



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2006

No. 60

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOUSTANY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, *May 16, 2006.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

NSA'S PHONE RECORDS PROGRAM

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the Chair.

Well, when we first heard about widespread wiretapping by the administration without legal authority under the Federal Intelligence Surveillance Act, the President said not to worry, just a handful of individuals, and only when they are communicating with people outside the U.S. Well, maybe not a handful. Maybe a few hundred. No, maybe 10,000 or thousands.

Oops. Now it actually turns out that they are monitoring and have asked for the records of the phone calls of hun-

dreds of millions of Americans. Over a trillion phone call records, we are told. They say they need this to protect America. What are they going to do with this mountain of data? They are going to apply a complicated mathematical algorithm to it and they are going to find some terrorists. Thus far they have raided two takeout services and one call center. That is what they have yielded from this. How about good old-fashioned intelligence with humans and police work?

Let's look at the bungling that led up to 9/11. Actually the new nominee who headed the NSA who has perhaps perjured himself about these billions of monitored records, he had in his hands a communication from al Qaeda on 9/11, actually on 9/10, saying, tomorrow is zero hour. But the NSA didn't bother to translate that until after 9/11.

Then we had the FBI. Now, Agent Samit said he had a communication about Moussaoui from French intelligence in August after he had been arrested by the FBI saying he was very dangerous, indoctrinated in radical Islamic fundamentalism, completely devoted to radical fundamentalism and Osama bin Laden. But his superiors didn't think that was enough to give him a warrant to open Moussaoui's computer and perhaps stop 9/11.

That's why we need to monitor the phone calls of billions of phone calls made by Americans, because of the incompetence of the people running these agencies.

Now, Agent Samit sent a letter to FBI headquarters accusing Moussaoui of plotting international terrorism and air piracy. This is August. August, before 9/11. Then Agent Rowley came forward and also gave us the same information. Agent Samit also asked for help from the FBI's London, Paris and Oklahoma City offices, FBI headquarters, CIA counterterrorism center, Secret Service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Federal Aviation

Administration, an intelligence agency not identified but presumed to be the National Security Agency headed by General Hayden who failed to translate the warning before 9/11. But we need to monitor the phone calls of law-abiding Americans, billions of them. What a wild goose chase. They want to cover up the extraordinary incompetence that allowed these stumblebumps to launch a devastating attack on America by saying they are doing something now by monitoring billions of phone calls. This is absolutely outrageous.

Let's go back a little further. There were two other guys involved, Nawafal Hazmi and Khalid al Mihdhar. Now, they were tracked to the planning meeting, pretty good work, by the CIA over in Southeast Asia. That's good. Unfortunately, they didn't have listening devices, they didn't have agents go through them, they didn't know what they were planning, but they knew they were bad guys planning something. Then they lost track of them. Where did they go? Well, they traveled legally to the United States of America with visas issued by the Bush State Department, they lived openly in San Diego with listed phone numbers, but they were never visited or monitored by the FBI or anybody else, even though the CIA knew these were bad guys.

But what are we going to do in response to this incompetence? Well, we'll give the people involved gold medals and great retirements. Mr. Tenet, who was heading the CIA, he got a gold medal for freedom from the President. No one has ever taken the fall for this incompetence. Now, instead, they are trying to divert us and say, what we're going to do is monitor all the telephone conversations of all Americans and apply a mathematical algorithm. So the next time we have a terrorist in hand, we won't open his computer, either, because we'll be watching the algorithms and the phone calls of law-abiding Americans.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2599

What unbelievable incompetence on the part of this administration, in addition to law-breaking. The American people are not well served by this. We need to clean up this mess and truly protect America.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday was Mother's Day. Across our Nation, America's mothers were honored with cards, gifts, flowers and phone calls. But for any mother, the most precious gift of all is a strong and healthy baby. Today, to help ensure that mothers receive that most precious of gifts, I am introducing the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2006.

Newborn screening is a public health intervention that involves a simple blood test used to identify many life-threatening genetic illnesses before any symptoms begin. Approximately 5,000 babies are born each year with detectable and treatable disorders. Forty years ago, these disorders would have gone undetected until symptoms appeared. As a result, these children unnecessarily died or suffered lifelong disabling consequences. Today, these severe disorders, mostly inborn errors of metabolism, can be detected in newborn babies and treated in time to prevent serious complications. But due to the fact that a national newborn screening law does not exist in this country, there is great disparity and variation from State to State in the quality and number of newborn screening tests an infant may receive. Consequently, each year approximately 2,000 infants are permanently disabled or die from otherwise treatable disorders. This bill could prevent these tragedies and save millions of dollars in health care costs to both families and States.

The Newborn Screening Act of 2006 seeks to eliminate these unnecessary deaths and severe disabilities by educating parents and health care professionals about the advisability of newborn screening and improves the system for follow-up care for infants detected with an illness through the newborn screening tests. The bill encourages States to uniformly test for all recommended disorders and provides resources for States to expand and improve their newborn screening programs. It also requires the CDC to ensure the quality of laboratories involved in newborn screening and establishes a system for collecting and analyzing data that will help researchers develop better detection, prevention and treatment strategies.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere in our country today, there is a mother holding

her newborn son or daughter totally unaware that her seemingly healthy baby is being attacked by a genetic disease because her State or birthing facility did not offer the one test that could have provided her with this critical information. If she knew, she could have begun the treatment needed to protect her baby from permanent disability or death.

Mr. Speaker, we have the power to help prevent this tragedy. By passing the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2006, we can ensure that parents and health providers are knowledgeable about newborn screening and that babies receive the comprehensive and consistent testing they need. It is a challenge we simply cannot ignore.

I urge my colleagues to join me in presenting a Mother's Day gift to the 4 million women who give birth each year by becoming cosponsors of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2006 and helping to pass it into law.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, You are forever faithful. Our history reveals Your constant protection and guidance of this Nation, so we have placed all our trust in You.

As Your faithful people, we are always optimistic about the future because we rely not on human endeavor alone, but upon Your promises. "I am Your Lord God. I am with You."

As Your people, we become a people filled with promise. That does not mean we expect to see everything fulfilled according to our own timing. We simply mull over the seed of promise in our own hearts and plant Your promises in others.

With hope rooted in Your promises, O Lord, we foster the growth of vision in a world of neighbors and in the next generation by what we say and how we act. You alone fulfill every promise and will recreate the face of the earth now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KELLER 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.

NATIONAL GUARD TROOPS BELONG ON THE BORDER

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Bush's decision to place additional National Guard troops on the Mexican border. I recently returned from a week long trip to the Mexico-California border. And as this photograph shows, I met with National Guard troops who were constructing a border security fence in the San Diego area.

President Bush's decision has been criticized from two sources.

First, some American politicians have complained that National Guard troops have no business being involved with border security. Well, this photograph clearly shows that National Guard troops are already playing a key role in helping to secure our borders.

Second, Mexico's President Vicente Fox complained about the U.S. possibly militarizing our border. This is the height of hypocrisy. Mexico was the first one to put their military on their southern border to stop illegals from coming into Mexico from Guatemala.

The American people want less whining from the open borders crowd and more action from the rest of us to secure our borders. This is a step in the right direction.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH STEPP

(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, thousands of high school students across America are participating in Poetry Out Loud, a national competition which helps students master public speaking skills and learn about their literary heritage.

On April 8, Elizabeth Stepp proudly represented Richland Northeast High School in the 2006 National Endowment for the Arts South Carolina Poetry Out Loud State Competition. After performing poetry before Poet Laureate Marjory Wentworth and Kwame Dawes, founder of the South Carolina Poetry Initiative, Elizabeth was awarded the South Carolina State Championship.

Tonight Elizabeth will represent South Carolina in the Poetry Out Loud

National Finals held at the Lincoln Theater in Washington. As she prepares for this exciting event, I would like to recognize her tremendous accomplishment and wish her best wishes for continued success.

In conclusion, God bless the memory of Congressman Sonny Montgomery, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

BLACK CLOTH OF SACRIFICE

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, today I would like to remember the 155 men and women ripped from the ranks, gunned down, stabbed, ambushed, killed. Not soldiers in Iraq or Afghanistan, but American peace officers fighting an insurgency on American streets.

We honor those who died and those who survive them. They drape their badges in the black cloth of sacrifice to respect their fellow warriors. They lay their friends to rest, but they still risk their own lives to protect and serve.

One of the 13 Texas officers murdered last year, Officer Hank Nava, Jr., of Fort Worth, was savagely gunned down by an outlaw on parole who shot Officer Nava in the face.

Just days ago, Detective Vicky Armel of Fairfax County, Virginia, was ambushed by a street punk firing more than 70 rounds from an attack rifle.

We do not know the agony of these officers, but we know their indifference to danger. This Police Week we honor the honorable. We give our gratitude to police officers nationwide for their courage. We say thank you to those who turn toward turmoil so that we may turn toward safety.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL GUARD IS A GOOD FIRST STEP

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, last night the President spoke to the American people about his plan for establishing a secure border and a sound immigration policy.

The highlight of President Bush's plans is to send up to 6,000 National Guard troops to assist Border Patrol agents, and I applaud the President for taking steps necessary to try and secure the borders. For far too long this Nation has had a policy of benign neglect, one that has left our system of immigration fundamentally broken. National Guard troops are an excellent short-term solution. However, this action must not be part of a real effort to enforce our laws and must not be coupled with a thinly veiled attempt to grant amnesty. The American people want assurances that our sovereignty and security are being respected.

America is a nation of immigrants. It is built upon the dreams and sacrifices

of those who came to share in our common goals of liberty, fairness and adherence to law. It is in celebration of these principles and in honor of those who came before us that we should act in respect for law and in respect for liberty.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

RIGHT-TO-RIDE LIVESTOCK ON FEDERAL LANDS ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 586) to preserve the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on public lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, administered by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service where there is a historical tradition of such use, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 586

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 "Right-to-Ride Livestock on Federal Lands Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. USE AND ACCESS OF PACK AND SADDLE ANIMALS ON PUBLIC LANDS.

(a) NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM LANDS.—Section 12 of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-7) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) USE AND ACCESS OF PACK AND SADDLE ANIMALS.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall provide for the management of National Park System lands to preserve and facilitate the continued use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, where there is a historical tradition of such use. As a general rule, all trails, routes, and areas used by pack and saddle stock shall remain open and accessible for such use. The Secretary may implement a proposed reduction in the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands only after complying with the full review process required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed—

“(A) to authorize the Secretary to refuse to issue a permit for a new use of pack and saddle stock animals, including use by a commercial outfitter or guide, without complying with applicable resource management plans and planning processes required under this Act or any other provision of law;

“(B) to limit the authority of the Secretary to impose a temporary emergency closure of a trail, route, or area to pack and saddle stock animals or issue special permits; or

“(C) to create a preference for one recreational use for any unit of the National Park System, without consideration of the stated purpose of the unit.”.

(b) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LANDS.—Section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1732) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) USE AND ACCESS OF PACK AND SADDLE ANIMALS.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary shall provide for the management of public lands to preserve and facilitate the continued use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, where there is a historical tradition of such use. As a general rule, all trails, routes, and areas used by pack and saddle stock shall remain open and accessible for such use. The Secretary may implement a proposed reduction in the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands only after complying with the full review process required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed—

“(A) to authorize the Secretary to refuse to issue a permit for a new use of pack and saddle stock animals, including use by a commercial outfitter or guide, without complying with applicable resource management plans and planning processes required under this Act or any other provision of law;

“(B) to limit the authority of the Secretary to impose a temporary emergency closure of a trail, route, or area to pack and saddle stock animals or issue special permits; or

“(C) to create a preference for one recreational use for any area of the public lands, without consideration of the stated purpose of the area.”.

(c) NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM LANDS.—Section 4(d) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5)(A) The Secretary shall provide for the management of System lands to preserve and facilitate the continued use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, where there is a historical tradition of such use. As a general rule, all trails, routes, and areas used by pack and saddle stock shall remain open and accessible for such use. The Secretary may implement a proposed reduction in the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands only after complying with the full review process required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed—

“(i) to authorize the Secretary to refuse to issue a permit for a new use of pack and saddle stock animals, including use by a commercial outfitter or guide, without complying with applicable resource management plans and planning processes required under this Act or any other provision of law;

“(ii) to limit the authority of the Secretary to impose a temporary emergency closure of a trail, route, or area to pack and saddle stock animals or issue special permits; or

“(iii) to create a preference for one recreational use for any unit of the System,

without consideration of the stated purpose of the unit.”.

(d) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS.—Section 15 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1613) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a)” before “Regulations”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) USE AND ACCESS OF PACK AND SADDLE ANIMALS.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary shall provide for the management of National Forest System lands to preserve and facilitate the continued use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, where there is a historical tradition of such use. As a general rule, all trails, routes, and areas used by pack and saddle stock shall remain open and accessible for such use. The Secretary may implement a proposed reduction in the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands only after complying with the full review process required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed—

“(A) to authorize the Secretary to refuse to issue a permit for a new use of pack and saddle stock animals, including use by a commercial outfitter or guide, without complying with applicable resource management plans and planning processes required under this Act or any other provision of law;

“(B) to limit the authority of the Secretary to impose a temporary emergency closure of a trail, route, or area to pack and saddle stock animals or issue special permits; or

“(C) to create a preference for one recreational use for any unit of the National Forest System, without consideration of the stated purpose of the unit.”.

(e) ISSUANCE OF RULES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue final rules to define the meaning of a historical tradition of use of pack and saddle stock animals on Federal lands for purposes of the amendments made by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am the author of H.R. 586, which is identical to the legislation that passed the House of Representatives in the 108th Congress. This bill would preserve the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on our public lands where there is a historic traditional use.

