets. I have witnessed his leadership and determination first-hand, particularly as the lab moved forward with break-through research projects such as the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider and the National Synchrotron Light Source-II (NSLS–II).

It was my pleasure to work closely with Dr. Chaudhari and my colleagues in New York's congressional delegation to help BNL advance its mission. On behalf of New York's first congressional district, I extend my gratitude and congratulations to Dr. Chaudhari for a brilliant career along with best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors. His vision and passion for scientific discovery will always be remembered, and his outstanding advocacy and leadership will be missed.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES FACING THE CARIBBEAN UNDER GLOBALIZATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge the challenges facing Caribbean countries, and their leadership and to acknowledge the vital roles they play in the global community. As an example of the richness of the thinking in the region on the challenges faced by small states in their transition to the global economy, I enter in the RECORD a speech delivered by His Excellency Michael King, Ambassador of Barbados to the United States of America and Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States. Comments made by Ambassador King were part of his address to the annual general meeting of the Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA), a membership organization dedicated to the preservation of Caribbean cultural and natural resources, held Friday, February 3, 2006.

Currently, the Caribbean region is undergoing a transformation, but changes could come with a steep price. Countries such as Jamaica and Barbados have seen a boom in real estate, primarily for local housing development and further growth will necessarily be contingent on the greater exploitation of natural resources. In Trinidad, the lucrative oil windfall may open opportunities for industrialization which will not only use scarce resources but will bring up concerns regarding safe disposal of waste byproducts and health ramifications in nearby communities. Natural disasters also pose a challenge as the Caribbean and the United States observed with the destruction of Grenada in 2004 by Hurricane Ivan. All governments must boost their preparedness in order to prevent devastation to families, homes and businesses.

In his remarks, Ambassador King explains that because of the CCA's unique mission, they are in a position to outreach to members who can influence change. ''Having gone through a period of dormancy, the organization must act quickly not just to confirm its relevance but to provide the mechanism whereby it can become the catalyst for a resurgence of the environmental movement in the Caribbean,'' Ambassador King said in his remarks. The Ambassador suggests continued collaboration between CCA and organizations dedicated to promoting agriculture and tourism in order to boost CCA's efficiency. He also recommends CCA becoming a vehicle for interventions related to community-based educational programs and alliances with fledging non-governmental organizations working in the field.

Mr. Speaker, again please join me in acknowledging the merit of Ambassador King's remarks regarding the challenges facing the Caribbean in this era of globalization and what can be done to protect and preserve the Caribbean's cultural resources and environment.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK EGGER

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frank Egger of Fairfax, CA, who recently completed 10 terms—40 years—on the Fairfax City Council, including seven stints as mayor. The longest continuously serving city council member in the State, Frank's tenure was marked by his environmental activism and his passion for his town.

A San Francisco native, Frank lived in Santa Rosa for several years where he met his wife, Ronita Sundin, while modeling at a fashion show at the Flamingo Hotel. The couple moved to Fairfax in 1959 to raise their daughter Lori, who now has two children of her own. Frank left college to support his family and spent 44 years driving a bread truck for Sara Lee. He became active in North Bay labor issues, fighting for the rights of blue-collar workers, and eventually served as president of Teamsters Local No. 484.

In the 1960s Frank began his life's calling as an activist in both State and local issues when he perceived the environmental threats facing California and when a graceful Victorian bank in his hometown was replaced by a modern building.

Frank cofounded Friends of the Eel River, preventing the building of the Dos Rios Dam and is still fighting water diversions that could harm that stream's fisheries. He has had long working relationships with environmental pioneers including David Brower, Todd Steiner, Marty Griffin, and the late Peter Behr—with whom he developed the California Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, signed into law by Governor Reagan. He also served as one of the State's first coastal commissioners, spearheaded a State antinuclear initiative, and is a member of the statewide Environmental Health Legislative Working Group Pesticide Committee.

Locally, Frank was active in many key groups including the Ross Valley Paramedic Authority, GGNRA Board of Control, Marin County Congestion Management Agency, Marin Telecommunications Agency, and many others over his 40-year tenure. He has also been a fixture at meetings dealing with water issues in both Marin and Sonoma counties.

However, he will be most remembered for his leadership in preserving Fairfax's small-town character through his role in slowing its development and safeguarding its environment and the wages of its workforce. He was instrumental in the creation of the 500-acre Elliot Nature Preserve, enactment of strict antipesticide ordinances and a high living-wage law, and protection of the historic 23-acre Marin Town and Country Club from large-scale development.

In the cauldron of local politics, all would agree that Frank acted out of conviction for his town, for the environment, and for the well being of workers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have worked with Frank Egger, a brave and caring activist, whose years of service are an inspiration to all of us who believe in fighting for our values and speaking out for progressive causes. I know he will continue this fight, and I intend to be by his side.

HONORING GERALD R. BENNETT, MAYOR OF PALOS HILLS, IL, 25TH CELEBRATION IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayor Gerald R. Bennett of Palos Hills, IL. Mayor Bennett has given 25 years of public service to the Palos Hills community.

As a native of Chicago's southwest side, Mayor Bennett attended Brother Rice High School. He then continued his education at Lewis University of Joliet and graduated from the University of Illinois—Chicago.

Mayor Bennett began his public service in 1979 by serving as alderman from the Second Ward of Palos Hills. Upon the completion of his term he was elected as mayor of Palos Hills in 1981, a position he has continued to serve for the past 25 years.

As mayor, Mr. Bennett has transformed the city of Palos Hills into a progressive community which seeks to unite all of Chicago's southwest suburban towns. Because of his exemplary leadership, Mayor Bennett has served as founder and president of the Southwest Conference of Mayors for the past 23 years. He is also the chairman of the Board of Southwest Central Dispatch, an intergovernmental police and fire 911 service.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the many achievements of Mayor Gerald R. Bennett. It is my honor to acknowledge Mayor Bennett for his outstanding leadership and commitment to public service, in the city of Palos Hills and the Third Congressional District of Illinois.

HONORING JAMES ''BUTCH'' LANGHORN

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize James ''Butch'' Langhorn, an American patriot and good friend, for a lifetime dedicated to serving and defending our nation and the First Congressional District of New York in particular.

Since I was elected to Congress, it has been my honor and privilege having Butch working alongside me in my Long Island office. Butch was recently appointed Special Assistant to the Sheriff of Suffolk County. Although I will miss Butch tremendously, this important and highranking position is a well-deserved opportunity to continue his impressive career on Long Island.

Indeed, Butch is a consummate professional whose diligence and commitment constitute a shining example of public service. His tireless efforts and steadfast dedication have been invaluable assets to our constituent service operation, and I am confident that they will prove equally beneficial to the Sheriff, his office and his jurisdiction.

Time and again, Butch has risen above and beyond the call of duty, going the extra mile to provide the best service possible to our constituents, particularly veterans, many of whom know Butch personally and respect his impeccable record and integrity. I have often said that Butch is the best veteran's staffer in the U.S. House of Representatives. If there is someone better, then I want to meet that person.

As a young man, Butch attended Riverhead High School on Long Island before enlisting in the U.S. Army. He served four years on active duty, including a tour in Vietnam. Shortly after his return, Butch joined the Air National Guard as a technician and was attached to the 106th Air Rescue Wing located at Gabreski Air Force Base on eastern Long Island. Butch was awarded multiple decorations and reached the senior rank of Chief Master Sergeant for his countless achievements, particularly for excellence in managing the base's personnel and finances.

Throughout his military service, Butch was always keenly aware and interested in Long Island's political environment. He was elected to and remains the current Democratic Town Leader of the Town of Riverhead.

Butch's dedication to his community compliments his military record and civilian occupation. He has coached Little League baseball and Pop Warner football, and was awarded the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Memorial Award for the active and positive role that he has played for his church and in his community.

Butch currently resides in Riverhead with his wife, Linda. They have two children, Kelli and Michael; and four grandchildren, Katherine, Kameron, Kyler-Ann, and Danielle.

On behalf of my staff and New York's First Congressional District, I thank James ''Butch'' Langhorn for over four decades of public service, through which a common thread runs—his genuine commitment to his fellow veterans and Long Islanders. I wish him continued success, good health, and the best of luck in the future. Butch will be missed but always remembered with the highest degree of fondness, respect and gratitude.

RECOGNIZING FEBRUARY AS AMERICAN HEART MONTH

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge February as American Heart Month. Heart disease is an increasing issue in today's society. The risk of this detrimental disease can be prevented, if only we stop to recognize the warning signs.

Heart disease, strokes and other cardiovascular diseases are the leading causes of death in the United States. In 2003, collectively these diseases killed 910,600 of our citizens. Moreover, heart disease is the number one killer of women in America. Statistics show that more than 70 million Americans currently suffer from some form of cardiovascular disease. It is critical that we take action now to reduce the number of people who fall victim to these ailments.

As a member of the Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition, I feel it is my duty to raise awareness of the seriousness of cardiovascular disease. The coalition is comprised of several members of the House and the Senate. Together, we act as a resource center on heart and stroke issues such as biomedical research; quality and availability of care; health promotion and disease prevention. We also work to advance public policy aimed at fighting cardiovascular diseases. I believe in the importance of knowing the warning signs of this condition. More knowledge about this disease increases the chance of survival for our fellow countrymen.

Several things can be done to maintain a healthy heart. The first step is to be screened for heart disease, which includes having cholesterol and blood pressure checked. Next, it is important to start a conversation with health care providers about personal risks of heart disease. Most often, this includes a discussion of the family's history of stroke. Many doctors have advised that quitting smoking, losing weight and becoming more active through even moderate exercise greatly decreases the risk of cardiovascular disease. These are just a few things we can do to help reduce the risk of heart disease. The American Heart Association's website is a great resource for helpful facts, statistics, and warning signs of these impeding conditions. I believe it is crucial to heed these warnings.

Mr. Speaker, the heart is truly a vital organ pumping blood throughout our bodies everyday. I ask that you will join me in promoting heart healthy programs. Together, we will ensure Americans keep their hearts healthy.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEXAS WESTERN'S 1966 NCAA BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

SPEECH OF

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 2006

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in celebration of diversity in sports and civil rights in America first pioneered by Texas Western's 1966 NCAA Basketball Championship victory. On its 40th anniversary, I join my colleagues in recognizing the lasting impact this title game has etched into the history of American culture.

The Texas Western 1966 NCAA Championship triumph over the University of Kentucky is to this day acknowledged as the turning point for not only college basketball but American sports in general.

When no other schools in the Southeastern Conference or the former Southwestern Conference would award them athletic scholarships, African Americans had been recruited by and playing for Texas Western since the 1950s.

The university's most controversial move, however, came when the 1966 Miners were the first team in NCAA basketball to have an all-black starting lineup. Winning the title game was perhaps not as a great a feat for Coach Don Haskins as was placing five all-black starters against five all-white starters in 1966.

Haskins' daring insight combined with the players' undeniable athletic talent produced a game that would rupture the social structure of college sports and forever change the face of American sports.

The Miners' 72–65 victory over the Wildcats proved to be more than just an athletic anomaly. It became the social breakthrough that would invite the irrepressible talent and skill diversity has to offer to college athletics.

With cultural implications well beyond its sporting ones, this championship win has come to symbolize the glory that could be obtained by athletes—regardless of their heritage—who are bold enough to travel down the road of recognition, integration, and acceptance.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Texas Western's 1966 NCAA Basketball Championship as we commemorate the 40th anniversary of the team's revolutionary civil rights success.

TRIBUTE TO MR. FRED ANDERSON

HON. MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and public service of Mr. Fred Anderson of Loveland, Colorado. Mr. Anderson, a fifth generation Coloradoan, has devoted his life to public service and the people of Colorado.

In 1966 Mr. Anderson began his dutiful service in the State Senate. During his 16 year tenure as a State Senator, he chaired the Natural Resources Committee and the Legislative Audit Committee. He also served as president of the Senate from 1974 to 1982. Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Anderson was responsible for Colorado becoming the first state to set up an actuarially sound pension program for public employees. Moreover, Mr. Anderson was instrumental in the recodification of Colorado Water Law. The expertise Mr. Anderson brought to this lengthy process was an invaluable asset to the people of Colorado.

Mr. Anderson's reputation as an effective leader and skilled legislator earned him national recognition. He served as president of the National Conference of State Legislators and also received a Presidential Appointment to the Advisory Commission for Inter-Governmental Relations.

Mr. Anderson's service to his community has not been limited to the political realm. He has unselfishly given of himself as a member of countless civic and philanthropic organizations. Mr. Anderson has served on the Governing Board of Lutheran Hospital and Homes Society and as chair of the United Way. He has also been actively involved in the Rotary Club, Farm Bureau, and Colorado Cattle Feeders.

Perhaps most importantly however, Mr. Anderson is a family man of tremendous character. He and his wife Anne have been married for over fifty-two years. He is the proud father of three sons and a daughter as well as a proud grandfather of seven.

INTRODUCING THE PULMONARY AND CARDIAC REHABILITATION ACT OF 2006

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, COPD, is the number four killer in the United States, and it is the only condition in the top ten where deaths are increasing annually. Analysts predict it will move into the number three position within the next decade. But through pulmonary rehabilitation, doctors and health care providers are saving lives. This treatment is covered by Medicare, but confusion in the regulation denies many people the opportunity for this life-saving and life-extending treatment.

As far back as 1981, the Health Care Financing Administration, now the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, recognized the importance of pulmonary rehabilitation and readily acknowledged it was a covered service under Medicare. But in the past 25 years, the Medicare program has not published a policy for coverage of pulmonary rehabilitation services, letting local Medicare contractors decide how best to cover the service. So in some parts of the United States, Medicare beneficiaries have no access to pulmonary rehabilitation because local Medicare contractors have no defined policy for coverage.

So, today I introduce the Pulmonary and Cardiac Rehabilitation Act of 2006, a companion bill to S. 1440 introduced by Senators MIKE CRAPO and BLANCHE LINCOLN. I am pleased to be joined by my colleague JOHN LEWIS as a cosponsor of this reform legislation. This legislation clarifies Medicare language to establish a specific benefit category for pulmonary rehabilitation services.

Organizations such as the American College of Chest Physicians, the American Thoracic Society, the National Association for Medical Direction of Respiratory Care, the American Association of Respiratory Care and the American Hospital Association have all signaled their support for this reform.

Heart disease, along with other cardiovascular diseases, is the number one killer in the United States. So in addition to establishing a specific benefit category for pulmonary rehabilitation, this legislation would do the same for cardiac rehabilitation services. I commend CMS for taking action on cardiac rehabilitation and proposing a National Coverage Decision in December 2005. This bill would give legislative certainty and clarity to that action.

Because CMS agrees that cardiac rehabilitation is an important covered service, there is no cost associated with these provisions of the bill. The costs associated with the pulmonary rehabilitation section are currently being scored by the Congressional Budget Office and are expected to be minimal.

My mother recently experienced firsthand the benefits of these rehabilitation services at South Central Regional Medical Center in my hometown of Laurel, Mississippi. I hope this legislation will provide others around the country with the same health care opportunities that have so benefited my mother. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELIZABETHTOWN FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take this opportunity to honor the First Baptist Church of Elizabethtown, Illinois, as it celebrates its bicentennial anniversary on July 9, 2006. Since its founding in 1806, the Elizabethtown Baptist Church has been preaching the gospel in the community, and has served as a symbol of faith and endurance.

The church was founded by Stephen Stilley, William Jones, and others as God led them to begin a Baptist work in the Illinoisan territory. The first meeting of the church took place—as many of the New Testament churches did—in a small home. It was built in a safe place for the worshippers near Griffith Cave. This proved to be of the utmost importance when the building was burned by the Indians, at first. In 1877, the church purchased land from the Drumms family and built the current church from bricks made at the local kiln. Today the congregation has made extensive repairs in an effort to preserve the old church for future generations.

The challenge of the church is to keep the sacred word of God and faithfulness of the people. For 200 years, God has protected and preserved his people's church through the threat of fire, flood, and other natural and man-made disasters as living testimony of His Divine Grace. As the celebrations go on, all visitors are always welcome. My family and I have been graciously invited to attend the celebration of their bicentennial anniversary.

My prayer is that God will continue to bless this historic and remarkable congregation and they would remain a positive influence for the future of the Elizabethtown community of Illinois.

HONORING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 2006

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to join Chairman MEL WATT and the entire Congressional Black Caucus in recognizing the importance of Black History Month. While Black History Month always provides us with an important opportunity to reflect on the vital accomplishments and contributions of African Americans, it has taken on a special meaning this year with the recent passing of both Rosa Parks and Coretta Scott King.

Although they have passed on, Mrs. King and Mrs. Parks continue to inspire us to work towards the noble goal of equality for all. These two women were among a group of brave pioneers who led one of the greatest movements of our time—the Civil Rights Movement. I have great respect for all those who risked beatings and arrests, and were even willing to make the ultimate sacrifice—their lives—to stand up for a cause that is right and just.

My close friend and colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, stands among us as a giant of the Civil Rights Movement. During the legendary march that Representative LEWIS led to Selma, Alabama, more than 40 years ago, countless peaceful, law-abiding Americans were beaten and arrested. This day came to be called ''Bloody Sunday,'' and it helped spur a nation to action to fight against the evils of discrimination and racism.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the great honor and privilege to accompany Representative LEWIS and other civil rights leaders to Selma several times to commemorate the events of that fateful day by marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Each time, we are reminded of the impact that one single day can have on the course of history, and we celebrate those with the courage and determination to face down the worst so that all Americans might enjoy the freedom and equality that this nation stands for.

These pilgrimages to Selma vividly illustrate for us how far we have come in the quest for civil rights for all, yet also serve as a reminder that we must never be complacent in thinking that the battle is won.

The plight of those who are denied civil rights is a struggle that is far from over, and we must remain ever mindful of those whose rights are in danger of being denied. In the coming year, several provisions of the Voting Rights Act are scheduled for reauthorization. It is our duty to ensure that the march toward civil rights for all continues forward, rather than stalling or going backward.

The VRA is crucial in guaranteeing that the rights of all Americans remain protected, and, as such, should command broad, bipartisan support. It is a fitting tribute to Rosa Parks, Coretta Scott King, and to all those who have participated in the Civil Rights Movement in ways large and small, to renew the very Act that codified their long struggle for enfranchisement into law.

Our nation is deeply indebted to these men and women of courage and integrity. Their legacy will live on for generations.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY BRADLEY, THE 2006 IVAN D. LIVI AVIATION EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

HON. LEONARD L. BOSWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jerry Bradley, who has been named the Ivan D. Livi Aviation Educator of the Year by the Aviation Technician Education Council. The Aviation Technician Education Council is an organization of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) founded to further the standing of FAA approved schools. This award recognizes outstanding achievement of an aviation maintenance technology instructor.

As a general aviation pilot and member of House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's Subcommittee on Aviation, I am greatly impressed by the work Mr. Bradley, his colleagues and his students perform on a daily basis. The Aviation Technologies Program, which Mr. Bradley chairs, provides students in the Des Moines area with a unique opportunity to gain valuable skills and lessons, which they can carry forward throughout their careers. I commend Mr. Bradley for leading a program, which continues to be a model of success for schools in Iowa and throughout the United States.

Again, congratulations to Mr. Jerry Bradley for earning the Ivan D. Livi Aviation Educator of the Year Award. This honors his work, the Des Moines Public Schools Aviation Technologies Program, and his students.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BISHOP MICHAEL LUNSFORD

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that Michael R. Lunsford, a constituent of mine from Taunton, Massachusetts, recently celebrated the first anniversary of being elevated to the position of Bishop within the International Fellowship of Reformed Episcopal Churches, previously known as the International Fellowship of Reformed Episcopal, Pentecostal Churches of the Syro-Atiochan Rite.

While this marks an important milestone for Bishop Lunsford and for the members of his congregation, I believe it is also important for the broader community to be aware of the many ways in which he has contributed to improving the lives of Taunton residents, and improving the quality of life in the greater Taunton area. Indeed, he offers an excellent example of the way in which clerics contribute to their communities simultaneously on two levels: as spiritual leaders for the members of their particular houses of worship or faiths, but also as participants in important community efforts to address social concerns that go beyond the doors of their own houses of worship. It is from that perspective that I would like to acknowledge the valuable services Bishop Lunsford has performed—and continues to perform—for Taunton and its environs, and also overseas (obviously, in this case, the term ''community'' has a much more expansive meaning than we sometimes give it).

Bishop Lunsford moved to Taunton in 1983 with his wife, when he took on the position of pastor at the Crossroads Christian Center. He has been active in area religious and civic affairs since that time. From its inception in 1987, he has been an advisor to Barnabas Ministries, an international missionary organization that has provided encouragement and training to thousands of pastors in more than 27 developing countries throughout the world. He was also the founder of two local human service programs: Eagles Nest, an after school program established in 1998 that focuses on tutoring, reading programs and other youth services; and The Lord Cares Food Program, which began in 1993 and provides nutrition assistance to needy families by means of donations and volunteer work. He was also the founder in 2001 of Crossroads International, a multi-racial ministry headquartered in Taunton, with branches in New Bedford, Massachusetts, Providence, Rhode Island and Port Limon, Costa Rica. Crossroads International works on promoting business development, youth empowerment and anti-drug initiatives, among other efforts.

Bishop Lunsford is also on the board of Youth Challenge International, an anti-drug abuse organization, and is a member of numerous local human service and community boards, including Taunton Cares, Pro Home, Taunton Emergency Task Force, Community Counseling, Greater Taunton Clergy, and the Department of Mental Health.

Because his work is very much in the American tradition of combining spiritual and community leadership, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Michael R. Lunsford on his many contributions to Taunton, his elevation to the position of Bishop and his ongoing commitment to helping less fortunate people around the world.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE GILMORE

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you my pride in Steve Gilmore, a member of my staff who is leaving our service to assume new responsibilities as the Vice President of Governmental Affairs for the Chamber of Medford/Jackson County.

A little over 7 years ago, I had the good fortune to invite Steve Gilmore to join my staff in my district office in Medford, OR. When Steve became a member of our team, he was a recent college graduate with incredible enthusiasm, a passion for the operations of government, and an intense interest in the history of our great Nation. He was highly motivated with a deep and unselfish desire to help others. Those are among the many qualities that have enabled Steve to serve the constituents of the Second Congressional District with such effectiveness.

Steve, a former student body president at Eastern Oregon University, brought significant leadership skills to his duties throughout his 7 year career with the U.S. House of Representatives. His fellow workers and my constituents sought his counsel because he had the ability to weigh large quantities of diverse information and arrive at commonsense solutions to complex problems.

Steve has approached any and all tasks presented to him with enthusiasm, good cheer, and a quiet determination to get positive results. He leaves with a file overflowing with notes and cards of sincere appreciation from Oregonians he assisted. As all of my colleagues know, people seeking our assistance are often frustrated, distraught, and discouraged. Steve has been particularly good at helping those people to have confidence that we can work through their difficulties to make the system more responsive to their needs.

Always a gentleman, Steve's innate kindness has always been reflected in his interactions with his fellow staff members and those I represent. Steve has taken very seriously our commitment to be compassionate and responsive in fulfilling our mission to assist our constituents through difficulties they confront with our government.

I appointed Steve as my special projects coordinator and my director of constituent services because I knew I could count on him to wholeheartedly tackle special issues and cases that arise in a vast territory like Oregon's Second Congressional District. I'm confident that Steve will do an outstanding job of

productively growing the involvement the Chamber of Medford/Jackson County in the political process.

I am sorry to see Steve leave, but am pleased that he has been offered this great new opportunity. I thank him deeply for his exemplary service. Mr. Speaker, I know that you and my colleagues join me in wishing Steve and his lovely wife, Mindy, the best of success in this new avenue of service.

FREMONT EDUCATION FOUNDATION HONORS CHERYL COOK-KALLIO AND SANDI PANTAGES FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to two extraordinary women who were honored by the Fremont Education Foundation in Fremont, California on February 24, 2006 at the Foundation's Annual Excellence in Education Gala. The 2006 honorees, Cheryl Cook-Kallio and Sandi Pantages have provided exemplary contributions to the Fremont Unified School District. Ms. Cook-Kallio is the Excellence in Education Fremont Unified School District (FUSD) Honoree. Ms. Pantages is the Excellence in Education Community Honoree.

Ms. Cook-Kallio is an instructor at Irvington High School in Fremont, California and has been an educator with FUSD since 1979. She has coached and led her ''We the People'' team of students to win the California State ''We The People'' Competition. Her students placed fourth in the National ''We The People'' Competition in 2005. She is popular with her students and has received numerous professional honors, grants and fellowships for her teaching, mentorship, and excellence in the areas of Social Studies, United States History and Government. She is an exemplary mentor, motivator and respected educator.

Ms. Pantages has served as a member of the Fremont Education Foundation Board of Directors since 1992. She has provided immeasurable support to Fremont's students and has contributed greatly to the Fremont community through her 32-year association and employment with Alameda County Library. She developed the Alameda County Library Foundation and served as Manager of the Fremont Main Library and Fremont Libraries prior to her retirement in 2001. She has received numerous awards and recognition from the city of Fremont, Alameda County Library Foundation and was named Alameda County's Outstanding Manager of the Year-General Government in 1999.

Both Cheryl Cook-Kallio and Sandi Pantages have distinguished themselves in their careers and contributions to their community. I congratulate them for the well deserved honor they received from the Fremont Education Foundation.

COMMEMORATING THE 18TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NAGORNO KARABAKH FREEDOM MOVEMENT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, and the representative of a large and vibrant community of Armenian Americans, I rise today to commemorate the 18th anniversary of the Nagorno Karabakh Freedom Movement. On February 20, 1988, the people of Nagorno Karabakh officially petitioned the Soviet government to correct the historical injustices of Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin by reuniting the area with Armenia. Six days later, one million people demonstrated in Yerevan's Opera Square. Unfortunately, the central Soviet and Azerbaijani leadership violently reacted to this peaceful and legal request by engaging in full military aggression against Nagorno Karabakh.

In 1991, the people of Nagorno Karabakh voted overwhelmingly to establish an independent republic. However, Azerbaijan continued to perpetrate horrific crimes against Nagorno Karabakh including indiscriminate bombing and artillery attacks. Since 1994, a cease-fire, which has held through today, was reached with help from Russian and European mediators.

Today, Nagorno Karabakh continues to strengthen its statehood with a democratically elected government, a court system, an independent foreign policy, and a commitment to educating its citizens. Just last year, Nagorno Karabakh held its fourth parliamentary elections which were declared to be free and transparent by election observers. I will continue to join with my colleagues in supporting assistance to Nagorno Karabakh, which has a vital role in achieving a peaceful and stable South Caucasus region. I commend the people of Nagorno Karabakh for courageously defending their right to live freely on their ancestral land. On this anniversary, I reiterate my unwavering support to Nagorno Karabakh's freedom, democracy, and economic development.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, due to other business, I missed three votes on February 28, 2006. I ask that the RECORD reflect that had I been able to, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall vote No. 14, commemorating the lifetime innovations of Thomas Edison; ''aye'' on rollcall vote No. 15, celebrating the 40th anniversary of Texas Western's 1966 NCAA basketball championship; and ''aye'' on rollcall vote No. 16, to authorize the President to award a gold medal, on behalf of Congress, collectively, to the Tuskegee Airmen.

45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the United States Peace Corps and its more than 7,800 volunteers serving abroad as they celebrate the 45th anniversary of this respected organization. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy established the Peace Corps, impressing upon thousands of young people the need for public service and urging them to become not simply citizens of the U.S., but to become global citizens in pursuit of peace and friendship.