Perhaps no other activity is more synonymous with the exploration of our vast open lands than that of the use of pack and saddle stock. Who could forget those images of President Teddy Roosevelt and John Muir on horseback at what was to become the Grand Canyon and Yosemite National Parks?

While some may claim that this bill singles out pack and saddle use and affords it greater consideration than other forms of recreation or commercial use, I would argue that the pack and saddle use has played a fair and greater historic role on our public lands, particularly in our western States than simply recreation. What may be perceived by some today as recreation was once a vital part of everyday living throughout our Nation's history.

In addition, this bill in no way diminishes the Secretary of the Interior's ability to implement emergency closures or permanent reductions in the use and access of these pack and stock animals after complying with the full public review process required under the National Environmental Policy Act.

H.R. 586 codifies our commitment to access and to preserving one of the most fundamental and truly historic ways to experience our public lands. I urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, H.R. 586 has a checkered history. While there has been no action by the Resources Committee on the legislation in this Congress, questions and concerns were raised about identical legislation in the last session of Congress. In fact, the Bush administration has gone on record saying the legislation was both unnecessary and unwise.

Numerous recreational uses occur on our public lands, including hunting, fishing, hiking, camping. Singling out the recreational use of pack and saddle animals for special treatment creates the potential for conflict with these other recreational uses and complicates resource management of the public lands. At the very least, I think the Resources Committee should take time out of our schedule this session to explore the ramifications of what is being requested here. This will be the only recreational use codified in law.

With this noted, however, I will not object to the further consideration of this measure at this time. I appreciate my good friend and gentleman from California's interest in the subject. In fact, our office has received some e-mails and letters on this very subject ourselves.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce into the

RECORD a letter from Chairman GOODLATTE of Virginia. The Committee on Agriculture also received jurisdiction on this bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2006.

Hon. RICHARD POMBO,
Chairman, Committee on Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for notifying the Committee on Agriculture with regards to your intention to move H.R. 586, a bill entitled as the “Right-to Ride Livestock on Federal Lands Act of 2005”, under suspension of the rules.

As you are aware, the Committee on Agriculture received an additional referral of this legislation on those provisions of H.R. 586 that fall within this Committee's jurisdiction. However, after conferring with Chairman GUTKNECHT of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry, I will be glad to waive further consideration of this measure so as to allow its timely consideration by the entire House of Representatives.

This action is not intended to waive this Committee's jurisdiction over this matter for all purposes, and in the event a conference with the Senate is requested in this matter, I would ask you to support the Committee on Agriculture's request to be represented.

Thank you very much for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our Committees as we deal with these issues in the future.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, as the Ranking Democratic Member of the Resources Committee I would first observe that we on this side of the aisle also cherish the proud American tradition of horsemanship.

Whether it be thoroughbreds—and a potential Triple Crown winner this year possibly in the making judging from Barbaro's smashing performance in the Kentucky Derby—Appaloosas, Arabians, Clydesdales, our wild Mustangs on the Western Plains, Palominos, and even the Chincoteague Pony made famous by the book “Misty,” our country's history and indeed, still in the present, is deeply intertwined with the horse.

With that noted, while we will not object to the consideration of H.R. 586 today, there are certain problems with the legislation. In effect, the bill hampers the ability of local federal land managers to administer trails under their jurisdiction in a flexible fashion taking into account changed local circumstances. In effect, the pending bill says that trails historically open to pack and saddle stock horses shall always remain open to them within units of our National Park System, National Forest System, Wildlife Refuges and BLM lands. This not only ties the hands of the local land managers to make adjustments if warranted, but appears to be a nationwide rubber stamp approach to what has not been a national problem with respect to public trail usage.

I would observe there is one out, one means to make a change in the horse first rule this legislation advances, and that would be to go through a full-scale review under the National Environmental Policy Act. Here, I applaud those of my colleagues who are promoting this legislation because many of these have consistently voted in the Resources Committee to overturn, override, and exempt the application of NEPA to other matters.

I am also concerned about the precedent we are setting here. It is my understanding that the American Horse Council fully backs the pending bill. A noble organization, which does good service for the equine community. Yet, what if the American Motorcyclist Association catches wind of this bill. Can we expect a counter proposal from them, to make trails open to off-road motorcycles also deemed to be the highest and best use of public trails. I would expect their members would not want to be viewed as second class citizens when it comes to trail use. And the hikers, the bikers, the ATV groups. The list goes on.

With that Madam Speaker, I have some trepidation over the course this legislation sets, and this comes from a gentleman who is a strong defender of our horse tradition in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 586.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWING ASSINIBOINE AND SIOUX TRIBES OF FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION TO ENTER INTO A LEASE OR OTHER TEMPORARY CONVEYANCE OF WATER RIGHTS

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2978) to allow the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation to enter into a lease or other temporary conveyance of water rights recognized under the Fort Peck-Montana Compact for the purpose of meeting the water needs of the Dry Prairie Rural Water Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2978

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

SECTION 1. MONTANA INDIAN TRIBES; AGREEMENT WITH DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation (referred to in this section as the “Tribes”) may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, enter into a lease or other temporary conveyance of water rights recognized under the Fort Peck-Montana Compact (Montana Code Annotated 85-20-201) for the purpose of meeting the water needs of the Dry Prairie Rural Water Association, Incorporated (or any successor entity), in accordance with section 5 of the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-382; 114 Stat. 1454).

(b) CONDITIONS OF LEASE.—With respect to a lease or other temporary conveyance described in subsection (a)—

(1) the term of the lease or conveyance shall not exceed 100 years;

(2) the lease or conveyance may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior without monetary compensation to the Tribes; and

(3) the Secretary of the Interior shall not be subject to liability for any claim or cause of action relating to the compensation or consideration received by the Tribes under the lease or conveyance.

(c) NO PERMANENT ALIENATION OF WATER.—Nothing in this section authorizes any permanent alienation of any water by the Tribes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1415

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

H.R. 2978, introduced by our colleague DENNIS REHBERG of Montana, allows two Fort Peck Indian Reservation Tribes to lease water to nearby non-Indian communities.

In northeastern Montana, water supplies are very scarce. For this reason Congress authorized a rural water supply protection for the Fort Peck Indian Reservation and some of its neighbors a few years ago. As the project is now under construction, water users realize that the underlying law needs to be clarified in order to ensure a water transfer. This bill makes this commonsense clarification on the Federal level. The State Water Commission has already approved the conveyance, and I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, simply put, H.R. 2978 brings much-needed clean drinking water to over 31,000 residents of northeastern Montana. It does so by bringing together the plans of these tribes and the Dry Prairie Rural Water Association to convey water from an area of surplus to an area of need, with no compensation being asked and with full recognition and protection of the tribes’ water rights.

Too often in this body, we are witness to conflicts over resources, and this is especially true for the limited precious water supply that we have. This bill is a welcomed departure from all of that.

Madam Speaker, we strongly support the adoption of H.R. 2978.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2978.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1869) to reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1869

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 “Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) OTHERWISE PROTECTED AREA.—The term “otherwise protected area” has the meaning given the term in section 12 of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3503 note; Public Law 101-591).

(2) PILOT PROJECT.—The term “pilot project” means the digital mapping pilot project authorized under section 6 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 3503 note; Public Law 106-514).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) SYSTEM UNIT.—The term “System unit” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3502).

SEC. 3. DIGITAL MAPPING PILOT PROJECT FINALIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report regarding the digital maps of the System units and otherwise protected areas created under the pilot project.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall prepare the report required under subsection (a)—

(1) in consultation with the Governors of the States in which any System units and otherwise protected areas are located; and

(2) after—

(A) providing an opportunity for the submission of public comments; and

(B) considering any public comments submitted under subparagraph (A).

(c) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall contain—

(1) the final recommended digital maps created under the pilot project;

(2) recommendations for the adoption of the digital maps by Congress;

(3) a summary of the comments received from the Governors of the States, other government officials, and the public regarding the digital maps;

(4) a summary and update of the protocols and findings of the report required under section 6(d) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 3503 note; Public Law 106-514); and

(5) an analysis of any benefits that the public would receive by using digital mapping technology for all System units and otherwise protected areas.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$500,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2007.

SEC. 4. DIGITAL MAPPING PROJECT FOR THE REMAINING JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM UNITS AND OTHERWISE PROTECTED AREAS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out a project to create digital versions of all of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System maps referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)), including maps of otherwise protected areas, that were not included in the pilot project.

(b) **DATA.**—

(1) **USE OF EXISTING DATA.**—To the maximum extent practicable, in carrying out the project under this section, the Secretary shall use any digital spatial data in the possession of Federal, State, and local agencies, including digital orthophotos, color infrared photography, wetlands data, and property parcel data.

(2) **PROVISION OF DATA BY OTHER AGENCIES.**—The head of a Federal agency that possesses any data referred to in paragraph (1) shall, on request of the Secretary, promptly provide the data to the Secretary at no cost.

(3) **PROVISION OF DATA BY NON-FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—State and local agencies and any other non-Federal entities that possess data referred to in paragraph (1) are encouraged, on request of the Secretary, to promptly provide the data to the Secretary at no cost.

(4) **ADDITIONAL DATA.**—If the Secretary determines that any data necessary to carry out the project under this section does not exist, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall enter into an agreement with the Director of the United States Geological Survey under which the United States Geological Survey, in cooperation with the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate, shall obtain and provide to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service the data required to carry out this section.

(5) **DATA STANDARDS.**—All data used or created to carry out this section shall comply with—

(A) the National Spatial Data Infrastructure established by Executive Order No. 12906 (59 Fed. Reg. 17671); and

(B) any other standards established by the Federal Geographic Data Committee established by the Office of Management and Budget circular numbered A-16.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the submission of the report under section 3(a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report regarding the digital maps created under this section.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall prepare the report required under paragraph (1)—

(A) in consultation with the Governors of the States in which the System units and otherwise protected areas are located; and

(B) after—

(i) providing an opportunity for the submission of public comments; and

(ii) considering any public comments submitted under clause (i).

(3) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain—

(A) a description of the extent to which the boundary lines on the digital maps differ from the boundary lines on the original maps;

(B) a summary of the comments received from Governors, other government officials, and the public regarding the digital maps created under this section;

(C) recommendations for the adoption of the digital maps created under this section by Congress;

(D) recommendations for expansion of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System and otherwise protected areas, as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(E) a summary and update on the implementation and use of the digital maps created under the pilot project; and

(F) a description of the feasibility of, and the amount of funding necessary for—

(i) making all of the System unit and otherwise protected area maps available to the public in digital format; and

(ii) facilitating the integration of digital System unit and otherwise protected area boundaries into Federal, State, and local planning tools.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 10 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3510) is amended by striking “2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005” and inserting “2006 through 2010”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. **RADANOVICH**) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. **KIND**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

This legislation, which was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, would extend the authorization of appropriations for the Coastal Barrier Resources Act until September 30, 2010.

This law, first enacted in 1982, governs the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System, which is made up of coastal barrier units delineated on maps adopted by Congress. Today this system is comprised of 856 units and more than 3 million acres of fastland and associated aquatic habitat.

In addition to allowing the Fish and Wildlife Service to continue to administer this vital program, the bill authorizes the digital mapping of the entire coastal barrier system. After more than 20 years of using outdated and

many times inaccurate paper maps, it is time we provided this agency with the money to utilize modern technology.

According to the Department of the Interior, the Coastal Barrier Resources Act has saved the taxpayers in excess of \$1.2 billion. Inclusion of this property within the Coastal Barrier Resources System does not prevent private development of the land, and the Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for advising landowners whether their coastal property is within the boundaries of the system. Due to the nature of the existing maps, Congress has approved several technical corrections to the bills that have restored Federal flood insurance to taxpayers who were unfairly penalized by mapping errors.

I compliment Senator **JAMES INHOFE** for moving this program into the 21st century. I urge adoption of S. 1869.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. **KIND**. Madam Speaker, as described by the previous speaker, this legislation would reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources Act for another 5 years.

The very essence of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System is the series of paper maps that identify every undeveloped coastal barrier land form lying along the coasts of the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes.

In the quarter century that has elapsed since the time these maps were first created, there has been a quantum leap in the development of modern information technologies, especially technologies for utilizing geographic and other spatial data.

This legislation would authorize the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to transition from the current series of paper maps to a new, modern, digital data format. In the end, a digitized database should produce map products at a lower cost that are far more accurate, accessible, and easy to use to the general public.

In order to allow the service to begin this overdue process at the earliest possible date, Fisheries Subcommittee Chairman **WAYNE GILCHREST** and ranking Democratic member on the Fisheries Subcommittee, Congressman **FRANK PALLONE**, and the respective staffs have worked closely with the other body to develop this important piece of legislation.

I commend Mr. **GILCHREST** and Mr. **PALLONE** for their cooperation, and I urge Members to support this non-controversial bill.

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

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

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1869.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2006

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 518) to require the Secretary of the Interior to refine the Department of the Interior program for providing assistance for the conservation of neotropical migratory birds, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 518

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 "Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Improvement Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 2(1) of the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 6101(1)) is amended by inserting "but breed in Canada and the United States" after "the Caribbean".

(b) PURPOSES.—Section 3(2) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6102(2)) is amended by inserting "Canada," after "United States,".

(c) DEFINITION OF CARIBBEAN.—Section 4 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6103) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (5), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) CARIBBEAN.—The term 'Caribbean' includes Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands.";

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following:

"(4) FUND.—The term 'Fund' means the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund established by section 9(a)."