The Peace Corps has carried on that mission. By serving two years overseas, volunteers work cooperatively with local communities, providing expertise and assistance, and empowering people in developing countries. Their service continues President Kennedy's hopes for the Peace Corps to change the lives of countless individuals, families, and communities worldwide.

Today, I would also like to share the story of a volunteer from my district—a young woman from Santa Fe, New Mexico who was committed to the mission of the Peace Corps.

Tessa Marie Horan graduated from the College of Santa Fe in December 2003 and began a career focused on educating children. She was accepted to the Peace Corps in November 2005, and after nine weeks of training, was dispatched to work in Tonga to teach in the Community Education project. The education project is focused on building life skills for Tongan students, and Tessa, who was looking forward to getting to work, had already established a connection with the village youth.

Unfortunately, Tessa's life was cut tragically short this January when she was attacked by a shark in the waters off Tu'anuku. In what had become an afternoon ritual, she was playing outdoors with the village children when they decided to take a swim to cool off.

In the days before her death, Tessa's friends and family recall her saying that she was thoroughly enjoying her experience in Tonga and looking forward to the official start of the teaching program. Tessa was just 24-years old and often quoted Ghandi: ''Be the change you wish to see in the world.'' Those words are very fitting to describe the character of Tessa and the thousands of other Peace Corps volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations again to the Peace Corps on its 45th anniversary, and a personal, thank you to all former and current Peace Corps volunteers from New Mexico. Your selfless dedication and service serves as an example of the American spirit.

IN MEMORY OF NORMAN MIRANDA

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 2006, the citizens of East Providence and the state of Rhode Island lost

one of the beloved leaders of all time. A father, husband, grandfather and dear friend, Norman Miranda was a lifelong resident of East Providence. He was the city's longest serving elected and appointed official; 13 years as a councilman and 18 years with the Zoning Board of Review. Thirty-one years as a public servant, Norman was always passionate about the issues facing his community.

He was the loving father of Loriann and Norman Jr. and a loving husband to Shirley for 46 years. If you were to meet the two, you could easily sense their marriage was one built on love and faith. They worked together as a team to raise a beautiful family that will now carry on his legacy.

Norman's years of dedicated service to his community, speak volumes about his compassion for those in need and his ability to connect with others. He loved Ward 2 like it was an extension of his family and those who lived there loved him back. They knew he could be trusted for he represented the things that mattered most, family and faith.

I had the honor of knowing Norman and his family. I remember when I first ran for Congress he offered me his support and that meant I could count on all of East Providence. I can still see him proudly marching along the many parade routes in the city, smiling and waving at the crowd—most he knew by name. It's an image we all can hold onto, a man who left his mark by symbolizing all that is good and decent. He will be forever missed.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the Peace Corps. I would like to thank the over 7,800 volunteers who currently serve overseas for their important work with this organization.

We are in a time when the Peace Corps mission is more vital than ever, and the organization is at a 30-year high in the number of volunteers in the field. The Peace Corps is currently in 69 posts and serving 75 countries across the globe.

I salute the outstanding individuals who serve and have served in the Peace Corps, specifically the sworn-in volunteers whose hometowns are in Texas District 24: Bonnie Barron, Amanda Bass, Christopher Bass, Scott Bennett, Eric Brooke, Jaime Bruner, Susan English, David Fox, Mary Kah, Geoffrey Keogh, Carolyn McGee, Roanne Perry, and Aubrey Weers.

I am proud to represent these men and women who empower people in developing nations and promote the Peace Corps mission of peace and friendship. These volunteers are making major strides to improve the lives of people and communities around the world.

I wish the Peace Corps and its volunteers continued success and perseverance. We are grateful for their contributions to society and dedication to providing assistance where it is needed. May the Peace Corps continue its legacy of service, both at home and abroad.

CONGRATULATIONS TO RICHARD M. DEVOS ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to a native son and community pillar of my hometown, Grand Rapids, MI, Mr. Richard M. DeVos, on the occasion of his 80th birthday on March 4.

Rich has played a leading role in making Grand Rapids a wonderful and vibrant place to live. Rather than keeping the fortune that he and his business partner and lifelong friend, the late Jay VanAndel, built after creating and growing their business, Amway Corporation, Rich and Jay and their families found countless ways to reinvest the fruits of their success back into their community. Just a few of the notable examples are the development of the Amway Grand Plaza Hotel, which was the linchpin in the redevelopment of downtown Grand Rapids in the early 1980s, and a donation which led to the construction of DeVos Performance Hall, a world-class performing arts center which is the home of the Grand Rapids Symphony, Opera Grand Rapids and Broadway-class plays and musicals. The hall also is part of the larger DeVos Place Convention Center.

That Rich DeVos is still with us today is nothing short of a miracle. In 1997, he survived a unique heart transplant surgery in which he received the heart of a lung transplant patient, who in turn received a combination heart-lung transplant from the victim of an auto accident. As a result of his experience, Rich now serves as chairman of the speakers' bureau for the United Network for Organ Sharing and has even testified before Congress urging support to make organ donation easier. He and his wife, Helen, also provided funding for the DeVos Children's Hospital, the Cook-DeVos Center for Health Sciences, the DeVos Communications Center at Calvin College, the DeVos Center of Grand Valley State University and the Richard and Helen DeVos Fieldhouse at Hope College in Holland, MI.

Today, Rich DeVos is the same vibrant person who was a cheerleader at Grand Rapids Christian High School and who inspired thousands of people to open their own businesses with the help of Amway. Rich has continued his inspirational ways as an author, including "Hope from My Heart: 10 Lessons for Life" and "Compassionate Capitalism." Rich is also the owner of the National Basketball Association's Orlando Magic. DeVos and VanAndel's business, now known as Alticor, continues to be a major employer in West Michigan and throughout the world, with the reins of the business handed over to their children.

Throughout his life and career, Rich DeVos has been guided by his faith in God. This has manifested itself not only in his dedication to his church, but also in the way that he does business, how he works with and cares for his employees, and his involvement in his community. Rich truly is a person who understands the Gospel admonition, "From everyone to whom much has been given, much will be required." (Luke 12:48).

It is my very special pleasure to wish Rich DeVos a very happy 80th birthday and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

HONORING RICHARD M. DEVOS, SR. UPON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Richard M. DeVos, Sr. upon the occasion of his 80th birthday on March 4, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard DeVos and his wife, Helen, have been a blessing not only to the Grand Rapids area, but to communities throughout the United States.

He has positively impacted West Michigan through numerous civic and philanthropic contributions since cofounding the Amway Corporation in 1959 with lifelong friend and business partner, the late Jay Van Andel. He has helped to create the DeVos Children's Hospital, the Cook-DeVos Center for Health Services, the DeVos Communications Center at Calvin College, the DeVos Campus of Grand Valley State University, the DeVos Place convention center and the Richard and Helen DeVos Fieldhouse at Hope College.

Mr. DeVos has enhanced the quality of life in Grand Rapids through such generous support for educational, health and cultural initiatives.

Mr. DeVos's contributions are not limited to West Michigan, Mr. Speaker. He has contributed to numerous organizations in Central Florida as well, including the DeVos Sport Business Management Foundation Program at the University of Central Florida and the Orlando Magic Youth Foundation.

He has also touched hundreds of thousands of lives through his inspirational speeches and three books, "Believe!," "Compassionate Capitalism" and "Hope from My Heart."

Mr. Speaker, perhaps most importantly, Mr. DeVos has achieved so much in his life based upon a strong work ethic and an unyielding devotion to faith and family, ideals that we hold in the highest regard in our West Michigan community.

I wish Mr. DeVos all the best as he celebrates such a significant milestone with family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, please let it be known that on this 28th day of February in 2006, that the U.S. House of Representatives acknowledges the contributions and achievements of Mr. DeVos, and may God continue to bless him in the years ahead as he has so benefited the lives of those around him.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. RICHARD M. DEVOS, SR.

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a civic and business leader of Michigan, Mr. Richard M. DeVos, Sr., who will celebrate his 80th birthday this year.

Mr. DeVos cofounded the Amway Corporation, one of the most successful direct selling companies in the world. His efforts have enabled over 3 million people to own independent businesses.

Yet Mr. DeVos's work stretches beyond the realm of business; both he and his wife are

actively involved in philanthropy and charitable work. Their generosity has helped countless individuals both in their hometown of Grand Rapids and across Michigan. Institutions such as the DeVos Children's Hospital, the Cook-DeVos Center for Health Sciences, and the DeVos Campus of Grand Valley State University bear witness to their commitment to give back to the community.

Richard DeVos has also written three books that have inspired innovative and entrepreneurial spirits in younger generations. After undergoing a heart transplant in 1997, Mr. DeVos became the chairman of the Speakers Bureau for United Network for Organ Sharing and has worked diligently to deliver his message of perseverance and hope.

Today I rise to thank Richard M. DeVos, Sr. for his lifetime of service and dedication to our community, to congratulate him on his many accomplishments, and to wish him a happy and healthy birthday.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO A MICHIGAN LEADER, RICHARD DEVOS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplishments of Richard DeVos, a Michigan citizen who exemplifies the American spirit of entrepreneurship and community leadership.

As Richard DeVos celebrates his 80th birthday, we reflect on his many achievements as the co-founder of Amway Corp. with his life-long friend and business partner, the late Jay Van Andel, as well as his many selfless contributions to his state, community, and fellow citizens.

The author of three books, ''Believe!,'' ''Compassionate Capitalism,'' and ''Hope From My Heart: Ten Lessons for Life,'' Richard also is a public speaker with an international following. After receiving a heart transplant in 1997, he took on the additional responsibility of serving as chairman for the Speakers Bureau for United Network for Organ Sharing.

Richard has owned several professional sports franchises, including the Orlando Magic of the National Basketball Association.

Richard and his wife, Helen, support many hospitals, colleges and universities, arts organizations and Christian causes in their hometown of Grand Rapids, Michigan, and also numerous organizations in their adopted community in Central Florida.

A veteran of the U.S. Air Force, Richard and his wife Helen have raised four children and have 16 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Richard DeVos as, on his 80th birthday, we acknowledge his life-long vision, compassion, and commitment to the American people and his home state of Michigan. Richard DeVos is truly deserving of our respect and admiration.

COMMENDING THE PEACE CORPS ON ITS 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS INCEPTION

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the Peace Corps, and its many volunteers, on the 45th Anniversary of its inception. During a 1960 visit to the University of Michigan, then-Senator John F. Kennedy challenged students to not only better themselves academically, but to serve the call of duty and help promote and facilitate peace throughout the globe.

As a result of this proclamation, the Peace Corps was established with the noble goal in mind of promoting peace and friendship between the United States and other countries around the world. If President Kennedy were alive today, he would no doubt look upon the Peace Corps with great pride and admiration for what it has evolved in to: a vessel which fosters an in-depth understanding between Americans and the indigenous peoples of the countries in which they serve, helping the rest of us to better understand a plethora of different customs, traditions and ways of life.

Since its founding 45 years ago, more than 182,000 Peace Corps Volunteers have been invited by 138 host countries to help countless individuals who want to build a better life for themselves, their children, and their communities. Whether empowering seemingly helpless people to take control of their own lives, assisting with AIDS relief in poverty-stricken countries, developing greater business opportunities, expanding agriculture development, or—most recently—coming to the rescue of their own countrymen whose entire lives were uprooted by the devastating destruction of Hurricane Katrina, these volunteers provide a faithful service to this great Nation, and they should be proud of their achievement. And we are certainly proud of each and every volunteer and what they represent. In fact, from my own district in Indiana, there are currently 20 volunteers who are giving their time to this country, away from their families, to help strangers make a better life for themselves, and I would personally like to thank my fellow Hoosiers for their commitment.

As we all know, the Peace Corps has made life better for millions of people worldwide, and has enriched the lives of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who have devoted their time, energy and passion into answering the Peace Corps' call to duty. I would respectfully encourage my fellow colleagues to congratulate, commend, and encourage the continued advancement and success of the Peace Corps and all that its volunteers represent.

REMEMBER INTERNMENT OF AMERICANS IN WORLD WAR II

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066 authorizing the Secretary of War to define military areas in which ''the right of any person to enter, remain in or leave shall be subject to whatever restrictions'' are deemed ''necessary or desirable.''

By the spring of 1942, California, Oregon, Washington, and Arizona were designated as military areas.

In May of 1942, Santa Clara Valley Japanese Americans were ordered to ''close their affairs promptly, and make their own arrangements for disposal of personal and real property.''

Official government fliers were posted around California, Arizona and Washington instructing families to report to various assembly centers with just the bare necessities, leaving behind their homes, their lives, and most personal belongings.

Because permanent camps were not yet built, large community gathering places, such as the Tanforan Racetrack in San Mateo County in Northern California and the Santa Anita Racetrack in Southern California became home to Japanese internees for several months before being moved.

San Francisco Bay Area Japanese Americans were forced to live in horse stables at the Tanforan Racetrack until a permanent camp was built for them.

Eleven thousand Japanese Americans and aliens were evacuated from their homes and incarcerated throughout the duration of the war.

Three thousand of those interned were Japanese Americans from Santa Clara Valley.

By the fall of 1942, most internees were transported to camps far away from home, to internment camps in Arizona, Northern and Central California, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and even as far away as Arkansas.

Most remained in internment camps until the end of the war—3 long years later.

The horror for Japanese Americans did not end upon their return to Santa Clara County in 1945 at the end of the war. Upon release, approximately 7,000 Japanese Americans moved to Santa Clara Valley.

Most had no shelter, food, money, much less a job.

Some returned to find their homes looted and destroyed.

The San Jose Buddhist Church offered what it could—shelter and hot meals for most families.

In Santa Clara County, the family of Bob Peckham (later to become Federal District Court Judge Bob Peckham) took title to the property of Japanese-American neighbors and was able to preserve property and return it at the end of the internment, so people in our area in some cases were saved the loss of their homes and businesses.

All of this happened before I was born.

But I remember very well learning about it even before it was added to the history textbooks.

My mother was a young woman in 1942. My dad was in the army and she was building airplanes at Douglas Aircraft for the war effort.