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS TO ENHANCE CONSERVATION IN CANADA.—Section 5(c)(2) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6104(c)(2)) is amended by inserting "Canada," after "the United States,".

(e) COST SHARING.—Section 5(e) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6104(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "25 percent" and inserting "50 percent"; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

"(B) FORM OF PAYMENT.—

"(i) PROJECTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.—The non-Federal share required to be paid for a project carried out in the United States or Canada shall be paid in cash.

"(ii) PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—The non-Federal share required to be paid for a project carried out in Latin America or the Caribbean may be paid in cash or in kind."

(f) ADVISORY GROUP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—Section 7(b)(1) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6106(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The advisory group as a whole shall have expertise in the methods and procedures set forth in section

4(2) in each country and region of the Western Hemisphere".

(2) ENCOURAGEMENT TO CONVENE.—The Secretary of the Interior is encouraged to convene an advisory group under section 7(b)(1) of such Act by not later than 6 months after the effective date of this Act. This paragraph shall not be considered to authorize delay of the schedule previously established by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the submission, judging, and awarding of grants.

(g) REPORT.—Section 8 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6107) is amended by striking "October 1, 2002," and inserting "2 years after the date of the enactment of the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Improvement Act of 2006".

(h) NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6108) is amended by striking so much as precedes subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 9. NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a separate account, which shall be known as the 'Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund'. The Fund shall consist of amounts deposited into the Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

"(b) DEPOSITS INTO THE FUND.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit into the Fund—

"(1) all amounts received by the Secretary in the form of donations under subsection (d); and

"(2) other amounts appropriated to the Fund."

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 9(c)(2) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6108(c)(2)) is amended by striking "\$80,000" and inserting "\$150,000".

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such Act is amended further as follows:

(A) In section 4 (16 U.S.C. 6103), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(1) FUND.—The term 'Fund' means the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund established by section 9(a)."

(B) In section 9(d) (16 U.S.C. 6108(d)), by striking "Account" and inserting "Fund".

(4) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Treasury may transfer to the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund amounts that were in the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Account immediately before the enactment of this Act.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6109) is amended to read as follows:

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before the first sentence;

(2) by striking "\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005" and inserting "for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 the amount specified for that fiscal year in subsection (b)"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) AUTHORIZED AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in subsection (a) is—

"(1) \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007;

"(2) \$5,500,000 for fiscal year 2008;

"(3) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and

"(4) \$6,500,000 for fiscal year 2010.

"(c) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under this section may remain available until expended.

"(d) ALLOCATION.—Of amounts appropriated under this section for each fiscal year, not less than 75 percent shall be expended for projects carried out outside the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation to extend the Secretary of the Interior's authority to approve grants for the conservation of neotropical migratory birds. The Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Account was established in 2000 and has been widely popular.

In fact, the Fish and Wildlife Service, which administers the program, has received 690 grant requests to assist neotropical migratory birds. To date, the service has approved 146 conservation projects in 30 different countries. These projects have cost the Federal Government about \$13.8 million, but they have generated almost \$65 million in private matching funds. This is a remarkable achievement.

This bill would reauthorize the act for 4 years, expand the definition of the Caribbean to include Puerto Rico and all the U.S. Virgin Islands, reduce the matching fund requirement, allow conservation projects to be funded in Canada, and increase the authorization levels from \$5 million to \$6.5 million in fiscal year 2010.

I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 518.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 518, the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Improvement Act of 2006. This important legislation provides a comprehensive approach to addressing the varied and significant threats facing numerous species of migratory birds.

This act was first passed by Congress in 2000 and has a proven track record of reversing habitat loss and degradation. It also has advanced innovative management and habitat restoration strategies for a broad range of neotropical birds. This noncontroversial legislation would make technical and conforming improvements, most notably to broaden its scope to include Canada and adjust non-Federal matching fund requirements.

It is fitting that we are debating this bill on the House floor given that the

International Migratory Bird Day was just celebrated last week on May 12. The International Migratory Bird Day was created in 1993 to focus public attention on the need to protect birds and their habitats. This annual event celebrates one of the most important and spectacular events in the life of a migratory bird: its annual journey between summer and winter homes.

Moreover, last Saturday the Department of Interior announced \$3.9 million in grants for neotropical migratory bird conservation to be provided to 43 conservation partners in 34 States and 17 Latin American and Caribbean countries. These partners will contribute an additional \$17 million in matching funds to undertake projects that include researching, monitoring, and managing migratory bird populations.

Migratory birds contribute to our environmental and economic well-being. Many of these species protect crops and forests by feeding on insect pests. In addition, birds support a significant component of the economy. I know throughout my congressional district, which borders more shoreline along the Mississippi River than any other congressional district in the Nation, bird watching has become a large part of our recreational economy. In fact, the Upper Mississippi River Basin is North America's largest waterfowl migrating route. Each year 40 percent of all waterfowl species pass through the basin during migration. Additionally, nearly 70 million Americans spend more than \$20 billion each year participating in bird-related activities. Birding is the fastest growing outdoor recreational activity in many parts of the country.

Finally, this legislation would provide a very modest increase in funding over 5 years. While I feel more funding is needed given the tremendous track record of the matching funds and private contributions that the partners make to these programs, I believe this legislation is important and the reauthorization needs to move forward. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I also want to personally thank Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL, as well as the Chair and ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. GILCREST and Mr. PALLONE, for their help and effort in the reauthorization process.

Again, I encourage adoption of this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 518, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES CAMPBELL NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE EXPANSION ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1165) to provide for the expansion of the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge, Honolulu County, Hawaii.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1165

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 "James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge Expansion Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service manages the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge for the purpose of promoting the recovery of 4 species of endangered Hawaiian waterbirds;

(2) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service leases approximately 240 acres of high-value wetland habitat (including ponds, marshes, freshwater springs, and adjacent land) and manages the habitat in accordance with the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act (16 U.S.C. 668dd note; Public Law 105-312);

(3) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entered into a contract to purchase in fee title the land described in paragraph (2) from the estate of James Campbell for the purposes of—

(A) permanently protecting the endangered species habitat; and

(B) improving the management of the Refuge;

(4) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has identified for inclusion in the Refuge approximately 800 acres of additional high-value wildlife habitat adjacent to the Refuge that are owned by the estate of James Campbell;

(5) the land of the estate of James Campbell on the Kahuku Coast features coastal dunes, coastal wetlands, and coastal strand that promote biological diversity for threatened and endangered species, including—

(A) the 4 species of endangered Hawaiian waterbirds described in paragraph (1);

(B) migratory shorebirds;

(C) waterfowl;

(D) seabirds;

(E) endangered and native plant species;

(F) endangered monk seals; and

(G) green sea turtles;

(6) because of extensive coastal development, habitats of the type within the Refuge are increasingly rare on the Hawaiian islands;

(7) expanding the Refuge will provide increased opportunities for wildlife-dependent public uses, including wildlife observation, photography, and environmental education and interpretation; and

(8) acquisition of the land described in paragraph (4)—

(A) will create a single, large, manageable, and ecologically-intact unit that includes sufficient buffer land to reduce impacts on the Refuge; and

(B) is necessary to reduce flood damage following heavy rainfall to residences, businesses, and public buildings in the town of Kahuku.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(2) REFUGE.—The term "Refuge" means the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge established pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. EXPANSION OF REFUGE.

(a) EXPANSION.—The boundary of the Refuge is expanded to include the approximately 1,100 acres of land (including any water and interest in the land) depicted on the map entitled "James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge—Expansion" dated October 20, 2005, and on file in the office of the Director.

(b) BOUNDARY REVISIONS.—The Secretary may make such minor modifications to the boundary of the Refuge as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to—

(1) achieve the goals of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to the Refuge; or

(2) facilitate the acquisition of property within the Refuge.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The map described in subsection (a) shall remain available for inspection in an appropriate office of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) NOTICE.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and any publication of local circulation in the area of the Refuge notice of the availability of the map.

SEC. 5. ACQUISITION OF LAND AND WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriated funds, the Secretary may acquire the land described in section 4(a).

(b) INCLUSION.—Any land, water, or interest acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall—

(1) become part of the Refuge; and

(2) be administered in accordance with applicable law.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to urge the adoption of S. 1165, introduced by Senator DANIEL INOUE. This bill is virtually identical to H.R. 2866, sponsored by our distinguished Resources Committee colleague, Congressman NEIL ABERCROMBIE.

This bill would increase the size of the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge on the Island of Oahu by up to 800 acres of land. This refuge, which

was created in 1976, provides essential wetland habitat for some 75 endangered plants and animals including four species of highly imperiled waterbirds. The birds depend on the protection of the James Campbell Refuge for their survival.

The sole owner of the property is the James Campbell Estate, and their legal representative testified that the estate is a willing seller of this property for inclusion within the refuge. The timing of this transaction is critical because the James Campbell Trust, which was created over 100 years ago, terminates on January 20, 2007. By acquiring this property, the two noncontiguous existing parts of the refuge will be connected. Historical wetland habitat will be restored and a new protected flyway will be created, and the Army Corps of Engineers will have the opportunity to provide some badly needed flood protection for a neighboring community. This refuge expansion will also conserve the last remaining large coastal dune ecosystem on Oahu, preserve native strand plants and protect threatened coastal wildlife including sea turtles, migratory shorebirds, and Hawaiian monk seals.

I urge an "aye" on S. 1165.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, as described by my good friend from California, this noncontroversial legislation would authorize the expansion of the existing James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge, located on the north shore of the Island of Oahu in the State of Hawaii.

Members should also be aware that this legislation would accomplish other important conservation objectives such as wetland restoration, local flood protection, and the preservation of beach habitat for threatened and endangered species, especially green sea turtles and monk seals.

S. 1165 is virtually identical to H.R. 2866, companion legislation introduced in the House by my colleague from Hawaii, Congressman NEIL ABERCROMBIE.

In order to allow the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to proceed with these acquisitions at the earliest possible date, Mr. ABERCROMBIE has agreed to move this bill, passed by the other body, in order to expedite its passage by the Congress and the signing by the President.

□ 1430

I commend the gentleman from Hawaii for his vision and foresight in developing this thoughtful conservation legislation, and I urge Members to support this noncontroversial bill.

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of passage of S. 1165, the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge Expansion Act of 2005. I reintroduced the House

version of this bill (H.R. 2866) with my colleague, Congressman NEIL ABERCROMBIE.

S. 1165 expands the authorized boundary of the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge in Honolulu, Hawaii, to include approximately 1,100 acres of land. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, USFWS, has managed the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge in Kahuku, Hawaii, for the past 30 years to protect four endangered Hawaiian water birds—the Hawaiian stilt (ae'o), the Hawaiian moorhen ('alae 'ula), the Hawaiian coot ('alae ke'oke'o), and the Hawaiian duck (koloa maoli)—and at least 25 different North American migratory birds. In 2005, USFWS acquired fee title to the 240-acre refuge located in two separate parcels. The expansion area will allow for acquisition of adjacent land to create a single, large, manageable, and ecologically intact unit that includes sufficient buffer land to reduce impacts on the Refuge. The acquisition will also facilitate a solution to area flooding problems.

The expanded acreage would allow for restoration of critical wetland habitat, which would form the largest managed freshwater wetland on Oahu. It would connect the two existing units and create a protected corridor between them to provide essential habitat for four endangered waterbird species and migratory waterbirds. It would also protect the last remaining large-scale and intact coastal dune ecosystem on Oahu and preserve native strand plants and protect coastal wildlife such as threatened green sea turtles, seabirds, migratory shorebirds, and possibly the endangered Hawaiian monk seal. Support facilities could be constructed on upland areas to support environmental education and interpretation programs, visitor services, and habitat management programs. All land proposed for purchase is owned by the Estate of James Campbell, a willing seller.

Heavy floods occur frequently in this area, devastating residents who live in the adjacent town of Kahuku. Because of the location and natural function of this floodplain, the land acquisition also serves as the crucial component for the proposed Kahuku flood control project by preserving the floodwater retention of these wetlands and providing an area where flood control design can be made more efficient.

This habitat restoration proposal represents the most significant wetland enhancement project ever undertaken in Hawaii. By combining effective wetland restoration, endangered species conservation, environmental education, visitor opportunities, and flood control, benefits provided will serve not only the local communities, but also Hawai'i residents and visitors for generations to come.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, thank you for considering S. 1165 on the floor today. By authorizing the expansion of the James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge, NWR, we are protecting endangered and migratory birds from the effects of an increasingly urban island.

Located on the northern end of the island of Oahu, the Campbell NWR is the premier recovery area on the island for all four endangered Hawaiian waterbirds. The refuge consists of approximately 241 acres of naturally occurring, spring-fed marsh and manmade ponds in two separate parcels. Although the refuge was established specifically to benefit the endangered Hawaiian stilt (ae'o), coot ('alae ke'oke'o), moorhen ('alae 'ula), and duck (koloa maoli), it also provides essential

habitat for at least 25 species of wintering migratory birds coming from as far away as Alaska, New Zealand, and Asia.

The expansion proposed by S. 1165 would connect these two parcels, providing a protected flyway and essential habitat. The expansion would also incorporate significant coastal property and preserve the last remaining large scale sand dune ecosystem. This boundary enlargement will preserve native strand species as well as coastal wildlife such as threatened green sea turtles, seabirds, migratory shorebirds and possibly the threatened Hawaiian monk seal.