She told me about driving past the Tanforan Racetrack and how ashamed and guilty she felt. There were people locked up at the race track—living in horse stables—who she knew had done nothing wrong. People who had been her neighbors had been rounded up suddenly and taken away.

My mother told me how helpless she felt. She knew what her government was doing was wrong but she didn't know how to change it. She felt powerless but also felt guilty and ashamed because of what the United States government had done.

She was a life long Democrat and cast her first Presidential vote for FDR . . . but she never agreed with what he did to her neighbors.

There was no apology, no financial support, no help from the Federal Government until many years later.

Finally, on February 19, 1976 President Gerald Ford formally rescinded Executive Order 9066.

And, at long last, on July 21, 1980 Congress adopted legislation establishing the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) to investigate the claim that the incarceration of Japanese Americans and legal resident aliens during World War II was justified by military necessity.

On August 10, 1988 the Civil Liberties Act was signed into law, authorizing payments of $20,000 to each person that suffered from internment and established the Office of Redress to identify, locate, and pay these individuals, 82,219 were paid.

By then my neighbors and my parents neighbors who had been unjustly incarcerated—Ed Kawazoe, Jimi Yamaichi, Ted and Raiko, and many others—received at long last an apology. Some lived long enough to receive the compensation provided for in the law.

These efforts were celebrated in the community of Japanese Americans. But they were also celebrated in the broader community because Americans who were not incarcerated, like my mother, felt the shame and the guilt.

And while an apology could not undo the injustice and the compensation did not fully cover the loss, it helped that our country admitted the mistake and tried to make amends.

On March 4, 2004 H. Res. 56, introduced by Congressman MIKE HONDA, passed the House by a unanimous vote of 404–0. The resolution supports the goals of the Japanese, German, and Italian American communities in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance on the day FDR signed the infamous Executive Order 9066—February 19, 1942. It also seeks to increase public awareness of the events surrounding the restriction, exclusion, and internment of individuals and families during World War II.

Today, I support Mr. HONDA's resolution to recognize February 19th as the Day of Remembrance. It is the least we can do—spend one day per year reflecting on the horrors of internment, remember those who suffered, and work to find ways never to repeat that terrible page in history.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 16 I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

BUSH ONCE AGAIN SKIRTING LAW IMPACTING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. DIANE E. WATSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress should not allow the United Arab Emirates port deal to go through. It must be stopped, and House Republicans should grow a backbone and finally stand up to the president in the name of national security.

This deal shows once again the lengths the Bush administration will go to bend the laws to their advantage. The administration failed to conduct a 45-day investigation that is legally required. This, in itself, should be enough to stop this deal.

The national security implications are simply too important to ignore. And, unfortunately, House Republicans have neglected our vulnerable ports since 9/11. Over the past four years, House Republicans have opposed and defeated Democratic efforts to increase funding for port security. Right now, only six percent of cargo coming into the U.S. is being checked, producing a large hole in our homeland security. Democrats have tried to increase port security funding on this House floor FOUR TIMES over the last four years, and House Republicans defeated our efforts every time.

It's time Republicans make port security a priority.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND WORK OF MS. MARY JO AVERY, ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary contributions of a community and labor leader in the 4th Congressional District. Ms. Mary Jo Avery, long-time member and officer of Local 4603 of the Communications Workers of America, has dedicated her life to public service. I salute her for her achievements as she retires from SBC-Ameritech after 32 years of service.

Within the labor movement, Ms. Avery worked tirelessly to advance women's leadership and to advocate for solutions to the unique difficulties women workers often face. An award-winning union leader, she also played a pivotal role in developing the Wisconsin Women's Network into a vibrant and powerful organization. She helped mentor, develop, support and advance women leaders, not only within the labor movement but in the broader community. Herself a devoted parent—mother of four, grandmother of 9, and great-grandmother of 5—she argued for establishing policies and practices that would facilitate workers' efforts to maintain a work/family balance. CWA's leadership on this issue no doubt drew many lessons from Ms. Avery's own personal experience.

Also a noted civil rights activist, Ms. Avery connected the labor movement to local and national civil rights struggles. She received the National A. Philip Randolph Rosina Tucker Award for civil rights leadership and the Black Women's Network's Outstanding Achievement Award. Since 1995, she has served as President of the Milwaukee Chapter of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, and was previously appointed to the City of Milwaukee's Civil Rights Commission.

I have known Ms. Avery for over 20 years. She has been an important ally in the struggle to realize ideals we both share, and has been a personal source of inspiration and support. In all she does, Mary Jo works to ensure that the promise of America is extended to those often left out—women, people of color, and other vulnerable communities. I commend her for these accomplishments, thank her for her groundbreaking leadership, and wish her a long and enjoyable retirement.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES PEACE CORPS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, it was exactly 45 years ago today, on March 1, 1961, that President John F. Kennedy signed the Executive Order establishing the Peace Corps under its first Director, Sargent Shriver. Five months later, in that distant summer of 1961, the inaugural group of volunteers prepared to leave for the African country of Ghana. These first Peace Corps volunteers "boarded a chartered Pan American propeller driven plane for the 17-hour flight to Accra." This was the beginning of not only a life-shaping experience for these 56 pioneers but also the commencement of the entire Peace Corps saga which we are honoring today. These fellow citizens had responded to the clarion call contained in President Kennedy's inaugural address, which had challenged all Americans to "ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

Since that first summer, over 170,000 volunteers have answered the late President's call, serving in over 137 countries. These are our diplomats of the highways and byways. They bring the smiling face of American optimism, the famous American can-do spirit, and the American dedication to democratic values to the far corners of the globe. Their "offices" are found in dirt-floor village classrooms, at rural health clinics, on Third World farms, in development projects in some of the world's worst urban slums, and at orphanages for the abandoned children of the world. Their rewards are found in the shy smiles of students, the grateful laughter of children, and the hearty handshakes of senior citizens who have finally found their longed-for American friend. The price these volunteers are willing to pay for their unique experience of service often includes sweat and toil, loneliness and frustration, but also the hearty laughter of welcomes and the sad tears of fond farewells. They are the unsung heroes of America's continued engagement with the peoples of the developing world. At a time when anti-Americanism has become the fashion in certain quarters overseas, Peace Corps volunteers have served

their country in a manner which promotes international understanding and which makes all Americans proud.

And so I join the Peace Corps Director, Gaddi H. Vasquez, and his dedicated staff at both Peace Corps Headquarters and in the field, in honoring those over eight thousand volunteers, currently serving in 71 countries around the world, as well as those who served in the past. The present volunteers, at a time of increased security concerns in many overseas locales, deserve special recognition for their decision to leave family and friends, home and hearth, and their comfortable, secure lives behind in pursuit of the Peace Corps mission of ''world peace and friendship.''

Former volunteers often use the linguistic and cultural skills they acquired in Peace Corps service later in their professional lives. They sometimes find themselves continuing to work with distinction in the fields of government and international affairs. Their ranks include current Members of the House and Senate as well as Congressional staff. In this regard, these ''RPCVs,'' as returned volunteers are called, continue to make a contribution, providing windows of understanding regarding diverse cultures of which most Americans have only a scant knowledge. Every year around this March 1st anniversary date, returned volunteers visit classrooms and community centers around the United States to carry their message of international friendship and understanding. At a time of heightened sensitivity to the need for greater cultural understanding of peoples from different traditions, the insights of former Peace Corps volunteers constitute a too little recognized national treasure.

There is one endeavor related to the Peace Corps put forward during my tenure as Chairman of the International Relations Committee of which I am particularly proud. This is the legislative effort undertaken by myself and my good friend from across the aisle, TOM LANTOS, to see that there was sufficient funding to achieve President Bush's goal of increasing the size of Peace Corps. This undertaking was one concrete means for addressing the new challenges to international mutual understanding found in our post-September 11th world. Let us all hope that the Peace Corps continues to grow as one response to these challenges. Money spent on the Peace Corps is money well spent.

And so, today, I send greetings to those serving around the world who have. asked for little in return while asking what they, themselves, could do for their country. Whether this message finds you on some Caribbean isle, high in the Andes mountains, along a river in western Africa, in a sub-Saharan village, in a classroom in eastern Europe, on the steppes of Mongolia, in a river town in China, in a crowded urban center in Bangladesh, or far away in the South Pacific, I send you salutations on your anniversary date. Thank you for your service as America's Goodwill Ambassadors along the world's highways and byways. May you achieve every professional and personal success and may the Peace Corps flourish for the next 45 years.

CONGRATULATING THE PALM HARBOR UNIVERSITY BOYS AND GIRLS VARSITY TEAMS FOR WINNING THE FLORIDA STATE SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIPS

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of Palm Harbor University High School boys and girls varsity soccer teams. Both teams were recently crowned 2006 Florida State Soccer Champions (Class 5A).

The Palm Harbor University Hurricanes boys' team (26–4) shut out defending champion, Auburndale, 3–0 to claim the state title. The girls' team (20–1) also left their competition scoreless, as they triumphed over Bloomingdale High School 2–0 to win the Class 5A finals.

This was the second state championship for the Palm Harbor University boys (2002, 2006) and the third title for the girls team (1999, 2000, and 2006). Palm Harbor University made history with the 2006 championships, marking only the second time in Florida where a public school won boys and girls soccer titles in the same year.

For the benefit of my colleagues, following my remarks I will include reports from the St. Petersburg Times about the championship efforts of these two teams.

Congratulations to Coach Mike Mannino and Coach John Planamente for their leadership, dedication and the positive examples they set. In addition, Principal Harry Brown and his administration, Athletic Director Bob Heintz, the faculty and staff, the parents, the students, the alumni and the fans should all be applauded for their community spirit and faithful support. Most importantly, I would like to commend those outstanding student athletes who exemplified the meaning of sportsmanship, hard work and competitive spirit. All around, a job well done! You have made us all proud and we look forward to supporting Palm Harbor University boys and girls soccer teams next year.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Feb. 10, 2006]

PALM HARBOR CLAIMS THIRD STATE CROWN

(By Keith Nebuhr)

FORT LAUDERDALE.—One day after stunning the Nation's top-ranked team, Palm Harbor U. claimed an even bigger victory.

And this one comes with a ring.

Behind solid play on both ends, the Hurricanes defeated Bloomingdale 2–0 in the Class 5A final at Lockhart Stadium on Thursday night to complete 2 days in South Florida the players aren't soon to forget. Annie Stalzer's goal in the 48th minute gave PHU the lead. Kelly Brinkman added a score in the 78th minute that iced it.

When the game ended, PHU players raced toward the sideline to celebrate with fans. After accepting the gold medals and the championship trophy, they took a team picture. Many then called friends and relatives on their cell phones to give them the news.

''We've been play so well'' Stalzer said. ''This is the perfect season! We couldn't ask for anything better.''

The title is the third for PHU (20–1), which also earned championships in 1999 and 2000.

The Hurricanes lost to Fort Lauderdale St. Thomas Aquinas 3–0 in last season's final, but this time, the Hurricanes weren't to be denied. Since the start of its district tournament (a span of seven games), PHU outscored opponents 24–2. And it beat Aquinas 2–1 in the semifinals.

''The experience of being here helped,'' Hurricanes coach John Planamenta said. ''Every year, we've taken another step.''

Bloomingdale (24–2–1), going for its second title, had allowed 10 goals all season before Thursday. Only once had an opponent scored more than one. In the playoffs, just one of the Bulls' previous opponents found the net.

''They played a great game,'' Bloomingdale coach Sue Peet said of PHU.

PHU outshot Bloomingdale 16–4 (the Bulls had two shots in the first 75 minutes) and made sure it had two or three defenders around star midfielder Marissa Kazbour at all times.

PHU was equally solid on offense. But though the Hurricanes constantly pressured Bloomingdale's defense, they couldn't break a scoreless tie until Stalzer's goal, which bounced off one defender and over the head of goalkeeper Cristina Coca.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Feb. 17, 2006]

PHU MAKES HISTORY IN VICTORY

(By Brandon Wright)

FORT LAUDERDALE—Nate Wysk dropped flat on his back, extending his arms to the sky, Nick Eby ran full speed by midfield and slid across the moist grass. Eugene Starikov was scooped up by booster club vice president Doug Eby, who carried the diminutive striker like a baby, And of course, coach Mike Mannino got the customary Gatorade bath.

Palm Harbor University (26–4) scored a pair of goals in a three-minute span of the first half to complete a torrid run through the final four with a 3–0 win against defending champion Auburndale for the 5A state crown.

The Hurricanes became the sixth school ever, and second public school, to win both boys and girls soccer titles in the same year.

The PHU girls beat Bloomingdale 2–0 last week. It was the second boys championship in school history, the first coming in 2002.

''We put our whole hearts into winning state and we fulfilled our goal,'' Starikov said. ''We won a state championship, baby!''

''I was very nervous coming in,'' said Eby, who scored PHU's first goal. ''But we deserve this, we worked so hard every day at practice.''

PHU rolled through the final four games, outscoring opponents 8–0. The Hurricanes also put an end to Auburndale's 22-game win streak.

''To come in and give up no goals at this level of play and score eight goals grand total is awesome;'' Mannino said.

Much like the semifinal where PHU scored four goals in an 11-minute stretch, the Hurricanes struck quickly against Auburndale (24–2). Eby and Thomas Harrington scored three minutes apart right at the end of the first half, seizing momentum just before the break.

''Every team in the playoffs has been strong, but we took over with those two goals right before half,'' Eby said.

Both teams had quality chances in the first half before PHU broke through. Ishmail Kamara's shot from point-blank range was smothered by Auburndale goalkeeper Derek Miller and Brent Hileman just got fingers to Kyle Sample's attempt, ricocheting the ball against the crossbar before it was cleared.

But it was Eby, who came into the game with just two goals, who got the only strike

PHU would need in the 35th minute. Josh Roberts played a cross in from the right flank that Starikov and Miller both went up for. Starikov just got a piece of the ball and it deflected right to a waiting Eby.