As a dual benefit, this expansion would also help protect the neighboring town of Kahuku from devastating floods. The refuge expansion serves as an important component of the Kahuku flood control project by increasing drainage capacity and preserving the floodwater retention of these protected wetlands. In turn, the flood mitigation project could potentially enhance the wetland area to ensure maximum production and survival of endangered Hawaiian waterbird populations. The importance of this added benefit has been made clear as recent rains in Hawaii have flooded the town of Kahuku along with its schools and homes.

The Campbell NWR is a haven to endangered and migratory birds. Its expansion would further the goals of the refuge and the Refuge System while helping to protect an adjacent town from intermittent flooding.

I would also like to thank Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL for their support and efforts in addressing this issue. I respectfully request my colleagues to support this measure and its intent to protect the wildlife on the north shore of Oahu.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1165.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH HARTWELL MASON
NECK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3682) to redesignate the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia as the Elizabeth Hartwell Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3682

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

SECTION 1. ELIZABETH HARTWELL MASON NECK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia, is hereby redesignated and shall be known as the

"Elizabeth Hartwell Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Elizabeth Hartwell Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3682 was introduced by two of our distinguished Virginia colleagues, TOM DAVIS and FRANK WOLF. This measure would rename the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge after Mrs. Elizabeth Hartwell. While I never had the opportunity to meet this remarkable woman, there seems to be no debate that she dedicated her life to conservation.

After nearly 20 years of tireless work to stop the destruction of the Mason Neck Peninsula, Mrs. Hartwell and her supporters were successful in their efforts to create the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge.

This refuge, which was the first established to protect the American bald eagle, has grown to 2,277 acres of land. In addition to one of the largest concentrations of bald eagles in the lower 48 States, Mason Neck is home to the largest great blue heron rookery in the mid-Atlantic region and more than 200 species of birds, 41 species of reptiles and amphibians, and 31 species of mammals.

I am sure the authors of this legislation will attest that this refuge would not exist had it not been for Mrs. Elizabeth Hartwell. Despite powerful and well-financed opponents, she was successful because she lived her life committed to the philosophy of one of our Nation's greatest conservationists, Theodore Roosevelt, who reminds us that "it is not what we have that makes us a great Nation; it is the way in which we use it."

This legislation proposes a fitting tribute to someone who was affectionately called the "Eagle Lady."

I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 3682.

Madam Speaker, I reserve balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we have no objection to this legislation that would re-

name the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge to honor the late Elizabeth Hartwell, a local conservationist who dedicated much of her life to protecting this refuge located along the Potomac River.

I encourage my colleagues to support the name change.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I am honored today to speak today in support of H.R. 3682, a bill to rename the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge after Elizabeth Hartwell.

For almost 20 years, Mrs. Hartwell spearheaded efforts to protect the Mason Neck area. Her efforts led to the establishment of the 2,300-acre Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge, the 1,800-acre Mason Neck State Park, and the 1,000-acre Pohick Bay Regional Park.

Mrs. Hartwell began her environmental crusade in February 1965 when she learned about a rezoning application in Fairfax County for the development of a satellite city of 20,000 people on the most ecologically sensitive area of Mason Neck. She decided to lead an effort to stop this development and to preserve Mason Neck habitat for the endangered American bald eagle.

During the ensuing weeks and months, she organized a watchdog group called the Conservation Committee For Mason Neck. She made films of the wildlife that thrived there to show other civic organizations around the region. Mrs. Hartwell even gave tours by boat along Mason Neck's waterways and enlisted the support of several environmental organizations at the local, regional, State, and Federal levels.

The Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge was established in 1969 for the protection of nesting, feeding, and roosting habitat for bald eagles. It was the first Federal refuge established specifically for the then-endangered bald eagle. Today, there are multiple nests on the refuge and on neighboring public and private lands.

I am pleased to support the effort of several Mason Neck area homeowners associations to rename the Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge in honor of Mrs. Hartwell, who passed away on December 14, 2000. She dedicated her life to nature and to helping the environment, and it would be a fitting tribute to rename the Mason Neck Refuge after the woman who fought so valiantly for its creation.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I too have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3682.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 788) supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 788

Whereas the well-being of all people of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 870,000 law enforcement personnel in the United States serve their fellow citizens as guardians of peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front line in preserving the right of the children of the United States to receive an education in a crime-free environment, a right that is all too often threatened by the insidious fear caused by violence in schools;

Whereas 155 peace officers across the Nation were killed in the line of duty during 2005, well below the decade-long average of 164 deaths annually, and a major drop from 2001 when 237 officers were killed, including 72 officers in the September 11th terrorist attacks;

Whereas a law enforcement officer is killed in the United States every 53 hours, and there are 56,000 assaults against our law enforcement officers each year, resulting in 16,000 injuries;

Whereas section 136 of title 36, United States Code, requests that the President issue an annual proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day in honor of Federal, State, and local officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

Whereas on May 15, 2006, more than 20,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, D.C. to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who have fallen before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. 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 the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, each day, law enforcement officers in this country face grave danger as they protect the rights and freedoms we enjoy as Americans. Their commitment and sacrifice make our streets safer, our neighborhoods stronger, and our families more secure.

May 15 is set aside each year to honor the service and sacrifice of America's law enforcement officers and their families. It also promotes increased public support for the law enforcement profession and helps to promote law enforcement safety. The more than 850,000 men and women who guard our communities do so at great risk. Each year, one in 15 officers is assaulted, one in 46 is injured, and one in 5,255 is killed in the line of duty.

After the hijacked planes hit the World Trade Center in New York City on 9/11, 72 peace officers died while trying to ensure their fellow citizens got to safety. That act of terrorism resulted in the highest number of peace officers killed in a single incident in the history of this country.

Just 8 days ago, the tragedy of an officer killed in the line of duty struck my community in Fairfax County. Police officer Vicky Arnel was killed and two officers were wounded after a gunman opened fire with high-powered weapons in the parking lot of a Chantilly police station during a shift change. These tragic events shook the community, and the Fairfax police force, to the core.

It is important to recognize the sacrifices that these officers and their families make each day to ensure that we will have a safe environment in which to live, work, and raise our families. National Peace Officers Memorial Day will provide the people of the United States with an opportunity to honor the extraordinary service and sacrifice given year after year by our police forces.

The annual ceremony, which was held the evening of May 13, featured several contributions from police officers all over the country, including the singing of the National Anthem by Fairfax County, Virginia, police officer Laura Zambron. Following the ceremony, prominent law enforcement leaders, survivors, and law enforcement supporters read the names of the 466 fallen officers whose names were officially added to the memorial.

I urge all Members to come together to honor the dedication of these brave men and women, like Detective Arnel, by adopting House Resolution 788.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, each day, peace officers nobly protect our families, friends, and neighbors from crime and work to improve the quality of life for all of us.

For that, they deserve our sincere appreciation and respect.

While it is impossible to suitably thank these brave Americans for the tremendous sacrifices they make, we pause this week to salute them for their courage, dedication, and service and to pay our respects to those who have fallen in the line of duty.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 of every year as Peace Officers Memorial Day. This day was set forth to give special recognition to the brave men and women who protect our lives every day, often at great risk to their health and lives.

On average, a crime is committed in this country every 2 seconds, and you can rest assured that one of the nearly 800,000 law enforcement officers in this great country will respond promptly and courageously, no matter how dangerous the situation might be. It is appropriate that we both honor current peace officers and memorialize fallen heroes for the safety and assistance they provide us all.

Recent events just miles from this building in Fairfax, Virginia, offered a clear and present example of the dangers law enforcement officers face each day. In this past year alone, 155 law officers were killed and over 10,000 were assaulted in the line of duty as they protected and served their communities. While this number is down from the previous decade's average of 169 annually, it is still very unacceptable.

This week, thousands of law enforcement officers from around the country gathered in Washington, D.C., to pay tribute and to mourn together. Those of us who benefit from their hard work and sacrifice also honor their work and sacrifices. We all owe them a debt of gratitude that we can never repay.

Madam Speaker, I support the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day, as I am sure every Member of the House does, to honor Federal, State and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and I support this day to honor those who stand for us every day in the line of duty. I call upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect, wherever they are.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the author of this resolution.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this to the floor today. This is something we don't have to sell.

Madam Speaker, I rise, as the chairman and ranking member have to honor more than 20,000 peace officers from around the Nation who are visiting Washington, D.C., this week in honor of Peace Officers Memorial Day and National Police Week. These officers will commemorate the lives of 155

officers who died last year in the line of duty.

Today, we recognize May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day and pay tribute to the commitment, sacrifice, and public safety and the services these officers provide for all Americans on a daily basis.

As we all know, September 11 stands out as one of the most tragic days in American history. We lost 72 police officers on that one day. That is the most on any single day in history. While that was unusual and an extreme example, these law enforcement officers are serving us and sacrificing and protecting us, showing heroism and valor every day in every community around the Nation.

Last year, as I said, 155 police officers were killed in the line of duty. Though unquestionably this is tragic, the 155 deaths were below the decade-long average of 163. Still, this is the second consecutive year that the numbers have increased and a trend that must come to an end in 2006, and thankfully is on track to do so far.

Peace officers in every community have an admirable record of service and sacrifice, yet too many Americans lack a true understanding and appreciation of law enforcement's worth. This is why several years ago I participated in establishing the National Law Enforcement Museum in Washington, D.C. This past Saturday, 466 names of brave men and women were officially added to the memorial, including seven from my own home State of Colorado.

Peace officers face unprecedented risks, while bravely protecting our communities and our freedoms, and I hope my colleagues will join me today in paying tribute to our Nation's fallen officers and expressing our gratitude for the work these men and women do for us every day.

□ 1445

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague from the District for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I do rise in support of this resolution which is supporting the goals and the ideals of the Peace Officers Memorial.

Madam Speaker, as a former prosecutor and special prosecutor in the State of Wisconsin, it was my honor, or privilege really, of being able to work each day with these law enforcement officers in our community and throughout the State. I have always been impressed with their dedication and professionalism, their commitment to the community.

These men and women in uniform wake up every morning with a shared goal of trying to make our communities just a little bit safer, trying to make us and our children and grandchildren and all of our families just a little bit safer during the day.

And all too often we hear the tragic stories or read about it or see on the

news of fallen officers who fell in the line of duty. And it is right and proper that we have a National Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor their sacrifice made on behalf of all of us.

But what we do not hear about is the tremendous courage and dedication that officers exhibit each and every day and the cases that they sometimes find themselves in, which places their life and safety in great danger. And this, unfortunately, occurs on an all too frequent basis.

Madam Speaker, I also want to just take a moment and commend a member of my own family, my youngest brother, Terry Kind, for his years of dedicated service as a police officer for the Town of Holmen Police Department in western Wisconsin.

I have the chance to talk to him from time to time to try to keep a foot in the law enforcement community back home. And sometimes the stories that he relates to me are blood-curdling and quite startling. Not only talking about the victims of crime, but also the incredible danger that our officers face from time to time.

Madam Speaker, I would encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution today. I want to commend my colleagues on the floor here for bringing this resolution forward and speaking so favorably about it. I also want to commend and thank those law enforcement officers across our country who do a tremendous job under very difficult and dangerous circumstances each and every day of their dedicated lives.

Mr. CANTOR, Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution to support the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Recently, Virginia lost Detective Vicky Armel with the Fairfax County Police Department. Our Nation and the Commonwealth of Virginia experienced great loss as this fine police officer gave her life in line of duty.

Law enforcement officers take a solemn oath to protect and serve the communities they serve. With honor, they uphold our laws and protect the innocent.

As a nine-year veteran of the force, Detective Armel specialized in burglary crimes. She worked tirelessly each day to investigate and bring to justice those criminals who violated our homes, property, and peace of mind.

Her loss is felt deeply by her husband, Tyler, who is also a proud member of the Fairfax County Police Department, and their two children, 4-year-old daughter Mason and 7-year-old son Thomas. I stand with Detective Armel's community and congregation in support of her family.

Detective Armel's dedication and the sacrifices she made symbolize the honor of the law enforcement profession. Our thoughts and prayers are with her family, friends, and the community in which she served as we honor her passing on this Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Recently, Virginia lost Officer Gary J. Buro of the Chesterfield County Police Department. Our Nation and the Commonwealth of Virginia experienced great loss as this fine police officer gave his life in line of duty.

Law enforcement officers take a solemn oath to protect and serve the communities they serve. With honor, they uphold our laws and protect the innocent.

Officer Buro proudly served his Nation at home and abroad. As a U.S. Marine during the Gulf War, he defended our Constitution and fought to liberate Kuwait from Saddam Hussein's grasp. After returning home, he began a distinguished 11-year career in law enforcement. He served with the Lantana, Florida and New York City Police Departments. Only recently, Officer Buro brought his experience and dedication to Virginia and joined the Chesterfield County Police Department in January of this year.

Officer Buro's dedication and the sacrifices he made symbolize the honor of the law enforcement profession. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and the community in which he served as we honor his passing on this Peace Officers Memorial Day.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and urge Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 788.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 788.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4217

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4217.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICAN BALLET THEATRE

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res 751) recognizing the cultural and educational contributions of American Ballet Theatre throughout its 65 years of service as "America's National Ballet Company".

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 751

Whereas American Ballet Theatre (ABT) is recognized as one of the world's great dance companies;

Whereas ABT is dedicated to bringing dance to America and American dance to the world;

Whereas over its 65-year history, ABT has appeared in all 50 States of the United States, in a total of 126 cities, and has performed for more than 600,000 people annually;

Whereas ABT has performed in 42 countries as perhaps the most representative American ballet company, with many of those engagements sponsored by the Department of State;

Whereas ABT has been home to the world's most accomplished dancers and has commissioned works by all of the great choreographic geniuses of the 20th century;

Whereas Dwight D. Eisenhower recognized ABT's ability to convey through the medium of ballet "some measure of understanding of America's cultural environment and inspiration";

Whereas over the years ABT has performed repeatedly at the White House, most recently in December 2005;

Whereas ABT is committed to bringing dance to a broad audience and provides exposure to dance to more than 20,000 underprivileged children and their families each year;

Whereas ABT's award-winning Make a Ballet program and its other outreach initiatives help to meet the need for arts education in underserved schools and communities;

Whereas ABT's Studio Company brings world class ballet to smaller communities like Rochester, New York; Stamford, Connecticut; Sanibel, Florida; South Hadley, Massachusetts; and Winston-Salem, North Carolina; and

Whereas The Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis School at ABT and the ABT's other artistic development initiatives provide the highest quality training consistent with the professional standards of ABT: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and commends American Ballet Theatre for over 65 years of service as "America's National Ballet Company", during which it has provided world class art to citizens in all 50 States;

(2) recognizes that American Ballet Theatre also serves as a true cultural ambassador for our Nation, by having performed in 42 countries and fulfilling its reputation as one of the world's most revered and innovative dance companies; and

(3) recognizes that American Ballet Theatre's extensive and innovative education, outreach, and artistic development programs both train future generations of great dancers and expose students to the arts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHL) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous information on H. Res. 751.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in support of House Resolution 751, recognizing the cultural and educational contributions of American Ballet Theatre throughout its 65 years of service as "America's National Ballet Company."

When the American Ballet Theatre began, it inspired to develop a repertoire of the best ballets from the past, and to encourage the creation of new works by gifted young choreographers, whenever they might be found. Since then it has continued to be dedicated to bringing dance to America and American dance to the world.

I would say it has succeeded. Today the American Ballet Theatre is recognized as one of the great dance companies of the world, and throughout its 65-year history, the American Ballet Theatre has appeared in 50 U.S. States, in a total of 126 cities around the world, and has performed for more than 600,000 people annually.

America's National Ballet Company has also made 15 international tours to 42 countries, and has been sponsored by the U.S. Department of State on many of these engagements.

It was also the first American company to dance in the Soviet Union. Additionally the theatre has commissioned works by all of the great choreographic geniuses of the 20th century and many of the world's most accomplished dancers, including Mikhail Baryshnikov, have called the American Ballet Theatre home.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, I would like to emphasize the many enrichment programs the American Ballet Theatre offers for families, for training young and future dancers, and for the public and private schools.

I would specifically like to point out the work that the American Ballet Theatre has done to expose more than 20,000 underprivileged families and children in the fine art of dance, as well as introducing such children to career opportunities in the arts, both on stage and back stage, while also helping students develop valuable life skills.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and fellow New Yorker, Mrs. MALONEY, for introducing this resolution. I am happy to join my colleagues in recognizing the accomplishments and contributions of America's National Ballet Company, the American Ballet Theatre, and ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 751, recognizing the cultural and educational contributions of the American Ballet Theatre throughout its 65 years of service as America's National Ballet Company.

Madam Speaker, I also want to applaud Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY for her leadership in sponsoring this resolution. Unfortunately, due to illness, it prevents her from being here on the House floor today to speak about it.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 751 recognizes the anniversary of one of the finest and most distinguished ballet companies in the world, the American Ballet Theatre. The ABT is recognized as a living national treasure. Using dance as its medium, the American Ballet Theatre has brought joy to audiences here and abroad for over 40 years.

Equally important to the ABT has been its educational programs. Not only have they trained world class ballerinas, but ABT brings its art into the classroom by sponsoring dance programs in public schools across the country.

The Young People's Ballet Workshop offers students who would not ordinarily have the opportunity to experience the ballet to see the company perform and learn about the art of ballet. Again, I join my colleagues here today, and especially Congresswoman MALONEY, in supporting this resolution and congratulate the American Ballet Theatre on its 65th anniversary.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 751 to honor the American Ballet Theatre. For 65 years, the theatre has entertained and educated thousands, becoming a national cultural icon as "America's National Ballet Company."

The American Ballet Theatre has performed in all 50 states inspiring and thrilling Americans with their skilled artistry. The company has also served as America's cultural ambassador by bringing American dance to more than 42 countries, often as representatives of the State Department.

Yet beyond being one of the world's truly great ballet companies, the American Ballet Theatre has also excelled off the stage in its remarkable education efforts. Throughout its history, the company has brought classical dance to communities not typically able to experience world-class ballet and to students throughout the country. The theater has created some of the most innovative educational programs dealing with the arts, including the Make a Ballet program, empowering at-risk students by giving them the resources and confidence to produce and stage their very own ballet.

In my community, the American Ballet Theatre has also been a giving and vital artistic institution, providing Rochester-area residents rare performances and indispensable educational opportunities. In 2004, the company presented an extraordinary internationally-themed program at New Auditorium Theatre in Rochester, giving audience members the unique chance to see up close famed performers and dance styles from throughout the world. The American Ballet Theatre also offered a class—taught by the former theater dancer and artistic director John Meehan—giving local dance students the opportunity to learn and perform alongside up-and-coming ABT dancers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 751 to celebrate and honor an important cultural icon of America, the American Ballet Theatre.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 751, recognizing the cultural and educational contributions of American Ballet Theatre.

For 65 years American Ballet Theatre has educated and inspired us through their artistry

and commitment to bringing dance to America and American dance to the world.

While ABT is truly a national company and has performed for countless people in all 50 states and 42 countries, I want to speak today about the special relationship between American Ballet Theatre and the city of New York.

In my district we have been the beneficiaries of six decades of American Ballet Theatre's world-class art. Next week, ABT will open their annual engagement at the Metropolitan Opera House, performing their renowned mix of great ballet classics and challenging new works.

These performances are a primary reason that American Ballet Theatre is universally regarded as one of the world's great ballet companies. From the scale of the productions to the artistry of the dancers, ABT's performances are truly something to behold and I encourage my colleagues to see one of their engagements at the Kennedy Center, in New York City, or in your home state.

ABT's importance to my city transcends these annual performances at the Met, however. Every year the company performs a second series at smaller venues in New York, allowing ballet fans the unique opportunity to watch many of the world's greatest dancers in an intimate setting and enhancing New York's status as one of the world's cultural capitals.

Beyond their performances, American Ballet Theatre's educational mission and their focus on bringing ballet and the classic arts to audiences that otherwise would not have access is truly special. For over 10 years, ABT has offered extensive outreach and in-school arts programming in public schools, completely free of charge. ABT focuses its efforts in underserved communities and "at-risk" schools in New York, bringing the arts to schools that suffer from budgetary cuts to arts programming, and they reach over 20,000 New York students each year. During the 2006 spring season at the Metropolitan Opera House, ABT will distribute 10,000 complimentary tickets to New York students who would not otherwise have access to ABT's incredible artistic resources.

American Ballet Theatre truly is an American treasure, and should be recognized for enriching the cultural landscape of New York and our country. I want to thank my cosponsors and the leadership of both parties for bringing this resolution to the floor. And again, I encourage all of my colleagues to experience the talent and artistry of American Ballet Theatre.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 751.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

CALLING ON GOVERNMENT OF UNITED KINGDOM TO ESTABLISH INQUIRY INTO MURDER OF NORTHERN IRELAND DEFENSE ATTORNEY PAT FINUCANE

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 740) calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Pat Finucane, as recommended by international Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park agreement and a way forward for the Northern Ireland Peace Process, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 740

Whereas human rights defense attorney and solicitor Patrick Finucane was brutally murdered in front of his wife and children at his home in Belfast on February 12, 1989;

Whereas many international bodies and nongovernmental human rights organizations, including Amnesty International, British Irish Rights Watch, the Committee for the Administration of Justice, and Human Rights First, have called attention to serious allegations of collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces in the murder of Mr. Finucane;

Whereas in July 2001 the Governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom under terms of the Weston Park Agreement appointed retired Canadian Judge Peter Cory to investigate the allegations of collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces in the murder of Mr. Finucane and other individuals;

Whereas Judge Cory reported to the Governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom in April 2004 that sufficient evidence of collusion existed to warrant a public independent, judicial inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane and recommended that a public inquiry take place without delay;

Whereas the Government of the United Kingdom in April 2005 adopted the Inquiries Act 2005 which empowers the Government to block scrutiny of state actions and limits independent action by the judiciary in inquiries held under its terms, and, after the enactment of this legislation establishing new limited inquiry procedures, the Government announced that an inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane would be established which would operate under terms of the new legislation;

Whereas Judge Cory, in a written statement presented to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives in 2005, stated that his 2004 recommendation for a public inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane had "contemplated a true public inquiry constituted and acting pursuant to the provisions of the 1921 Act" (the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act 1921), and also stated that "it seems to me that the proposed new Act would make a meaningful inquiry impossible";

Whereas the family of Mr. Finucane has rejected the limited authority of an inquiry conducted under terms of the Inquiries Act of 2005;

Whereas Amnesty International, British Irish Rights Watch, the Committee for the Administration of Justice, and Human Rights First have likewise rejected any proposed inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane established under procedures of the

Inquiries Act of 2005 and have called for the repeal of the Act;

Whereas the Dial Eireann (Parliament of Ireland) adopted a resolution on March 8, 2006, calling for the establishment of a full public independent judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane; and

Whereas the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-228) and House Resolution 128 (April 20, 1999) support the establishment of a public independent judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses to the family of Patrick Finucane deepest condolences on his death, commends their steadfast pursuit of justice in his brutal murder, and thanks his wife Geraldine and son Michael for their willingness to testify on this matter before committees of the House of Representatives on numerous occasions;

(2) supports the efforts of the Administration in seeking the full implementation of the Weston Park Agreement and the establishment of an independent judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane;

(3) calls on the Government of the United Kingdom to reconsider its position on the matter of an inquiry into the murder of Mr. Finucane, to amend the Inquiries Act of 2005, and to take fully into account the objections of Judge Cory, objections raised by officials of the United States Government, other governments, and international bodies, and the objections raised by Mr. Finucane's family; and

(4) urges the Government of the United Kingdom immediately to establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane which would enjoy the full cooperation and support of his family, the people of Northern Ireland, and the international community as recommended by Judge Cory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 740. I thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership on human rights matters worldwide and for offering this important legislation regarding human rights in Northern Ireland.

Last month, on April 4, 2006, we voted nearly unanimously, 399-1, for H. Res. 744, that important resolution sponsored by the chairman of the House International Relations Committee, HENRY HYDE, expressed our support for the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 as the blueprint for lasting peace in Northern Ireland, and support for con-

tinued police reforms in Northern Ireland as a critical element in the peace process.

U.S. support was crucial to the signing of the Good Friday Agreement signed 8 years ago, and our support continues to be vital. H. Res. 744 rightly commended the progress which has been made in Northern Ireland. As a result of the Good Friday Agreement, there is a new Police Service of Northern Ireland, PSNI. Under the leadership of Chief Constable Hugh S. Orde, the PSNI has made giant strides toward fair and nonsectarian policing. There is a vigorous and fiercely independent Police Ombudsman's Office, whose chief, Nuala O'Loane, has been a catalyst for reform. There is now a policing board in Northern Ireland composed of independent and party representatives designed to provide civilian control and fair nonsectarian policing. There is a new historical inquiries team established by Chief Constable Orde which will provide a thorough and independent examination of unresolved deaths that occurred in connection with the Troubles from 1968 to 1989.

But H. Res. 740, which we shall vote on today, is the indispensable companion of Mr. HYDE's H. Res. 744. Even with all the improvements I have noted in policing, Madam Speaker, significant further work remains to be done in order to ensure acceptance by all communities of the Police Service in Northern Ireland. A key stumbling block to that greater acceptance has been the lack of resolution of charges of official collusion in the murder of human rights lawyer Patrick Finucane, who was gunned down in front of his home in front of his wife and three small children in 1989.

Pat Finucane was not only a courageous human rights activist and loving father and husband, he is also a symbol of the horrible culture of official collusion and terrorism and crime in Northern Ireland. Resolving the question surrounding his murder will help to put an end to that culture once and for all and allow Northern Ireland's still fragile peace to flourish in a new atmosphere of trust.

We have twice gone on record supporting establishment of a public independent judicial inquiry into the murder of Pat Finucane. In 1999, we adopted House Resolution 128 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) which condemned the murder of attorney Rosemary Nelson and requested a public inquiry into the Finucane murder.

In 2003, Congress passed and the President signed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, which included a provision offered by the gentleman from New Jersey supporting public judicial inquiries into the murders of both Rosemary Nelson and Patrick Finucane. We have moved the issue towards resolution, but we are not there yet.

In 2001, the British and Irish governments jointly appointed Judge Peter

Cory, a preeminent retired justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, to determine whether independent commissions should investigate possible state-sponsored collusion in six notorious and horrific murders. They also pledged to abide by his recommendations. In 2004, Judge Cory issued his report, yet the British Government still has not appointed an inquiry commission into the murder of Patrick Finucane. Our colleague, CHRIS SMITH, who could not be here today as he attends the funeral of Congressman Sonny Montgomery, has chaired numerous hearings on human rights and police reform in Northern Ireland since 1997, and in every one the issue of state-sponsored collusion in the Finucane murder has been central, yet still nothing has been done.

On March 8, the Irish Parliament passed an all-part motion fully supported by the Irish Government calling on the U.K. to immediately establish "a full independent public judicial inquiry into the murder of Pat Finucane as recommended by Judge Cory, which would enjoy the full cooperation of the family and the wider community throughout Ireland and abroad."