''I'd barely scored all year and to get the first goal of the state championship is just crazy,'' Eby said. ''This feels amazing.''

Harrington put PHU up 2–0 in the 38th minute with his sixth strike of the season. Kamara got his head on a strong throw In from Max Venker, sending it toward the middle of the box. The ball fell into a scramble of legs and squirted free right to Harrington, who was running full speed from midfield and the senior defender squarely drilled it into upper left corner.

''The ball kind of fumbled out while I was running up,'' Harrington said. ''And it was just right there.''

Hileman was brilliant in goal, making eight saves. The senior got tremendous help from fullbacks Nate Wysk, Levi Curnutte, Jamison Sweat and Harrington, shutting out an offense that featured 49-goal scorer Pascal Milien.

''Can't end a season any better than two goose eggs,'' Hileman said.

And what PHU win would be complete without a strike from Starikov? The junior transfer from California banged home his 43rd goal of the season in the 70th minute.

''Eugene wouldn't let the game end without getting one,'' Mannino said. ''He wanted to be the last straw that broke their back and he did it.''

ASSURED FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for assured funding for the veterans' health care. For too long, funding for the critical services needed by our veterans has been subject to the political whims of Congress and the Administration and budgetary schemes intended to hide inefficiencies and misplaced priorities. With a new generation of veterans returning home from their duty overseas, we must ensure that the Department of Veterans Affairs has the resources necessary to honor the promises we have made to our veterans.

Last year, the Administration admitted that it had underestimated the number of servicemen and women requiring medical treatment upon return from their missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. Within one week, the Administration begrudgingly reported that the Department of Veterans Affairs was $1 billion short of being able to fulfill its obligations to veterans for Fiscal Year 2005, and would be $2.6 billion short of fulfilling its obligations for Fiscal Year 2006 without Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bills.

Efforts to fully restore funding were initially stymied by denial and vain attempts to save face by those who had condemned attempts to provide adequate funding to the VA during the traditional appropriations process. What should have been a quick fix to an embarrassing problem turned into a drawn out negotiation battle between those who argued that the VA needed only the barest minimum sum of money to carry out its mission and those who demanded additional funding to guarantee veterans' health care would not be interrupted. Once again, veterans' healthcare was left in limbo while the Congressional Leadership played politics.

In the face of growing public outrage, the funding shortfall was eventually restored. But, it appears that we have learned nothing from the preventable incident. Yet again, veterans' health care will be subject to the lengthy, political appropriations process and the Administration's request again shortchanges veterans.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans dutifully and courageously honored their commitment to our Nation. Now, it is our turn to keep our promises. American veterans deserve better than to have their healthcare in constant jeopardy. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting assured funding for veterans healthcare so that those who have served will always have the care they need when they need it. We can, and must, do better for our nation's veterans. With the most sincere gratitude for all that American veterans have done to protect our freedom.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL KIDNEY MONTH

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this first day of National Kidney Month to recognize the efforts of numerous dedicated individuals, many in this body, who work not only to increase awareness about the devastating effects of kidney disease, but who also look for ways to eradicate this debilitating disease once and for all.

Today, more than 400,000 Americans are living with the wretched pain and horrible inconvenience of kidney failure, leaving them dependent upon life-saving dialysis three to four times each week. Twenty million more have Chronic Kidney Disease, where patients experience a gradual deterioration of kidney function, the end result of which is kidney failure.

The leading causes of these diseases are diabetes and high blood pressure, which disproportionately affect African Americans and Latinos. Diabetes occurs at twice the rate in the African American community as it does in white Americans. As of 2002, two million Latino adults had been diagnosed with diabetes. High blood pressure is also more prevalent in these communities. In fact, one in three African American adults are affected by high blood pressure. According to the American Heart Association, the prevalence of hypertension in African Americans in the United States is among the highest in the world.

Both Chronic Kidney Disease and kidney failure disproportionately affect African Americans and Latinos. African Americans make up about 13 percent of the U.S. population but comprise 32 percent of patients treated for kidney failure, giving them a kidney failure rate that is 4.2 times greater than that of white Americans. Among patients with diabetes, Latinos are between 4.5 and 6.6 times more likely to develop kidney disease than non-Hispanic white Americans.

Given that early kidney disease has no symptoms, most people do not realize that they are in danger of kidney failure. Therefore, it is critically important for all of us, whether it be members of Congress, health organizations or our extended families, to do our best to increase awareness of the dangers of kidney disease and encourage our family members, our friends and our neighbors who have high blood pressure and diabetes to ask their doctors to run simple blood and urine tests that can detect potential problems.

The good news is that once diagnosed, patients can receive high quality care. Individuals with kidney disease who are able to obtain treatment early experience a higher quality of life and are able to maintain more of their day-to-day activities, including keeping their jobs. This is a situation to which an ounce of prevention results in a gallon of future savings, both in quality of life and in hard dollars for individuals and for the government.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the goals set forth in observance of National Kidney Month, for we must continue to raise awareness about this important issue and to show support for Americans living with kidney disease. But, I am concerned that in an environment in which our budgetary priorities include cutting funding for the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Disease to the tune of $20 million in fiscal year 2006 and '07, we are not doing enough to thwart the increase in kidney failure and the conditions from which it results. We cannot ignore the human suffering and financial consequences of kidney failure. Our failure to make this disease a major legislative priority will cost us greatly in the future.

BUCK O'NEILL SHOULD BE ADMITTED TO THE BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was sorely disappointed recently to learn that the Baseball Hall of Fame failed to vote to induct John Jordan ''Buck'' O'Neill into its ranks.

Born the grandson of slaves, Buck joined the Kansas City Monarchs of the Negro League in 1938. He remained in Kansas City with the Monarchs for 17 spectacular years, 10 as a player and 7 as manager. During this time he was named an all-star three times as a player, served 2 years with the United States Navy, and led the Monarchs to four league titles as a manager, all the while facing the harshness of separation and discrimination in a country that was still segregated. In 1962, Buck broke an important barrier, by being named the first African-American coach in the Major Leagues by the Chicago Cubs. After 33 years with the Cubs, Buck returned home in 1988 to scout for the Kansas City Royals. He currently serves as chairman of the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, a continuing demonstration of his love for the game of baseball and for his commitment to the essential role that the Negro Leagues played in the integration of both American sport and American society.

During his time in Kansas City, Buck has taught the citizens of the Kansas City metropolitan region about the importance of determination and resolve in the face of hostility, in

addition to showing us the importance of family, friendship, happiness and history. Buck taught us about baseball. But more importantly, Buck taught us about life. He is a wonderful role model, and I thank him for his contributions to the Kansas City metropolitan region and to our United States of America. As Kansas City, Missouri, Mayor Kay Barnes was quoted as saying in this morning's Kansas City Star, ''I'm terribly disappointed. I think it was a mistake that he has not been chosen. However, we all love him in Kansas City, and I believe that all around the country people recognize the contribution he has made to baseball in general and to the Negro Baseball League history.''

Buck O'Neill, you will always be a charter member of the Kansas City Hall of Fame.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO AWARD A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN

SPEECH OF

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 2006

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1259, a resolution to honor the Tuskegee Airmen. I would also like to express my appreciation for their heroism and bravery. These men deserve the Nation's highest honor for their courage and patriotism.

In July 1941, 13 young Americans began military flight training at the Tuskegee Army Air Field in Tuskegee, AL. Five of those 13 young men completed training and received their Army Air Corps silver pilot wings, becoming our Nation's first African-American military fighter pilots. They would later be known as the Tuskegee Airmen.

Between 1941 and 1946, 1992 pilots graduated at Tuskegee Army Air Field, with 450 of those serving during World War II in either the famed 99th Fighter Squadron or the 332nd Fighter Group. Both units, heralded for their bravery and tenacity, received more than one Presidential Unit Citation for exemplary tactical air support and aerial combat. The group also felt the price of war, losing 150 pilots while in training or on combat flights.

It has been said that the Tuskegee Airmen faced two wars—one against a military force overseas and the other against racism and bigotry at home and abroad. Yet, in the face of these challenges, they accepted their country's call to service and fought heroically in great battles for freedom.

I am honored to represent 3 of these courageous individuals: Mr. O. Oliver Goodall of Altadena, CA; Mr. Andrew Jack Simon of South Pasadena, CA; and Mr. LeRoy Criss of Pasadena, CA. They received their training and joined the ranks of Tuskegee Airmen in 1942 and 1943. Today, I honor Mr. Goodall, Mr. Simon, Mr. Criss, and all other Tuskegee Airmen who served our country with valor and distinction.

HONORING THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, FRANK McKENNA

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the outgoing Canadian Ambassador to the United States, Frank McKenna. After a successful tenure in office, the Ambassador is returning home to New Brunswick.

Due to his commitment to solving problems and his indefatigable energy, Ambassador McKenna has presided over a number of important achievements during his time in Washington. I have had the opportunity to work closely with Ambassador McKenna in the last year on issues important to both our countries. We have agreed that the longest undefended border in the world must remain strong and secure, but not become a barrier to travelers, businesses, and border communities in both of our great nations.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is our Nation's largest trading partner, with some $1.2 billion worth of goods and services crossing the border between our two countries each day. Ambassador McKenna and I have worked together to strengthen this relationship, and to advocate for commonsense solutions that both improve border security while also facilitating trade and travel.

Indeed, through his successful careers in public life, law, business, and in diplomacy, Ambassador McKenna has understood the depth and breadth of relations between Canadians and Americans. He has employed his experience, tact and plain-spoken pragmatism to ensure that the occasional difference in priorities of our two governments does not get in the way of this friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ambassador McKenna for his friendship, and his service to Canada and the U.S. I wish him well on his future endeavors, and hope that we will get together again soon over a meal of fried chicken and rice pudding.

CONGRATULATING MY FRIEND RAUL VARGAS ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM OVER 30 YEARS OF SERVICE TO OUR NATION'S LATINO STUDENTS

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor an old friend and fellow educator, Mr. Raul Vargas, on the occasion of his retirement. For over three decades, Raul has guided young men and women in realizing their academic goals through his pioneering efforts in higher education accessibility for Latino students in southern California and across the country.

Born in Lordsburg, New Mexico, Raul moved with his family to Miami, Arizona after his father's death. It was in this small mining town that I first met Raul, and can recall many fond memories growing up with Raul and his siblings, Felipa, Alfredo, Alfonso, Elvia, and Elisa. At Miami High I learned of Raul's ability as a basketball player and a student.

During the summer of 1964, I was again reacquainted with Raul at Arizona State University. We decided to become roommates and moved in with Leo Gutierrez and Bob Venegas to Contempo West, a.k.a., sin city. It was during this time that I assisted Raul with his study habits and he assisted me with my social life. During this time he met a young lady from Wickenburg, Arizona who would later become his wife. We remained roommates until December 1965 when I left to marry Verma.

In 1972, Raul accepted a position at the University of Southern California (USC) as Executive Director of the Office for Mexican American Programs, marking the beginning of over thirty years as a leading administrator as part of the USC family. It was there that Raul and eight other USC alumni founded the USC Mexican American Alumni Association (MAAA) in 1974. The MAAA was established to be a vehicle of support for higher Latino enrollment at USC, providing tuition assistance to undergraduate, graduate, medical, dental, and law school students. The overwhelming success of the program under Raul's leadership, is evident not only in its more than 5800 scholarships awarded totaling $11.1 million, but also in its program being replicated in institutes of higher learning across the country, including ASU.

When ASU joined the PAC–10, the ASU Hispanic Alumni began a rivalry with USC's MAAA. We commissioned a ''menudo pot'' that would go to the winning alumni association after the ASU/USC football game. As the ASU Hispanics learned of the USC MAAA program, they invited Raul to meet with Dr. Russell Nelson, the ASU President, to assist in organizing a Hispanic scholarship program similar to USC MAAA. With Dr. Nelson's agreement, the Los Diablos, an ASU Hispanic scholarship program, was born. To date, the ASU Los Diablos Scholarship continues to assist Latino students at ASU. After seeing the USC Hispanic Convocation organized by USC MAAA during a visit to USC, the ASU Hispanic students also organized a similar Hispanic Convocation honoring ASU Hispanic graduates.

Mr. Speaker, it is with immense admiration and privilege that I ask my colleagues to join Raul's many friends and family in recognizing my dear friend in his lifetime of unwavering service to our nation's Latino students. We hope that Raul will enjoy this well-deserved retirement, to play golf and travel with his wife Marcia. He will also be able to spend more time with his son Cesar, daughter Tracey, and granddaughter Alexis. Raul, thank you and congratulations my friend!

DEDICATION OF THE ST. PETERSBURG PARKWAY/WILLIAM C. CRAMER MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today the St. Petersburg Parkway/William C. Cramer Memorial Highway will be dedicated in St. Petersburg, Florida. Bill became a trusted friend to many

while serving in this House and today's celebration is a reflection of his service to the State of Florida.

The Honorable William C. Cramer served in the U.S. House of Representatives for sixteen years, from 1955 to 1971, representing the St. Petersburg/Tampa area. During his service in Congress, Bill Cramer became the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee and he co-authored the 1956 Interstate and Defense Highway Act. That Act was the catalyst for the nation's interstate highway system, setting the authorized mileage at 41,000 miles and establishing the highway trust fund to pay for construction of the system.

Those 41,000 miles, however, did not include an interstate link from Tampa around (I–75) and through St. Petersburg (I–275), down the west coast of Florida (I–75) to Alligator Alley and across to Miami. During his tenure in Congress, Cramer labored tirelessly to add this ''missing link'' to the interstate highway system, and he succeeded in that effort in his final term as a capstone to his congressional service. In the Howard-Cramer Amendment of 1968 and the 1968 Federal Aid Highway Act, Cramer was able to add the mileage needed to build Florida's missing interstate links, and he also secured final approval to construct those links from two successive administrations.