The U.K. Government must find a way to institute a credible inquiry which would be accepted by all: by Judge Cory, the Irish public, by the world community, and, most of all, by the Finucane family. I commend my colleagues CHRIS SMITH, ELTON GALLEGLY, PETER KING, JIM WALSH, RICHARD NEAL, DON PAYNE, and TOM LANTOS for their work on this issue.

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

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 740 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I too would like to thank Chairman SMITH for introducing this important resolution. Congressman SMITH has been a tireless advocate in calling for full accountability in Northern Ireland, particularly as it relates to the 1989 slaying of Belfast attorney Patrick Finucane. I commend him for his dedication and determination to seek justice in this case along with the Finucane family, which has waited far too long for the truth to be unveiled.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution on the floor today simply calls on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full independent public judicial inquiry into the murder of Pat Finucane as recommended by Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park Agreement.

The fact remains that Mr. Finucane's brutal murder has been unresolved for 17 years. To this end, it is critical that the British Government fulfill its commitment to the Weston Park Agreement and agree to hold an independent public inquiry recognized as credible by the international community, the affected family, the Irish Government, the United States Congress that will shed light on the serious allegations of

collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces in this egregious murder.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday Northern Ireland's legislature met for the first time in 3½ years. I applaud this development that will hopefully lead to greater compromise and cooperation between Protestants and Catholics. The convening of the assembly along with the relevant tranquility and economic success that people of Northern Ireland have experienced since the signing of the Belfast agreement is deeply encouraging. However, issues at the core of the conflict remain unresolved, ultimately holding back lasting reconciliation. At the heart of this impasse are the public inquiries into high-profile murders in Northern Ireland, including the slaying of Mr. Finucane. The resolution before us states unequivocally Congress's interest as well as that of the United States to see a just, swift, and fair resolution to this unconscionable crime which must be resolved in order to ensure long-term peace and stability in Northern Ireland for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 740 which calls on the government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, public judicial inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane. I would also like to commend CHRIS SMITH, the Chair of the Human Rights Subcommittee and the sponsor of this resolution, for his consistent attention to this tragic case.

On February 12, 1989, human rights defense attorney and solicitor Patrick Finucane was brutally murdered in front of his wife and children at his home in Belfast on February 12, 1989. There have been serious allegations of collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces in the murder of Mr. Finucane.

In July 2001, the Irish and British Governments made new commitments in the Weston Park Agreement to hold public inquiries into high profile murders if so recommended by former Canadian Supreme Court Judge Peter Cory. Indeed, Judge Cory found sufficient evidence of collusion to warrant a public inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane.

It was clearly understood that such an inquiry would be held under the United Kingdom Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act 1921, which would provide a fair procedure for the discovery of evidence and other matters. Yet, despite widespread criticism, the British government is attempting to set up a restricted inquiry under the controversial 2005 Inquiries Act, which gives control to a government minister rather than an independent tribunal. This would give the minister the power to decide what information is kept secret or excluded, to end the inquiry at any time, and to edit the inquiry's final report.

The Inquiries Act has been rejected as inadequate by Judge Cory, the Finucane family, the Irish Government and human rights groups. In fact, last year, Judge Cory submitted written testimony to the House International Relations Committee stating that the new legislation is "unfortunate to say the least" and "would make a meaningful inquiry impossible".

Mr. Speaker, I have met several times with the Finucane family and human rights groups dedicated to a just inquiry into Patrick's murder. I stand with them today as the House of Representatives takes up this important resolution. Let their courage and determination be a symbol to all those fighting to uncover the truth of such horrors.

I would also like to commend Mitchell Reiss, the special envoy for the Northern Ireland Peace Process, who is continuing to push for full implementation of the Weston Park Agreement and the establishment of an appropriate investigation into Patrick Finucane's murder.

It is my hope that in the days ahead, after seeing this resolution, the United Kingdom will reconsider its position on the Finucane case and will immediately establish a full, independent, public judicial inquiry into the murder of Pat Finucane, as recommended by Judge Cory. Such an inquiry will have the support of the Finucane family and the confidence of all who follow this case.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 740, which I introduced with bipartisan support, will do just what it says: provide a way forward for the Northern Ireland Peace Process.

I thank my colleague from Michigan, Mr. THAD MCCOTTER, for managing this bill so ably on the floor. I thank Chairman HENRY HYDE, Reps. ELTON GALLEGLY, PETER KING, JIM WALSH, TOM LANTOS, the Ranking Member of the House International Relations Committee and many others for their work and support on this bill.

Yesterday, the Northern Ireland Legislative Assembly met for the first time since 2002. Yet it still faces crucial challenges over community policing, and acceptance by the nationalist community of the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI). For the population of Northern Ireland to fully transfer its trust to the police, it must have confidence that the police and the authorities deserve trust and will be held accountable.

A key stumbling block to that greater acceptance has been the lack of resolution of charges of official collusion in the murder of human rights lawyer Patrick Finucane, who was gunned down in his home, in front of his wife and three small children, in 1989. Pat Finucane was not only a courageous human rights activist, but also a loving father and husband. His murder symbolizes the depth and danger of official State sponsored collusion in

Northern Ireland. Resolving the questions surrounding this murder will help restore confidence in the agencies of government in the north, and allow Northern Ireland's still fragile peace to flourish in a new atmosphere of trust.

That is a major reason why this inquiry needs to be done, and done right, as soon as possible. This is the purpose of H. Res. 740, which calls on the British government to establish the kind of full, public, independent, judicial inquiry into Patrick Finucane's killing called for by Judge Peter Cory, an esteemed Supreme Court judge from Canada who was asked by the British and Irish Governments to investigate this murder and make a recommendation regarding the possibility of collusion.

H. Res. 740 calls for exactly the type of inquiry that nongovernmental human rights organizations, including British Irish Rights Watch, the Committee for the Administration of Justice, Human Rights First, and Amnesty International have demanded. This is what the Irish Government and Parliament have urged. It is what we in Congress have supported. In 1999 the House passed House Resolution 128, which I authored, and in 2003 the full Congress passed, and the President signed into law, Chairman HYDE's Foreign Relations Authorization Act (Public Law 107-228).

But most of all, this is what the Finucane family, which for 17 years has courageously campaigned for justice, for Pat Finucane and all the victims in Northern Ireland, has demanded. Let us once again join them in their struggle.

I have held eleven hearings on human rights and police reform in Northern Ireland since 1997. In every one of those hearings witnesses have testified to the central role the Finucane murder has played in advancing an atmosphere of distrust and no confidence in state agencies. We've had family members, other Northern Ireland attorneys, nongovernmental human rights activists, as well as Mitch Reiss, President Bush's special envoy for the Northern Ireland Peace Process and Param Kumaraswamy, the United Nations' Special Rapporteur all testify that properly investigating this case is key to securing a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

This is a crucial moment in the peace process in Northern Ireland. A credible public, independent, judicial inquiry into Pat Finucane's murder will help ensure confidence in the rule of law in the north of Ireland and will help bring the people of both sides of the divide to a just, stable and lasting peace which they richly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again express my deepest condolences to the Finucane family and thank them for their courageous and tireless efforts on behalf of justice not only for their loved one but also for others who may have been victims of state-sponsored collusion in the north of Ireland. Similarly, I would like to acknowledge the

work and support from many human rights activists including Jane Winter of British Irish Rights Watch, Elisa Massimino from Human Rights First formerly the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, and Maggie Beirne, Martin O'Brien and Paul Mageean who have testified before Congress on behalf of the Committee on the Administration of Justice. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to remind my colleagues of the riveting testimony offered on this matter in 1998 by Rosemary Nelson, an attorney from Northern Ireland who told Congress that defense attorneys there feared that they could be murdered themselves because no one had been held accountable in the murder of Patrick Finucane. Six months after her testimony, Rosemary Nelson was killed, the victim of a car bomb.

For the Finucanes, for Rosemary Nelson and her family, and for peace and justice in Northern Ireland, I urge my colleagues to vote to pass this important resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the statement from the Honorable Judge Peter Cory, March 15, 2005 and a copy of the resolution adopted by Dail Eireann on March 8th urging an independent, judicial, public inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane.

THE HONORABLE PETER CORY,
C.C., C.D., Q.C.,

Toronto, ON, March 15, 2005.

Chairman CHRIS SMITH,
Rayburn HOB,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: The proposed legislation pertaining to the public inquiries is unfortunate to say the least.

First, it must be remembered that when the Weston Park Accord was signed, the signatories would have had only one concept of a public inquiry. Namely, that it would be conducted pursuant to the 1921 Public Inquiry Act. Indeed, as an example, the Bloody Sunday Inquiry would have commenced its work as a public inquiry by that time.

The families of the victims and the people of Northern Ireland would have thought that if a public inquiry were to be directed it would be brought into existence pursuant to the 1921 Public Inquiry Act.

To change the ground rules at this late date seems unfair. It seems as well unnecessary since the security of the realm would be ensured by the courts when the issue arose in a true public inquiry.

My report certainly contemplated a true public inquiry constituted and acting pursuant to the provisions of the 1921 Act.

Further, it seems to me that the proposed new Act would make a meaningful inquiry impossible. The commissions would be working in an impossible situation. For example, the Minister, the actions of whose ministry was to be reviewed by the public inquiry would have the authority to thwart the efforts of the inquiry at every step. It really creates an intolerable Alice in Wonderland situation. There have been references in the press to an international judicial membership in the inquiry. If the new Act were to become law, I would advise all Canadian judges to decline an appointment in light of the impossible situation they would be facing. In fact, I cannot contemplate any self respecting Canadian judge accepting an appointment to an inquiry constituted under the new proposed act.

Yours sincerely,

THE HON. PETER DEC. CORY.

“That Dáil Éireann:

Recalling the brutal murder of solicitor, Patrick Finucane at his home in Belfast on 12 February 1989;

Noting the on-going allegations of collusion between loyalist paramilitaries and British security forces in the murder of Mr. Finucane;

Recalling the commitments made at the Weston Park talks in July 2001 by the British Government to hold a public inquiry into the Finucane case, if so recommended by the Honourable Judge Peter Cory, it being clearly understood that such an inquiry would be held under the UK Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act, 1921;

Noting that Judge Cory found sufficient evidence of collusion to warrant a public inquiry into the case and recommended that such an inquiry take place without delay;

Recalling that in his conclusions, Judge Cory set out the necessity and importance of a public inquiry into this case and that the failure to hold a public inquiry as quickly as reasonably possible could be seen as a denial of the agreement at Weston Park;

Noting that the limited form of inquiry under the UK Inquiries Act 2005, proposed by the British Government has been rejected as inadequate by Judge Cory, the Finucane family, the Government and human rights groups;

1. Commends the Finucane family for their courageous campaign to seek the truth in this case of collusion;

2. Deeply regrets the British Government's failure to honour its commitment to implement Judge Cory's recommendation in full;

3. Welcomes the sustained support of successive Governments and all parties for the Finucane family over the past decade in their efforts to find the truth behind the murder;

4. Acknowledges the work of the Oireachtas Sub-Committee on Human Rights in highlighting this case;

5. Welcomes the Taoiseach's commitment and efforts in pursuing the case with the British Prime Minister Tony Blair;

6. Endorses the Government's international efforts at highlighting the case in the US, at the United Nations and at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg;

7. Calls on the British Government to reconsider its position on the Finucane case to take full account of the family's objections and amend the UK Inquiries Act 2005;

8. Calls for the immediate establishment of a full, independent, public judicial inquiry into the murder of Pat Finucane, as recommended by Judge Cory, which would enjoy the full co-operation of the family and the wider community throughout Ireland and abroad.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 740, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. 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.

CONDEMNING IN THE STRONGEST TERMS THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN DAHAB AND NORTHERN SINAI, EGYPT, ON APRIL 24 AND 26, 2006

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 795) condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Dahab and Northern Sinai, Egypt, on April 24 and 26, 2006.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 795

Whereas, on April 24 and 26, 2006, a series of explosions at Dahab and in Northern Sinai, Egypt, planned and carried out by terrorists, resulted in the deaths of scores of civilians and the injury of many others;

Whereas the people of Egypt have been subjected to several other deadly terrorist attacks over the past years; and

Whereas President George W. Bush called President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt to extend condolences on behalf of the American people for the loss of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks on Dahab and Northern Sinai, Egypt and other terrorist attacks directed against Egypt;

(2) expresses its condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed in the attacks and expresses its sympathies to those individuals who have been injured;

(3) joins with President George W. Bush in expressing the solidarity of the people and Government of the United States with the people and Government of Egypt as they recover from these cowardly and inhuman attacks; and

(4) expresses its readiness to support the Egyptian authorities in their efforts to bring to justice those individuals responsible for the recent attacks in Egypt and to pursue, disrupt, undermine, and dismantle the networks which plan and carry out such attacks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 795. With this resolution, the House reflects on the recent bombings in the Sinai which cut short dozens of lives. We take this opportunity to share with our friends, the people of Egypt, our sorrow, our sym-

pathy, and our determination to help Egypt defend itself against such attacks.

The Egyptian people have been subject to terrorist attacks for many years; they have responded strongly and generally effectively. While there were several successful attacks during 2005, there were also antiterrorism successes. According to the State Department's "Country Report on Terrorism," two attempts to target tourists in Cairo were thwarted by Egyptian authorities. Nevertheless, because the Egyptian economy relies so strongly on tourism, each incident has an effect that is magnified for the country and has an impact that goes beyond the personal tragedies of those who are killed and injured. Anyone who has had the opportunity to visit Egypt will have experienced the gracious hospitality for which Egyptians are famous. It is a terrible shame that the Egyptians in the tourism sector, many of whom are economically deprived, must bear the burden of the vicious terrorist strikes.

Mr. Speaker, Egypt and the United States have a good level of antiterrorism cooperation. I hope that the combined antiterrorism efforts of Egypt and the United States will continue to bear fruit. We must continue to work together.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by quoting the statement of the Secretary of State, Dr. Condoleezza Rice, on April 4, 2006: "The United States condemns the vicious terrorist bombings in Dahab, Egypt today. We extend our deepest sympathies to those injured by this attack and to the families and loved ones of those killed. There could be no justification for this barbaric act of terrorism. Our thoughts and prayers are with the people of Egypt at this time of grief. We have been in contact with the Egyptian Government to extend our condolences and to offer whatever assistance they may need. We will support our Egyptian friends in their commitment to fight terror and to bring justice to those who are responsible for this crime."

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

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 795 and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Congressman DAVIS and Congressman ISSA for joining me in introducing this important resolution being considered on the floor today.

On April 24 and April 26, a series of attacks were carried out in the Sinai region of Egypt, claiming the lives of 23 innocent civilians and injuring more than 60 men, women, and children. These horrific acts further demonstrate that no nation is free from the scourge of terror that has targeted the United States and our allies in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. From Taba to Dahab to Sharm al-Shaykh, the terrorist attacks perpetrated by Islamic

extremists in Egypt are deplorable and should be condemned by every nation that shares a commitment to security and peace. It is in this regard that I call on leaders of the international community and especially the Arab world to join the United States in decrying these horrific acts, these action by terrorists, and exhaust every measure to work with Egypt in combating extremism and terror.

Today, Congress expresses its solidarity with the people of Egypt who have suffered greatly at the hands of terror. As allies in the war on terror, the United States and Egypt share a common commitment to security in the Middle East. As such, the people of America stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of Egypt and renew our commitment to eradicating terror throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge our colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the sponsor of the resolution.

□ 1515

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 795, a resolution I introduced condemning the terrorist attacks in Dahab and northern Sinai in Egypt.

On April 24 and 26, 2006, a series of explosions at Dahab and in northern Sinai, Egypt, planned and carried out by terrorists, resulted in the deaths of scores of civilians and the injuries of many others.

Over the years, the relationship between the United States and Egypt has proven to be of critical importance to both countries. These relations have always been founded on mutual and deep understanding of each country's interests and role, both at the regional and international levels, in creating a world that is more safe and secure.

Like the United States, Egypt is a prime target of terrorism. President Sadat lost his life in 1981 as a price for signing the peace accords with Israel. Between 1990 and 1997, Egypt suffered from a series of terrorist attacks, mainly targeting the tourism sector that had long been the anchor of economic growth in the country.

Since September 11, Egypt has been a crucial ally to the United States in the global war on terror. Egypt, along with other Middle East allies such as Israel and Jordan, have paid a price for that too. Terrorist attacks rocked the Sinai Peninsula three times over 18 months. Moreover, last year, Egypt lost its Ambassador to Iraq.

The bloody attacks that took innocent lives in Dahab earlier this month indicate that terrorism does not discriminate by race, ethnicity, or region. Instead, terrorists target those seeking to live a peaceful and free life. We must hunt the terrorists down and bring them to justice. There is no other way

to respond to those so committed to the destruction of life. We must also stand with the Egyptian people in solidarity.

This resolution does just that, making it clear that Congress and the American people are behind them during this difficult period.

Mr. Speaker, let the House of Representatives speak in unison and with clarity on this issue: Terrorism has no place in this world and it will not be tolerated.

I want to thank my colleagues, DARELL ISSA, Mr. WEXLER and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN for their work on this resolution. It is only through their efforts that we were able to bring it to the floor so quickly. I also want to thank my colleague, Mr. MCCOTTER, for managing this so well. In addition, I thank the leadership on both sides for allowing this bill on the floor today, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 795. The cruel and deadly terrorist attacks last month in Egypt's Sinai Peninsula took place on the weekend of the Coptic Orthodox Easter and an Egyptian national holiday commemorating the Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai. Its casualties included Egyptian Muslims and Egyptian Christians, as well as foreigners. In all, 18 people were murdered—12 of them Egyptian—and 85 wounded.

These attacks have proven once again that the extreme ideology of violent Islamic fundamentalism poses a danger not only to the Western World but to all peace-loving people on the globe. The terrorists do not distinguish between Christians, Jews, or Muslims—or between Arabs and non-Arabs—in their search to destroy the core values of civilization.

Mr. Speaker, at this difficult time we extend our deepest sympathies to the Egyptian people—and to the loved ones of all those of many nations who perished in the April 24 bombings. We also offer sincere expressions of concern to all those wounded in the bombings on April 24 and 26—in the latter of which only the would-be murderers themselves lost their lives.

The rise of terrorism in the once placid Sinai is a source of great concern to Egypt, its neighbors, and to all its friends. This was the third major bombing at Sinai resorts in the past 18 months, following attacks on Taba and its environs on October 7, 2004, which left 34 dead, and on Sharm el-Sheikh on July 23, 2005, which murdered 64. The April 26 attack to which I alluded a moment ago was directed at both Egyptian police and a contingent of the U.S.-led Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) in the Sinai, people who have no purpose other than preserving the peace between Israel and Egypt.

We want the Egyptian people to know they have our full support as they seek to hunt down those who planned and implemented all these heinous attacks and as they seek to eradicate the scourge of fundamentalist violence that has afflicted Egypt in ebbs and flows over the years—the same scourge that took the life of Anwar Sadat, one of the towering figures of the twentieth century, as well as the life of Farag Hoda, a brilliant author and highly principled secularist.

I believe the ultimate answer to this problem lies in education, economic development, and

political reform. But now is not the time to debate such issues.

For now, Mr. Speaker, let us stand as one with the Egyptian people and government in opposing and rejecting the violent ideology of hate, of which Egypt has been but the latest victim.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in doing likewise.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 795, condemning the terrorist bombings in Egypt on April 24 and 26, 2006. The deplorable and cowardly acts of violence perpetrated against civilians on those two days of terror are worthy of our condemnation, and illustrate the depths to which terrorists will sink to spread their hatred and violence. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution on its own merits, but also out of respect for four good people from my hometown of Casper, Wyoming, all of whom were severely injured in the April 24 blast in Dahab.

On the evening of April 24, 2006, Betsy Lamberson, Tom South, Bruce Lamberson and Cindy Parrish were attempting to enjoy a nice dinner together at this resort town on the Gulf of Aqaba. Their plans were suddenly and brutally cut short when a terrorist group affiliated with Al-Qaeda detonated three separate blasts, killing 24 people and injuring more than 80. These four Wyoming folks were among those seriously injured. We can thank God that all of them lived through the ordeal. However, with broken limbs and serious shrapnel injuries, each of them has a long road to recovery.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no greater reminder to us of what is at stake in our war against terrorism than four innocent people from my hometown nearly cut down by the senseless hatred of radical Islamists. Will cannot and will not live in the shadow of this violence, unable to visit family in far away places out of fear for our very lives. Our resolve is only hardened by these attacks on our countrymen, and our commitment to defeating terrorism across the globe is renewed today.

On behalf of Wyoming and her citizens, I pray that Betsy, Tom, Bruce, and Cindy will fully recover from their injuries and be able to enjoy all that life has yet to offer them. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, which sends a clear message to terrorists wherever they may be hiding: we will not stand idly by while you so callously attempt to harm innocent people, and destroy the freedoms they deserve.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remaining time.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 795.

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. MCCOTTER. 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.

CONDEMNING MURDER OF AMERICAN JOURNALIST PAUL KLEBNIKOV ON JULY 9, 2004, IN MOSCOW AND MURDERS OF OTHER MEMBERS OF THE MEDIA IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 499) condemning the murder of American journalist Paul Klebnikov on July 9, 2004, in Moscow and the murders of other members of the media in the Russian Federation, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 499

Whereas on July 9, 2004, American journalist Paul Klebnikov was murdered by gunmen as he exited the Moscow offices of Forbes Magazine;

Whereas no person has been convicted of any offense in connection with the murder of Mr. Klebnikov;

Whereas Mr. Klebnikov is survived by his wife Helen, and his three young children;

Whereas twelve journalists have been murdered in the Russian Federation since 2000 and Mr. Klebnikov was the first and only United States citizen among these journalists;

Whereas the Department of State's 2005 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices states government pressure in Russia continues to weaken freedom of expression and the independence and freedom of the media, particularly among the major national television networks and regional media outlets;

Whereas the Russian Prosecutor General's office arrested and tried Musa Vahaev and Kazbek Dukzov for the murder of Mr. Klebnikov;

Whereas Musa Vahaev and Kazbek Dukzov were acquitted on May 5, 2006, of the charges of murdering Mr. Klebnikov;

Whereas the Government of Russia has stated that Mr. Klebnikov's murder was ordered by Khozh-Akhmed Nukhayevev, a fugitive Chechen criminal gang leader, but has not publicly released any evidence of Mr. Nukhayevev's complicity;

Whereas it remains unclear who ordered the murder of Mr. Klebnikov or if any party will be convicted of this crime; and

Whereas a group of United States investigative journalists has launched an independent inquiry into the death of Mr. Klebnikov: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the murder of American journalist Paul Klebnikov on July 9, 2004, in Moscow and the murders of other members of the media in the Russian Federation;

(2) commends the Russian Prosecutor General's office for its continuing investigation of the murder of Mr. Klebnikov;

(3) urges the Government of Russia to continue its inquiries to determine and bring to justice all parties involved in the murder of Mr. Klebnikov;

(4) urges the Government of Russia to accept offers of assistance with the investigation of Mr. Klebnikov's murder from the United States and other concerned governments;

(5) urges the Government of Russia to take appropriate action to protect the independence and freedom of the Russian media and all visiting members of the media; and

(6) commends all journalists working and living in Russia for their courageous dedication to transparency and the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 499, a resolution that condemns the murder of American journalist Paul Klebnikov in Moscow and the murder of other members of the media in the Russian Federation. H. Res. 499 was a product which I introduced, and I commend and thank the chairman of the Europe and Emerging Threats Subcommittee, Mr. GALLEGLY, and, of course, the chairman of the committee, Chairman HYDE, for all of their help with this legislation, as well as all of my colleagues on the International Relations Committee, and not surprisingly, I strongly urge its passage.

On July 9, 2004, Paul Klebnikov, the editor-in-chief of the Russian edition of Forbes Magazine, was shot 10 times outside his office building in Moscow. He left behind a wife and three young children. As part of his work, Mr. Klebnikov had developed into one of the foremost experts on the intersection between organized crime, politics, law enforcement and big business in Russia. Unfortunately, the murder of Paul Klebnikov is not an isolated attack on members of the press. In the past 6 years alone, 12 journalists have been murdered in the Russian Federation.

H. Res. 499 condemns this brutal murder, as well as the murder of other members of the Russian media. While applauding the work of the Russian prosecutor general's office for its ongoing investigation, the legislation urges the Government of Russia to continue its inquiry and bring to justice all parties involved in this horrific crime. It also calls upon Russia to accept offers of assistance from the United States and other rightly concerned governments.

Finally, H. Res. 499 commends Russian-based journalists for their courageous dedication to transparency and the truth and urges the Russian Government to take appropriate action to protect the independence and freedom of members of the press working and living in Russia.

H. Res. 499 was approved both by the Subcommittee on Europe and Emerg-

ing Threats and the full International Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is often wondered why in the United States our Constitution refers to freedom of speech rather than freedom of conscience. It is because the founders of this country and the framers of our Constitution understood that there can be no freedom of conscience where there is not freedom of speech to express it. What the Founding Fathers knew has been perverted by many who would enslave and subjugate their fellow human beings, which is why we in the United States who enjoy a freedom of speech and its concomitant freedom of conscience must be ever alert to ensure that the watchdogs of liberty, a free and unfettered press, are forever protected from intimidation or extermination at the hands of dictators.

Again, I would like to thank my colleagues on the International Relations Committee, and I would like to urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

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

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

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 499, and I want to thank Congressman McCOTTER for introducing this important resolution that is being considered on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, American journalist Paul Klebnikov devoted his career to exposing corruption within Russia. He was committed to seeing Russia become a free and wholly democratic society. I think I can speak for everyone in this room today that we all share his dream.

Unfortunately, Mr. Klebnikov will not be witness to this, as he was ruthlessly gunned down outside the Moscow offices of Forbes Magazine. He, like 11 other journalists since the Putin administration took office, was murdered in cold blood, chilling freedom of speech and the media in Russia.

Last year, President Putin announced publicly that fighting corruption and protecting the Russian people from crime is a priority for his administration. For this promise not to be seen as yet another hollow gesture, President Putin must do everything in his power to investigate and prosecute the perpetrators of Mr. Klebnikov's murder. A free media will never exist in Russia unless the murderers are brought to justice.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge our colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

I just wish to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and of course, the ranking member of the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who has been a staunch opponent of totalitarianism and a champion of freedom in this institution for decades.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 499, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today the phones in our district offices and our D.C. offices are ringing off the hook, and most of those calls are coming in about the situation that our country faces with illegal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not that complicated an issue. The Members of this body and here in the House agree, secure the border first. That is the first thing that needs to be done.

The Republican leadership in the House worked hard to pass the bill that we passed last December, which addresses border security and employer enforcement.

So to my constituents and to the other Members of this body I say, let us say no to amnesty or any type of amnesty. Let us continue to support construction of a border, whether it is a wall or surveillance. Let us secure our border. I do support the use of military presence on the border as an emergency measure.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for action. The time has passed. It is time for us to be certain that this Nation is secure. It is an issue of national security.