Former Congressman Cramer passed away in October of 2003. Late in April of 2004, the Florida Legislature enacted HB 9, and on May 13, 2004, the Governor signed that Act into law. HB 9 designated the portion of I–275 between the Howard Frankland Bridge and the Sunshine Skyway as the ''St. Petersburg/William C. Cramer Parkway,'' upon approval of the affected local governments. In 2005, the Florida Legislature enacted, and the Governor signed into law, HB 385 that changed the designation to the ''St. Petersburg Parkway/William C. Cramer Memorial Highway.'' This honor is an appropriate and well-deserved recognition of Bill Cramer's pivotal role as the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee in authorizing and securing the funding for not only I–275 through St. Petersburg, but also the other critical west coast sections of Florida's Interstate Highway system.

Bill Cramer came from humble beginnings, his family moving to St. Petersburg before he and his brother and sisters entered the public schools. He sold fruit on street corners and was an usher at the Florida Theatre as a youngster to raise money, and he graduated from St. Petersburg High School, serving as student council president. He went on to graduate from St. Petersburg Junior College, where he also served as class president. As did so many men and women, he left his hometown to serve his country as an officer in the U.S. Navy during World War II. Cramer then finished college, and after graduating from Harvard Law School he returned home to St. Petersburg to practice law. Almost immediately he jumped into public service, being appointed Pinellas County attorney before his election to the Florida Legislature and subsequently his election to the U.S. Congress. While in Congress, he dedicated his career to building the basic infrastructure of the county, the roads, harbors, airports and public buildings that are crucial to the growth of our nation's economy. In particular, he focused on bringing the economic benefits of the interstate highway system to the Tampa-St. Petersburg and southwest Florida areas.

After retiring from his active law practice, Cramer returned to St. Petersburg College and the University of South Florida to teach courses in Government. He strove to instill in his young students his passion for service and his conviction that through hard work and perseverance everyone, no matter their circumstances, has a chance to help build a better and more promising future for their community, state and nation. Bill Cramer's was a life well lived, and there is no more fitting memorial for him that to have the highway he built for his hometown named in his honor.

What follows is a brief outline of how Bill Cramer led Congress and two administrations to authorize and fund Florida's interstate ''missing links''

From his position as the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee and its Roads Subcommittee, Cramer worked for years to try and add the west coast Florida ''missing links'' to the interstate system. In introducing a bill early in 1967 to designate this route as an interstate, Cramer stated on the House Floor on January 16, 1967, that ''this missing link is one of the most obvious inadequacies in the interstate system.'' He went on to note ''it is essential that a new interstate highway be constructed so that interstate traffic presently terminating in the Tampa-St. Petersburg area can be funneled down the lower west coast to the Ft. Lauderdale-Miami area.''

Although this specific designation bill was not enacted, Cramer persisted and he and Congressman James Howard (D–N.J.) introduced H.R. 13933 in November of 1967. This bill addressed the practical problem that almost no interstate mileage remained to be designated from the 41,000 miles originally authorized by the 1956 Interstate and Defense Highway Act. H.R. 13933, which became known as the Howard-Cramer Act, added 200 miles to the 41,000-mile interstate system, to be applied for by various states to fill in missing links and gaps. The law stipulated that priority consideration should be given to extension of routes that terminated in a municipality, a condition then existing in the Tampa-St. Petersburg area. The President signed the Howard-Cramer Act on January 2, 1968.

Cramer understood that the 200 new interstate miles in the Howard-Cramer Act would be aggressively pursued by states across the nation, and that additional mileage was needed to achieve his dream of completing Florida's missing links. The 1968 Federal Aid Highway bill provided the ideal opportunity to accomplish this goal.

As ranking minority member of the Committee, Cramer crafted this bill that reauthorized the interstate highway program, provided for beautification of the nation's highways and established new rights and benefits for those displaced by highway construction, among many other important milestones. Of central importance to Cramer was a further expansion of the authorized mileage in the interstate system to accommodate construction of Florida's missing links. The House-Senate Conference Committee approved adding an additional 1,500 miles to the interstate system. His leadership ensured that both the House Public Works Committee Report (H. Rept. 1584) and the Conference Committee Report (Conf. Rept. 1799) specifically identified the Tampa/St. Petersburg to Miami missing link as the type of route that should be approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation from this new mileage. President Johnson signed the 1968 Federal Aid Highway Act into law late in the summer of that year.

Bill Cramer managed the floor debate on the 1968 Federal Aid Highway bill, which was the capstone of his service on the Public Works Committee. During the July 3, 1968 debate on the bill, one of his colleagues, Congressman Don Clausen, remarked:

''I believe, in all sincerity, that the gentleman from Florida (CRAMER) is respected by members of the subcommittee as much or possibly more than any other Member on either side of the aisle. Certainly, no one has been a better student, become more knowledgeable, or demonstrated the ability to articulate our road and highway message to the Congress or the Nation, than the ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee—Bill Cramer. I am sure that future generations of Americans will come to appreciate the work he has done and the contributions he has made to our nation's road and highway system.''

In fact, during debate on the bill, Speaker of the House, John McCormack, came down from his rostrum to personally congratulate Cramer and the Speaker was quoted as saying: ''Bill, this has been one of the most statesmanlike presentations that I have observed since coming to the Congress.''

From his position in Congress, Cramer continued thereafter to pursue the matter aggressively with the Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, until Boyd approved the 252-mile missing link on December 13, 1968. The approved route ran through Pinellas County (St. Petersburg), over the Sunshine Skyway, a toll bridge, and Alligator Alley, a toll road across the Everglades, and on to Miami. Florida clearly received the lion's share of the additional 1,500 miles authorized, far more that any other state, in what the St. Petersburg Times characterized in its December 14, 1968 edition as a ''legislative coup'' for Cramer.

This 252-mile route, however, did not include mileage that Cramer had requested bypassing Tampa to the east and connecting with the interstate now approved through St. Petersburg and crossing the Sunshine Skyway. When Secretary of Transportation John Volpe took over under President Nixon (after January 20, 1969), Cramer asked for an additional 32 miles for a Tampa Bypass for I–75. It was subsequently approved as part of the additional interstate mileage provided for in the Howard-Cramer Act passed in January of 1968.

Construction on the entire 284-mile (I–75 and I–275 St. Petersburg bypass) project was completed many years ago and now serves the fast growing area of southwest Florida, connecting it with Miami and the nation's interstate highway system. Prior to 1967, the State of Florida, under Governor Claude Kirk's leadership, was promoting constructing the missing link as a toll road. Cramer, however, from his influential congressional position championed an interstate route that would be free to travelers, and he prevailed.

Cramer's leadership and tenacity in getting the approval—by Congress and two administrations—of Florida's 284-mile missing link is fully documented. Designation of a portion of this missing link, I–275 through his hometown

of St. Petersburg, as the St. Petersburg Parkway/William C. Cramer Memorial Highway has appropriately and justly recognized Cramer's life-long dedication to St. Petersburg and his outstanding leadership in helping to build the Nation's interstate highway system. In enacting HB 9 and HB 385, the Florida Legislature has acknowledged the pivotal role that Bill Cramer played in securing authorization and funding for Florida's interstate highway missing links that have been so vital to the economic well being of St. Petersburg and all of southwest Florida.

Cramer's congressional district included Pinellas County from 1955 to 1971, and it also included Hillsborough County from 1955 to 1963, prior to redistricting. He was devoted to the goal of including that area and the lower west coast of Florida as the first major addition to the nation's initial 41,000 mile interstate system. The Howard-Cramer Act and the 1968 Federal Aid Highway Act made this a possibility, and Cramer's persistence made it a reality.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL MARIO ATRIAN, JR.

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of our Nation's young heroes, Lance Corporal Mario Atrian, Jr.

Lance Corporal Mario Atrian joined the United States Marine Corps at the age of 17 and served two tours of duty in Iraq. On April 9, 2004, during his second tour of duty, LCpl. Atrian was injured while bravely fighting to protect a friendly unit from an enemy ambush. Despite bleeding profusely from both his right and left arms, and his driver being killed, LCpl. Atrian continued to defend his comrades and relinquished his position to receive medical attention only after the enemy ambush had been broken and his fellow wounded Marines were away from enemy fire. Today, LCpl. Atrian will receive one of our Nation's highest awards, the Silver Star for his leadership, his loyalty, and his courage.

Lance Corporal Mario Atrian is from Los Angeles and is a resident of my district. Our community is blessed to have such a distinguished, brave, young man. I encourage him to continue to fight for that which he believes with such courage and dignity throughout the rest of his life.

HONORING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the many Black Fraternal, Social and Civic Institutions which have had such a tremendous impact and overall positive effect on African American life and history.

Established in an age when racial segregation and disenfranchisement plagued African Americans, the rise of each of the black fraternities and sororities bore witness to the fact that despite hardships, African Americans refused to conform to a status of inferiority.

These organizations, some which have been in existence since the early 1900s, have cut across racial, national, physical and social barriers, in order to make a difference educationally, socially, economically, and politically. They have proven to be an effective channel for social change and a recognized force in the struggle for civil and human rights.

Serving more than just their immediate members, these black fraternities and sororities known as the "Divine Nine" joined with other civic associations such as the Urban League, the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, the Prince Hall Masons, the Eastern Stars, and so many others to provide service to the entire black community. It wasn't just the "church" that addressed the needs and answered the call of the black community, but it was these fraternal organizations that stepped up and took on that role as well.

Just who are the "Divine Nine"? They are Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc., Iota Phi Theta Fraternity, Inc., Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, Inc. Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. and Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc.

Nine strong, they promote interaction through forums, meetings and other mediums in order to exchange information and engage in cooperative programming and initiatives through various activities.

Other black social organizations also took the helm in addressing the concerns of the black community and like the fraternal organizations, represent the aspirations of many African Americans. They are The Links, Jack and Jill, 100 Black Men, and Rainbow/PUSH Coalition.

We look to and thank all of these organizations for striving to improve the quality of life within our communities, and enhance educational and economic opportunities for all African Americans. Their leadership and steadfast commitment to the betterment of our young people and our communities, has been and continues to be a tremendous success and of great inspiration.

May all of these fine and outstanding organizations continue to carry on their good work knowing that they have the admiration and support of the U.S. Congress.

TRIBUTE TO LEROY RICHARDSON: A LIFE OF SERVICE

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of our community's genuine unsung leaders, the late Leroy Richardson. His untimely passing on December 22, 2005 has truly left a deep void in our midst.

In many ways, this quiet but dignified leader represented the best and the noblest of our community. He was a man of strong faith who was known for his remarkable generosity. He was a dedicated member of the New Shiloh Baptist Church, where he faithfully worshipped and served under the late Rev. Dr. Arthur Jackson, Jr. and under its current pastor, the Rev. D.L. Powell.

Known as a man of limitless passion and dedication to the well-being of his fellow men, Mr. Richardson was a leader who went out of his way to focus on the socioeconomic well-being of countless families that came to know of his caring and compassion. Aside from his interest in the funeral industry, he founded a very successful business known today as the Richardson-Jackson Removal Service, Inc.

He served for many years as President of the #3 Usher Ministry and he was also a member of the Trustee Ministry, Assistant Lead-Servant of the Couples Ministry and the Assistant Director of Operations for the New Shiloh Baptist Church. Though a highly private individual, he dedicated his life to the service of others. In so doing, he symbolized everything that is good and noble about the American spirit of idealism and optimism in serving his fellowmen. Our community truly feels the loss of a decent and caring man in the late Leroy Richardson, and I know my colleagues join with me in celebrating his life and his many good works on behalf of our community.

TRIBUTE TO G. SCOTT HUBBARD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. G. Scott Hubbard, who recently stepped down as Director of NASA Ames Research Center in Mountain View, California to become the Carl Sagan Chair for Study of Life in the Universe at the SETI Institute.

Mr. Hubbard began his career at NASA Ames Research Center in 1987, becoming Center Director in 2002. I have had the pleasure of working closely with Mr. Hubbard on many issues since he assumed the Directorship. He has been an invaluable public servant, guiding NASA Ames through difficult times and inspiring confidence throughout the organization. I'm proud of our work together on many of the new endeavors at NASA Ames, as well as the work to ensure the long-term future of NASA Ames and Moffett Federal Airfield. Mr. Hubbard has always been a thorough professional . . . responsive, efficient and effective.

NASA Ames Research Center is in the heart of Silicon Valley and has played a crucial role in Silicon Valley's success. Director Hubbard demonstrated an unparalleled ability to use NASA Ames' unique position in the high-end research and development community to forge groundbreaking public-private R&D collaborations. Under his leadership, NASA Ames successfully partnered with Silicon Graphics and Intel Corporation to develop the fastest operational supercomputer in the world, and created the Center for Nanotechnology to lead federal research in this revolutionary technology. Mr. Hubbard was integral to the creation of the NASA Ames Research Park, a world-class R&D and education campus with industry, universities and non-profits all taking part. Today, more than thirty small R&D companies and fourteen universities are on-site. Because of his tireless

efforts, high-technology giant Google will soon be adding a new state-of-the-art facility to the Research Park. Under Mr. Hubbard's tenure, NASA Ames established the University Affiliated Research Center with the University of California, which remains the largest R&D partnership ever developed by NASA in our nation.

Beyond his work as Director of NASA Ames, Mr. Hubbard has been a highly respected member of NASA and our country's academic community. He attended Vanderbilt University where he studied physics and astronomy. In 1974 at Lawrence Berkeley Lab, Mr. Hubbard co-developed a new radiation detection technology which is now incorporated in the Mars Odyssey Mission. In March 2000, he served at NASA headquarters as the first Mars Program Director and successfully restructured the entire Mars program in the wake of mission failures. Prior to his appointment as NASA Ames Center Director, he was Deputy Director for Research at NASA Ames. In 2003, he served as the sole NASA representative on the Columbia Accident Investigation Board which established the definitive physical cause of the loss of the Columbia. Director Hubbard has also been the NASA Ames Associate Director for Astrobiology and Space Research, the first director of NASA's Astrobiology Institute, and NASA's mission manager for Lunar Prospector. Director Hubbard is also credited with conceiving the Mars Pathfinder Mission. He recently accepted a visiting scholar appointment in the Electrical Engineering Department of Stanford University, underscoring the deep respect that Mr. Hubbard has earned in the academic community. At Stanford, Mr. Hubbard's research plans will focus on nanotechnology, biotechnology and information technology areas, as well as studying the emergence of the entrepreneurial space industry.

Time and again, Scott Hubbard has proven his commitment to NASA and our nation's space exploration endeavors. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our deepest gratitude to him for his superb public service. He has served our country exceedingly well, and because he has, we honor him for his work and wish him well in his new position as the Carl Sagan Chair at the SETI Institute.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 6

2:30 p.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine The U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement.
SD–215

MARCH 7

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine military strategy and operational requirements in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program.
SD–106

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the goal of energy independence.
SD–366

Environment and Public Works
Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2007 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
SD–628

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Randall L. Tobias, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.
SD–419

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine defective products relating to criminal penalties ensuring corporate accountability.
SD–226

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine veterans' preference in the Federal government, focusing on the implementation of veterans' preference in the hiring of employees, including an evaluation of the laws designed to protect and promote the employment of veterans, the impact of workforce flexibilities on veterans, and how veterans' redress mechanisms work.
SD–342

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the current oversight and operation of credit rating agencies.
SD–538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine rural telecom.
SD–562

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the response of community-based organizations to the 2005 Gulf Coast hurricanes.
SD–430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.
SH–216

2:15 p.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider Protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris on August 31, 1994 (Treaty Doc.109–04), Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Bangladesh for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income signed at Dhaka on September 26, 2004 with an exchange of notes enclosed (Treaty Doc.109–05), Protocol Amending the Convention Between the United States of America and the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Estates, Inheritances, and Gifts signed at Washington on November 24, 1978 (Treaty Doc.109–07), and Protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income signed at Washington on September 30, 2005 (Treaty Doc.109–08).
S–116, Capitol

2:45 p.m.
Armed Services
Strategic Forces Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the nuclear weapons and defense environmental cleanup activities of the Department of Energy in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years nuclear security program.
SR–232A

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine Hurricane Katrina, focusing on recommendations for reform.
SD–342

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider S. 1955, to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Security Act of 1974 and the Public Health Service Act to expand health care access and reduce costs through the creation of small business health plans and through modernization of the health insurance marketplace, S. 1902, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize funding for the establishment of a program on children and the media within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to study the role and impact of electronic media in the development of children, and the nominations of Michell C. Clark, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Management, Department of Education, Jean B. Elshtain, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities, Edwin G. Foulke, Jr., of South Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, Allen C. Guelzo, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities, Arlene Holen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, George Perdue, of

Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, Anne-Imelda Radice, of Vermont, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Craig T. Ramey, of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences, Sarah M. Singleton, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation, Richard Stickler, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Kent D. Talbert, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Education, Horace A. Thompson, of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, and certain nominations in the Public Health Service.

SD–430

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Trade and Finance Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine export-import bank reauthorization.

SD–538

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense quadrennial defense review; to be followed by a closed session in SR–222.

SH–216

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine Crime Victims Fund rescission.

SD–342

MARCH 9

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD–628

Armed Services
To resume hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program.

SD–106

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine aviation security and the Transportation Security Administration.

SD–562

Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2007 for the Small Business Administration, and related measures.

SR–428A

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the legislative presentations of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Blinded Veterans of America, The Non-Commissioned Officers Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Jewish War Veterans.

SH–216

10:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the United States Department of Agriculture's management and oversight of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

SR–328A

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the roles and missions of the Department of Defense regarding homeland defense and support to civil authorities in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program.

SR–222

MARCH 13

3 p.m.
Armed Services
To hold a closed briefing on an update from the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization.

SR–222

MARCH 14

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine military strategy and operational requirements in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program.

SH–216

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine wireless issues spectrum reform.

SD–106

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine Wall Street perspective on telecom.

SD–106

MARCH 15

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the the Secretary of the Senate, Architect of the Capitol, and the Capitol Visitor Center.

SD–138

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine innovation and competitiveness legislation.

SD–562

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine military strategy and operational requirements in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program; to be followed by a closed session in SH–219.

SH–216

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Disaster Prevention and Prediction Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine impacts on aviation regarding volcanic hazards.

SD–562

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the homeless programs administered by the VA.

SR–418

MARCH 28

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine Federal Aviation Administration budget and the long term viability of the Aviation Trust Fund.

SD–562

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
National Ocean Policy Study Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine offshore aquaculture.

SD–562

MARCH 29

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the importance of basic research to United States' competitiveness.

SD–562

MARCH 30

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Disaster Prevention and Prediction Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing to examine National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System.

SD–562

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the legislative presentations of the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, the AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, and the Vietnam Veterans of America.

SD–106

APRIL 4

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine Federal Aviation Administration funding options.

SD–562

APRIL 5

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Sergeant at Arms and U.S. Capitol Police Board.

SD–138

3 p.m.
Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine improving contractor incentives in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007.

SR–222

APRIL 26

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine fostering innovation in math and science education.

Room to be announced

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the progress of construction on the Capitol Visitor Center.

SD–138

MAY 3

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Government Printing Office, Congressional Budget Office, and Office of Compliance.
SD–138

MAY 17

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine accelerating the adoption of health information technology.
Room to be announced

MAY 24

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the progress of construction on the Capitol Visitor Center.
SD–138

JUNE 14

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine alternative energy technologies.
Room to be announced

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate passed S. 2271, USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1555–S1592

Measures Introduced: Ten bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2342–2351, and S. Res. 386. **Page S1579**

Measures Reported:

S. 2349, to provide greater transparency in the legislative process. **Page S1579**

Measures Passed:

USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments: By 95 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 25), Senate passed S. 2271, to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1557–61**

Adopted:

Frist Amendment No. 2896 (to Amendment No. 2895), of a perfecting nature. **Page S1557**

By 81 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. 24), Frist Amendment No. 2895, to establish the enactment date of the Act. **Page S1557**

Honoring Negro Leagues: Senate agreed to S. Res. 386, honoring the Pre-Negro Leagues and Negro Leagues baseball players and executives elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame Class of 2006. **Pages S1586–90**

USA PATRIOT Act Reauthorization—Conference Report: Senate resumed consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199, to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism. **Pages S1561–75**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 86 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. 26), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consider the motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report was not agreed to on December 16, 2005 (Vote No. 358). **Page S1561**

By 85 yeas to 14 nays (Vote No. 27), Senate agreed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the conference report. **Page S1561**

By 84 yeas to 15 nays (Vote No. 28), upon reconsideration, three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the conference report. **Page S1561**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the conference report at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, March 2, 2006, and that, notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, Senate vote on adoption of the conference report at 3 p.m. **Page S1590**

Messages From the House: **Pages S1577–78**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1578–79**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1579–80**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1580–85**

Additional Statements: **Page S1577**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1583–85**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S1585–86**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—28) **Page S1557, S1559, S1561**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and, adjourned at 6:36 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 2, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1590.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Education, after receiving testimony from Margaret Spellings, Secretary of Education.

APPROPRIATIONS—LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Library of Congress and the Open World Leadership Center, after receiving testimony from James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress, who was accompanied by several of his associates.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded hearings to examine Army Transformation and the future combat systems acquisition strategy in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program, after receiving testimony from Claude M. Bolton, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology and Army Acquisition Executive; General Richard A. Cody, USA, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army; Paul L. Francis, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office; and David R. Graham, Deputy Director, Strategy Forces and Resources Division, Institute for Defense Analyses.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded hearings to examine active component, reserve component, and civilian personnel programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007, after receiving testimony from David S. C. Chu, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; Lieutenant General Franklin L. Hagenbeck, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, United States Army; Vice Admiral John C. Harvey, Jr., USN, Chief of Naval Personnel, United States Navy; Lieutenant General H. P. Osman, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, United States Marine Corps; and Lieutenant General Roger A. Brady, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force.

REGULATORY RELIEF PROPOSALS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine regulatory relief proposals to remove regulatory burden from the banking industry, after receiving testimony from John M. Reich, Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, and Julie L. Williams, First Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, both of the Department of the Treasury; Donald L. Kohn, Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Douglas H. Jones, Acting General Counsel, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; JoAnn M. Johnson, Chairman, National Credit Union Administration; Gavin Gee, Idaho Department of Finance, Boise, on behalf of the Conference of State Bank Supervisors; Linda Jekel, Washington Department of Financial Institutions, Olympia, on behalf of the National Association of State Credit Union Supervisors; H. Greg McClellan, MAX Federal Credit Union, Montgomery, Alabama, on behalf of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions; Bradley E. Rock, Bank of Smithtown, Smithtown, New York, on behalf of the American Bankers Association; Edmund Mierzwinski, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Travis Plunkett, Consumer Federation of America, Margot Saunders, National Consumer Law Center, and Steve Bartlett, The Financial Services Roundtable, all of Washington, D.C.; F. Weller Meyer, Acacia Federal Savings Bank, Falls Church, Virginia, on behalf of America's Community Bankers; Joe McGee, Legacy Community Federal Credit Union, Birmingham, Alabama, on behalf of the Credit Union National Association; and Terry Jorde, CountryBank USA, Cando, North Dakota, on behalf of Independent Community Bankers of America.

2007 BUDGET: HHS

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

WINTER STORMS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Disaster Prevention and Prediction concluded a hearing to examine the role of the National Weather Service in forecasting and warning

for winter storms, after receiving testimony from Louis W. Uccellini, Director, National Centers for Environmental Prediction, National Weather Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, and Mayor Denise Michels, Nome, Alaska, on behalf of the Alaska Conference of Mayors.

U.S. TERRITORIES ECONOMIES

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the state of the economies and fiscal affairs in the Territories of Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands, after receiving testimony from American Samoa Delegate Eni Faleomavaega, and American Samoa Governor Togiola T.A. Tulafono, both of Vailoatai; Virgin Islands Delegate Donna M. Christensen, and Virgin Islands Governor Charles W. Turnbull, both of St. Croix; Guam Delegate Madeleine Z. Bordallo, and Guam Governor Felix Perez Camacho, both of Hagatna; Northern Mariana Islands Resident Representative Pedro A. Tenorio, Saipan; and David B. Cohen, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Affairs.

FOREIGN GUEST WORKER TREE PLANTING CONTRACTS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests concluded a hearing to examine the role of the Forest Service and other Federal agencies in protecting the health and welfare of foreign guest workers carrying out tree planting and other service contracts on National Forest System lands, and to consider related Forest Service guidance and contract modifications issued in recent weeks, after receiving testimony from Mark Rey, Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment; Victoria A. Lipnic, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment Standards Administration; D. Michael Dale, Northwest Workers' Justice Project, Portland, Oregon; Cassandra Moseley, University of Oregon Institute for a Sustainable Environment, Eugene; Lynn Jungwirth, Watershed Research and Training Center, Hayfork, California; and Cindy Wood, Wood's Fire and Emergency Services, Inc., Portola, California, on behalf of the National Wildfire Suppression Association.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the status of the Yucca Mountain Project, focusing on the proposed spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, after receiving testimony from Senators Reid and Ensign; William Wehrum, Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; Paul M. Golan, Acting Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Department of Energy; Robert R. Loux, Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects, Office of the Governor, Carson City; Robert Fri, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the National Research Council; Allison M. MacFarlane, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge; and Dade W. Moeller, Dade Moeller and Associates, McLean, Virginia, on behalf of the Health Physics Society.

BUDGET: DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Michael Chertoff, Secretary of Homeland Security.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S COMPETITIVE EDGE (PACE) ACT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Education and Early Childhood Development held hearings to examine S. 2198, to ensure the United States successfully competes in the 21st century global economy, focusing on efforts to improve math and science and technology education, receiving testimony from Henry L. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education; Arden L. Bement, Jr., Director, National Science Foundation; Thomas W. Rudin, The College Board, New York, New York; James B. Hunt, Jr., Institute for Educational Leadership and Policy, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, former Governor of North Carolina; Peter O'Donnell, Jr., O'Donnell Foundation, Dallas, Texas, on behalf of the National Academies' Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century; and Joshua R. Tagore, University High School of Science and Engineering, Hartford, Connecticut.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

RYAN WHITE CARE ACT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the Ryan White CARE Act relating to fighting the AIDS epidemic of today, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Duke, Administrator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded hearings to examine the nominations of Norman Randy Smith, of Idaho, to be United States Circuit

Judge for the Ninth Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Craig and Crapo, and Patrick Joseph Schiltz, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, who was introduced by Senator Coleman, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BORDER VIOLENCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security held joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Citizenship to examine Federal strategies to end border violence, focusing on border-related volent crime, criminal networks that smuggle people and drugs across U.S. borders, and certain programs implemented to address these problems, receiving testimony from Paul K. Charlton, United States Attorney for the District of Arizona, Department of Justice; David Aguilar, Chief of Border Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, and Marcy Forman, Director of Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, both of the Department of Homeland Security; Sheriff Larry A. Dever, Cochise County, Arizona; Sheriff A. D'Wayne Jernigan, Val Verde County, Texas, on behalf of the Texas Border Sheriff's Coalition; Lavoyger Durham, El Tule Ranch, Falfurrias, Texas; and T. J. Bonner, National Border Patrol Council, American Federation of Government Employees (AFL–CIO), Campo, California.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

NOMINATION

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Eric M. Thorson, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Small Business Administration, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Grassley, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 4824–4842; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 349; and H. Res. 701, 703–705 were introduced. **Pages H508–09**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H509–10**

Reports Filed: Report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 702, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements and for other purposes (H. Rept. 109–381). **Page H508**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Porter to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H453**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered today by Bishop Steven E. Wright, National Chaplain, the American Legion. **Page H453**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:03 a.m. for the purpose of receiving the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy. The House reconvened at 12:45 p.m., and agreed that the proceedings had during the Joint Meeting be printed in the Record. **Page H453**

Joint Meeting to receive the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy: The House and Senate met in a joint session to receive the Honorable Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy. He was escorted into the Chamber by a committee comprised of Representatives Boehner, Blunt, Fossella, Gallegly, Mica, Tiberi, Young of Florida, Pelosi, Hoyer, Larson of Connecticut, Pascrell, Doyle, Ryan of Ohio, and Thompson; and Senators Frist, McConnell, Stevens, Santorum, Domenici, Durbin, Leahy, Clinton, and Menendez. **Pages H453–55**

SUSPENSIONS: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor: H. Res. 357, to honor Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, by a yea-and-nay vote of 410 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 17; and **Pages H458–61, H466–67**

Honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary: H. Con. Res. 335, to honor and praise the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 97th anniversary. **Pages H461–66**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:40 p.m. and reconvened at 3:01 p.m. **Page H466**

Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Chairman Kolbe and Vice-Chairman McCaul of Texas, appointed on February 16, 2006: Representatives Dreier, Manzullo, Delahunt, Fa1eomavaega, English of Pennsylvania, Weller, Reyes, Davis of California and Fortuño. **Page H493**

Katrina Emergency Assistance Act of 2006—Order of Business: The House agreed that it be in order at any time to consider in the House S. 1777; that the bill be considered as read; that the amendment in the nature of a substitute placed at the desk be considered as adopted; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions. **Page H499**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page 466.

Senate Referrals: S. 2271 was referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Financial Services. **Page H506**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of the House today, and appear on pages H466–67. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Office of Inspector General. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the USDA: Phyllis K. Fong, Inspector General; and Kathleen S. Tight, Deputy Inspector General.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Secretary of the Interior. Testimony was heard from Gale A. Norton, Secretary of the Interior.

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE, AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life, and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies continued Fiscal Year 2007 appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FCC. Testimony was heard from Kevin Martin, Chairman, FCC.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST AIR FORCE AND NAVY

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Department of the Air Force. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Air Force: Michael W. Wynne, Secretary; and GEN T. Michael Moseley, USAF, Chief of Staff.

The Committee also held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Department of the Navy. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Navy: Donald C. Winter, Secretary; ADM Michael G. Mullen, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; and GEN Michael W. Hagee, USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY

Committee on Armed Services: Ordered reported adversely H. Res. 645, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Department of Energy's Atomic Energy Defense Activities. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Energy: Ambassador Linton F. Brooks, Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration; James Rispoli, Assistant Secretary, Environmental Management; and Glenn Podonsky, Director, Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET PRIORITIES

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on the Department of Defense Budget Priorities Fiscal Year 2007. Testimony was heard from Gordon England, Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense.

AMERICAN MINING INDUSTRY—EVALUATING HEALTH AND SAFETY REGULATIONS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled ''Evaluating Health and Safety Regulations in the American Mining Industry.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Labor: Robert Friend, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Mine Safety and Health Administration; and Ray McKinney, Administrator, Coal Mine Safety and Health, Mine Safety and Health Administration; and public witnesses.

CAR TITLE FRAUD

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing entitled ''Car Title Fraud: Issues and Approaches for Keeping Consumers Safe on the Road.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEDICARE DRUG BENEFIT IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Medicare Part D: Implementation of the New Drug Benefit.'' Testimony was heard from Mark McClellan, M.D., Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

CFIUS PROCESS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Foreign Investment, Jobs and National Security: The CFIUS Process.'' Testimony was heard from Robert M. Kimmitt, Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury; Michael P. Jackson, Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security; Eric S. Edelman, Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense; C. David Welch, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

OIL AND GAS ROYALTIES

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Energy and Resources held a hearing entitled ''Oil and Gas Royalties: The Facts, The Remedies.'' Testimony was heard from Walter Cruickshank, Deputy Director, Minerals Management Services, Department of the Interior.

2010 CENSUS/APPORTIONMENT

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, hearing entitled ''Apportionment in the Balance: A Look Into the Progress of the 2010 Decennial Census.'' Testimony was heard from Louis Kincannon, Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; the following officials of the GAO: Brenda Farrell, Acting Director, Strategic Issues; and David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues; and public witnesses.

U.S. FISCAL OUTLOOK

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Fiscal Outlook and the FY 2005 Governmentwide Financial Statements.'' Testimony was heard from David M. Walker, Comptroller General, GAO; and Donald V. Hammond, Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Plain English Regulations: Helping the American Public Understand the Rules.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BRIEFING—ACQUISITION OF TERMINAL OPERATIONS IN U.S. PORTS BY DUBAI PORT WORLD

Committee on Homeland Security: Met in executive session to receive a briefing on the acquisition of terminal operations at six United States ports by Dubai Port World. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS STATE AND LOCAL PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology held a hearing entitled ''The State of Interoperable Communications: Perspectives from State and Local Governments.'' Testimony was heard from Gino Menchini, Commissioner, Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications, City of New York; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action the following measures: H.R. 4742, To amend title 35, United States Code, to allow the Director of the Patent and Trademark Office to waive statutory provisions governing patents and trademarks in certain emergencies; and S. 1785, Vessel Hull Design Protection Amendments of 2005.

ENERGY EMPLOYEES ILLNESS COMPENSATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims began hearings entitled ''The Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act—Are We Fulfilling the Promise We Made to These Veterans of the Cold War When We Created the Program,'' Part I. Testimony was heard from Shelby Hallmark, Director, Office of Worker's Compensation Programs, Department of Labor; and John Howard, M.D., Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

ENERGY POLICY ACT IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held an oversight hearing entitled ''How the Federal Marketing Administrations Are Implementing the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and An Assessment of the Proposed Fiscal Year Budgets for These Agencies.'' Testimony was heard from the following Administrators of the Power Administrations, Department of Energy: Stephen J. Wright, Bonneville Power Administration; Michael S. Hacskaylo, Western Area Power Administration; Michael A. Deihl, Southwestern Power Administration; and Charles A. Borchardt, Southeastern Power Administration; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL UNIFORMITY FOR FOOD ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule providing for general debate only on H.R. 4167, National Uniformity for Food Act of 2005. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that after general debate the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion and no further consideration of the bill shall be in order except by a subsequent order of the House. Testimony was heard from Representatives Rogers of Michigan, Waxman, Stupak, Cardoza, and Wasserman-Schultz.

OVERSIGHT—COAST GUARD BUDGET

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held an oversight hearing on the United States Coast Guard and the Federal Maritime Commission Fiscal Year Budget Requests. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security: VADM Terry Cross, Vice Commandant; and Master Chief Petty Officer Franklin A. Welch; Steven R. Blust, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission; and David L. Winstead, Commissioner, Public Building Service, GSA.

OVERSIGHT—ENVIRONMENT/WATER RESOURCES BUDGET

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held an oversight hearing on Agency Budgets and Priorities for Fiscal Year 2007 for the following Agencies: the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Army: John Paul Woodley, Jr., Assistant Secretary (Civil Works); and LTG Carl A. Strock, Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers; Bruce Knight, Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA; and Craig H. Middlebrook, Deputy Administrator, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation.

MEDICARE PAYMENT POLICIES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on MedPAC's March Report on Medicare Payment Policies. Testimony was heard from Glenn M. Hackbarth, Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

COBELL V. NORTON

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Indian Affairs concluded a joint oversight hearing with the House Committee on Resources to examine the settlement of Cobell v. Norton, focusing on S. 1439 and H.R.

4322, to provide for Indian trust asset management reform and resolution of historical accounting claims, after receiving testimony from Stuart E. Eizenstat, Covington and Burling, John Bickerman, Bickerman Dispute Resolution, and Joseph Garcia, National Congress of American Indians, all of Washington, D.C.; Sandra K. Johnigan, Johnigan, P.C., Dallas, Texas; Mike Marchand, Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, Portland, Oregon; Keller George, United South and Eastern Tribes, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee; and Harold Frazier, Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association, Eagle Butte, South Dakota.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2006

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water, to hold hearings to examine an outline of the Global Nuclear Energy Plan and the future of nuclear power, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine military installations, military construction, environmental programs, and base realignment and closure programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007, 2 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine implementation of the Exon-Florio Amendment, focusing on Dubai Ports World acquisition of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 2007, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine USF distribution, 10 a.m., SD–562.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold a closed briefing on the challenges and responses with respect to a nuclear Iran, 9 a.m., S–407, Capitol.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the challenges and responses with respect to a nuclear Iran, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the state of mine safety and health, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 2128, to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine legislative presentations of the Fleet Reserve Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, the Gold Star Wives of America, and the Military Officers Association of America, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Rural Development, 9:30 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water, and Related Agencies, on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2 p.m., 2362B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, on Avian Influenza-International Response, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, on Administrator of EPA, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, on American Competitiveness Initiative, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life, and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, on U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, 9:30 a.m., on American Battle Monuments Commission, 10 a.m., on Arlington National Cemetery, 10:30 a.m., and on Armed Forces Retirement Home, 11 a.m., H–143 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, on NSF, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization budget request for the U.S. Transportation Command and Component Commands, 9 a.m., and a hearing on the National Security Implications of the Dubai Ports World Deal to Take Over Management of U.S. Ports, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials, hearing entitled "Legislation to Implement the POPs, PIC, and LRTAP POPs Agreements," 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment, executive, joint briefing on terrorist intentions toward U.S. aircraft, 10 a.m., H2–176 Ford.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on United States Policy Toward the Palestinians in the Aftermath of Parliamentary Elections, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation, oversight hearing on Assessing Rights Under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, oversight hearing on Western Hemisphere Energy Security, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 2829, Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005; H.R. 4709, Law Enforcement and Phone Privacy Protection Act of 2006; H.R. 4356, Emergency and Disaster Assistance Fraud Penalty Enhancement Act of 2005; H.R. 1871, Volunteer Pilot Organization Protection Act of 2005; H.R. 1176, Nonprofit Athletic Organization Protection Act of 2005; and H.R. 2955, Intellectual Property Jurisdiction Clarification Act of 2005, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Constitution, oversight hearing entitled ''The Scope and Myths of Roe v. Wade,'' 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims and the Subcommittee on Crime Terrorism, and Homeland Security, joint oversight hearing entitled ''Outgunned and Outmanned: Local Law Enforcement Confronts Violence Along the Southern Border,'' 12 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, oversight hearing on the National Park Service's Fiscal Year 2007 Budget, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Water and Power, oversight hearing entitled ''The President's Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Requests for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Water Division of the U.S. Geological Survey,'' 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, hearing entitled ''Lobbying Reform: Accountability Through Transparency,'' 10 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, hearing on NASA Science Mission Directorate: Impacts of the Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Proposal, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Workforce, Empowerment and Government Programs, oversight hearing on the SBA's Entrepreneurial Development Programs, 10:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines, oversight hearing on Curbside Operations: Bus Safety and ADA Regulatory Compliance, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, oversight hearing regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs' Fiscal Year 2007 information technology budget, 10 a.m., 340 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, to continue hearings on Social Security Number High-Risk Issues, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive briefing on Global Updates/Hotspots, 9 a.m., and, executive, to mark up H. Res. 641, Requesting the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to electronic surveillance without search warrants on individuals in the United States, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

SECOND SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through February 28, 2006

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	23	9	..
Time in session	151 hrs., 47′	46 hrs., 59′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	1,554	452	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	235	..
Public bills enacted into law	2	4	6
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	..	5	..
Measures passed, total	44	36	80
Senate bills	4	3	..
House bills	6	8	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	5	2	..
House concurrent resolutions	5	6	..
Simple resolutions	24	17	..
Measures reported, total *	6	14	20
Senate bills	5	..	..
House bills	1	8	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
Simple resolutions	..	6	..
Special reports	..	2	..
Conference reports	..	..	..
Measures pending on calendar	187	105	..
Measures introduced, total	215	247	462
Bills	165	170	..
Joint resolutions	5	4	..
Concurrent resolutions	7	18	..
Simple resolutions	38	55	..
Quorum calls	..	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	23	14	..
Recorded votes	..	1	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

* These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 6 reports have been filed in the Senate, a total of 16 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through February 28, 2006

Civilian nominations, totaling 237, (including 148 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	37
Unconfirmed	199
Withdrawn	1
Other Civilian nominations, totaling 1,326 (including 780 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	695
Unconfirmed	631
Air Force nominations, totaling 1,494 (including 100 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,473
Unconfirmed	21
Army nominations, totaling 2,980 (including 608 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,088
Unconfirmed	1,892
Navy nominations, totaling 50 (including 21 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	22
Unconfirmed	28
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,274 (including 2 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	987
Unconfirmed	287

Summary

Total nominations carried over from the First Session	1,659
Total nominations received this Session	5,702
Total confirmed	4,302
Total unconfirmed	3,058
Total withdrawn	1
Total returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 30 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3199, USA PATRIOT, Terrorism Prevention Reauthorization Act, with a vote on adoption of the conference report to occur at 3 p.m.; following which, Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2320, LIHEAP Funding bill, with a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, March 2

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 4167—National Uniformity for Food Act of 2005 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E247
Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E238, E239
Boswell, Leonard L., Iowa, E241
Burton, Dan, Ind., E244
Ehlers, Vernon J., Mich., E243
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E250
Frank, Barney, Mass., E241
Hoekstra, Peter, Mich., E243
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E240
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E245
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E242
Kirk, Mark Steven, Ill., E245
Knollenberg, Joe, Mich., E243
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E237, E239
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E244
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E242
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E243
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E250
Mica, John L., Fla., E248
Moore, Dennis, Kans., E247
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E245
Musgrave, Marilyn N., Colo., E240
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E242
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E239
Pastor, Ed, Ariz., E248
Pickering, Charles W. ''Chip'', Miss., E240
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E237, E238, E250
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E244
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E239
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E248
Shimkus, John, Ill., E240
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E247, E248
Solis, Hilda L., Calif., E250
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E242
Udall, Tom, N.M., E242
Walden, Greg, Ore., E241
Watson, Diane E., Calif., E245
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E237, E238
Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E246

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.