HAPPY MOTHER'S DAY

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would have recognized the work and dedication of a special constituent from Michigan's 11th District on Sunday. However, she was away from home.

I would like to thank Georgia Joan McCotter, a mother, for a lifetime of trying to make sure that her two sons, Thaddeus and Dennis, were raised to be good and decent people. Although she fully succeeded in my brother's case, I would like to assure her that I am still trying, but that the love in my heart for her will never diminish over time.

So, to her belatedly, if you are home, if you are listening, Happy Mother's Day.

□ 1530

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 New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

The 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.)

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

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

ENERGY PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently our Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, made a statement that I would like to read. In this statement she said: "We do have to do something about the energy problem. I can tell you that nothing has really taken me aback more as Secretary of State than the way that the politics of energy is, I will use the word 'warping diplomacy,' around the world. We have simply got to do something about the warping now of diplomatic effort by the all-out rush for energy supply."

Mr. Speaker, the 8th of this March was a really historic date, and it passed and really very few people knew how historic it was. It was 50 years since a report given in San Antonio, Texas, by

a world-famous scientist. And I will talk about that a bit more in a few minutes.

The 15th of March of this year marked one year from the date that I first came to this floor to talk about the problem that Condoleezza Rice was talking about, about the energy problem; and since that time I have been to the floor several times to talk about that. Since then, there have been two major government studies on this same topic. One of them is known as the "Hirsch Report," from Robert Hirsch, who was the principal investigator for SAIC, a very large prestigious scientific engineering organization.

This study was sponsored by the Department of Energy; and for several months after the report was available, it was kind of bottled up inside the agency and we were kind of asking the question, why wasn't it out on the street sooner because it really makes some very significant points.

A second study was done at the request of the Army by the Corps of Engineers. And I have those two reports here. Here is the "Peaking of World Oil Production: Impacts, Mitigation and Risk Management." The project leader was Dr. Robert Hirsch. And here is that report, paid for by our Department of Energy and done by SAIC. That was dated February of 2005.

A few months later, in September of 2005, a report by the Corps of Engineers, and here is a copy of that report, which just got out to the street about 3 months ago, by the way. So for a number of months this was bottled up inside the Pentagon. Both of these reports say essentially the same thing, and I would like to spend a few minutes this afternoon talking about what these two reports say.

The first is a quote from the "Energy Trends and Their Implications, U.S. Army Installations." And, Mr. Speaker, anywhere in this report that the Army is mentioned, you could put the United States in, or for that matter the world, and it would have the same meaning. But since they are a part of the Army and this was an Army study, they talk about the Army.

This first statement: "In general, all nonrenewable resources," and fossil fuels are generally perceived of as being in the time scale that we are concerned about, nonrenewable. "In general, all nonrenewable resources follow a natural supply curve. Production increases rapidly, slows, reaches a peak, and then declines at a rapid pace similar to its initial increase. The major question for petroleum is not whether production will peak, but when. There are many estimates of recoverable petroleum reserves, giving rise to many estimates of when peak will occur and how high the peak will be. A careful review of all of the estimates leads to the conclusion that world oil production may peak within a few short years, after which it will decline. Once a peak occurs, then historic patterns of world oil demand and price cycles will cease."

And the next is a quote from the "Hirsch Report": "World oil peaking is going to happen," saying the same thing as the Army Corps of Engineers. And, by the way, we have no reason to believe that there was any interchange between these two groups that were doing the study. "World oil production is going to peak. World production of conventional oil will reach a maximum and decline thereafter." Exactly the same thing that the Army Corps of Engineers was saying. "That maximum is called the peak. A number of competent forecasters project peaking within a decade, others contend it will be later. Prediction of the peaking is extremely difficult because of geological complexities, measurement problems, pricing variations, demand elasticity, and political influences. Peaking will happen, but the timing is uncertain."

"Oil peaking presents a unique challenge," they say. And then this astounding statement: "The world has never faced a problem like this." There is no precedent. You cannot go back in history to find a problem like this. They say: "The world has never faced a problem like this. Without massive mitigation more than a decade before the fact, " and most of the world experts believe we do not have a decade, in fact, we may be there, "without massive mitigation more than a decade before the fact, the problem will be pervasive and will not be temporary. Previous energy transitions, wood to coal and coal to oil, were gradual and evolutionary. Oil peaking will be abrupt and revolutionary."

The next chart shows that these same data inspired 30 prominent Americans, Boyden Gray, Jim Woolsey, and Frank Gaffney, and 27 other very prominent people, among them several retired four-star generals and admirals, to write a letter to the President. In effect what they said was, Mr. President, the fact that we have only about 2 percent of the world's reserves of oil, and we use 25 percent of the world's oil and we import about two-thirds of what we use, presents a totally unacceptable national security risk. We really have to do something about that.

As the chart shows here, we represent a bit less than 5 percent of the world's population, about 1 person out of 22. And we are really good at pumping our oil. We have only 2 percent of the reserves, which from that 2 percent of the reserves we are pumping 8 percent of the world's oil, which means we are pumping our wells four times faster than the average.

Now, what are they talking about? As the next chart shows, this was all predicted quite awhile ago. To understand the history of this, to put it in context, we have to go back more than half a century to the 1940s and 1950s. A scientist by the name of M. King Hubbert was working for the Shell Oil Company, and he observed the pumping and the exhaustion of individual oil fields. The United States was pretty

much first on the scene in any large way. At one time we were the world's largest producer of oil, and I believe the world's largest exporter of oil. And right when we were in our heyday in 1956, M. King Hubbert went to San Antonio, Texas, and gave that famous paper I referred to a few minutes ago, saying that in just 14 years, in about 1970, the United States would peak in oil production; we would reach a maximum.

Shell Oil Company did not believe that was going to happen and cautioned that he would make himself a fool and them a fool for hiring him if he went to give that paper and published it. And he went anyway. Then 14 years later, right on schedule, we peaked in oil production.

The smooth green curve here was the M. King Hubbert's curve. The more ragged green curve with the larger symbols is the actual production data. And you see that that peaked in 1970 and then fell off. Now, this is the lower 48. In just a moment, we will put another chart up here which shows what happens when you include the Alaskan oil finds.

This is the lower 48, and this is what has happened in the lower 48. The red curve there, by the way, is the former Soviet Union, and they kind of came unglued when the Soviet Union fell apart. You see that their production did not reach the potential. They are already on the downside, by the way. They have somewhat more oil than we. They peaked a little bit later. They had a second small peak, but then it is all downhill after that.

The next chart shows where our oil has come from in our country. And the rest of the U.S. and Texas, the dark blue and light blue, are what M. King Hubbert was talking about, and these are the actual data points from 1935 to now. We have added to this now the natural gas liquids and the Alaskan oil find, that big oil find in Alaska, Prudhoe Bay, Dead Horse. I have been there, at the very beginning of that 4-foot pipeline through which about a fourth of our domestic production has been flowing. That is on the downside now, by the way, and it is becoming less and less. Notice that there was just a blip and the slide down the other side of Hubbert's Peak with that big Alaska oil find.

The thing on this chart, Mr. Speaker, which interests me is that little yellow there on the downside. Just a blip. A small blip. That is the famed Gulf of Mexico oil find. You may remember that. It wasn't all that many years ago we found that, and, boy, that was a lot of oil. There are now 4,000 oil wells out there in the Gulf of Mexico. And that was to save us. It just barely, barely is a ripple in our slide down the other side of Hubbert's Peak.

The next chart puts this in world perspective. We have been talking about the United States, and now this takes us to the world. The big bars here are the discovery of oil, and you will notice

some of that was found way back in the 1940s, some big discoveries, then the 1950s, and, boy, the 1970s and the 1980s. But notice that since 1980, the finds of oil have been ever less and less, and that is in spite of really good techniques for finding oil.

We now have 3D seismic, we have computer modeling, and we have been very aggressive. You see, since about 1980, we have been finding less oil than we are using, because the consumption curve here is this solid black line. At about 1980, you see there the consumption of oil exceeded the oil that we were finding. So for that period between 1980 and now, the deficit between what we found and what we are using has been filled with reserves that we have. Worldwide, pretty big reserves.

□ 1545

Not much in our country because we have been pumping our oil for a long time, very aggressively.

This is an interesting chart, and anyone who works with these charts knows that the area under one of these curves represents the total amount available. So if you add up all of these little bars, we made a smooth curve through the discovery here. The area under that discovery curve would represent the total amount of oil that we have discovered. Similarly, the area under the consumption curve will represent the total amount of oil that we have consumed.

Now, what is very obvious is that you can't consume oil that you haven't found. So what does that mean? Now, you can have any projection for the future that you like. You can assume that we are going to do a lot of enhanced oil recovery, that we are going to find a little bit of oil, most experts believe there isn't that much left, the little bit of oil that remains and pump it very quickly.

But one thing is certain: you cannot pump what you haven't found. And so ultimately the area under the consumption curve cannot be greater than the area under the discovery curve.

Notice that they are suggesting in this little chart that peaking is going to be at about 2010. Some believe that it may have already occurred.

The next chart is an interesting one from the Energy Information Agency, and they use a very strange, in a way, bizarre application of statistics. We have the 95 percent probability in statistics which is the most probable, and something is significant if it is the 95 percent probability. It is highly significant at 97. You can go on down with the 50 percent probability or a 5 percent probability.

You can get a little sense of these probabilities when you look at the little chart they draw about a hurricane's path. You notice that for the next 24 hours it is a fairly narrow funnel, and then it gets wider and wider as they go out because of the increased uncertainty as you go out.

Well, here the Energy Information Agency has drawn the oil curve, and

you see that they peaked in 1970. We have been going downhill ever since. And back there, a little bit before 2000 I guess on this graph they made a projection of where we were going. Now, they are using these statistics you see at the bottom down there, the past, which is the red line, and then the 95 percent probability and the mean, which is the 50 percent.

The 50 percent probability is not the mean, Mr. Speaker. If you were going to draw this chart realistically, you would have to have another green line that came as far below the yellow line as that one is above it like here, and another blue line that is down here. They are using the 50 percent probability as if it were the mean and saying that is the most probable. Of course in statistics, 95 percent probability is obviously more probable than the 50 percent probability.

Well, this bizarre use of statistics results in something that the next chart will show. But just a moment on this one. Notice what has happened since they made this projection. Notice where the red line has been going. It has of course been following the 95 percent probability, although they believe that it should be following the 50 percent probability, or the green line. In other words, we should be finding more and more oil.

The next chart looks at that in another way. By the way, they say here the probability, they say 95 percent is low probability. That is the highest probability. I have no idea how you get this warped statistic; 95 percent is the highest probability. The 50 percent probability is not the mean, and the lowest probability is 5 percent.

Well, they mean that the lowest amount of oil you would find is a 95 percent probability. The highest amount is 5 percent. But the 5 percent could just as well be the other side of the 95 percent probability which would be really, really low.

Well, here is a graph that they have drawn, and this graph points out something very interesting, the peak for the 95 percent probability, which says that the world had totally about 2,000 gigabarrels of oil. By the way, we use "giga" rather than billion because in England a million million is a billion. In our country it is a thousand million, which is a billion. But giga means the same thing to everybody world around, so we use gigabarrels.

If we have in fact 2,000 gigabarrels total, we have used about a thousand of that, and about a thousand remains, which means that we are at this point here; and this should start sliding downhill after that. But they have imagined another thousand gigabarrels of oil to be found; and if that is true, notice that moves the peak out only to 2016.

We are using oil at such a horrendous rate in the world, that even if we found 50 percent more oil than we have ever found, that moves the peak out only that far. And then they show what hap-

pens if you go out to 2037. If you have enhanced oil recovery and so forth and get that much more, look what happens. Look at the way it drops there.

The next chart is an interesting one. It shows the same thing pretty much that we showed in that big oil chart that showed the discovery curve. And these are, this is the relationship of discovery to use. Notice, in about 1980 here, we started using more than we had discovered. So this curve says the same kind of thing that the previous one said, only this shows the relationship of discoveries to use.

The next chart is another statement from the "Hirsch Report," and I want to spend a few minutes now on these two reports because they are really very meaningful reports. I will note, Mr. Speaker, that both of these reports have come out in the past year after we gave our first discussion here a year ago, the 14th of March.

This again is from the "Hirsch Report." The peaking of world oil production presents the United States and the world with an unprecedented risk management problem. As peaking is approached, liquid fuel prices and price volatility will increase dramatically. And without timely mitigation, the economic, social and political cost will be unprecedented. Viable mitigation options exist on both the supply and demand side, but to have substantial impact they must be initiated more than a decade in advance of peaking.

Mr. Speaker, we probably do not have a decade. As a matter of fact, we may be here. Dealing with world oil production peaking will be extremely complex, involve literally trillions of dollars, and require many years of intense effort.

Mr. Speaker, the question I am asking is, if this is true, and if this report was paid for by the Department of Energy, why aren't the leaders in our country telling the American people this?

Now, if they didn't believe this report, just a few months later came the report from the Corps of Engineers that says essentially the same thing as we will see from some following charts. The next chart is another quote from the "Hirsch Report": "We cannot conceive of any affordable government-sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules." They are talking now about what will we do to make sure that there is enough oil available when we have reached peak production; what can we fill that gap with.

They are saying they can't conceive of any affordable government-sponsored crash program to make this happen, so as to incorporate higher energy efficiency technologies in the privately owned transportation sectors. Significant improvements in energy efficiency will thus be inherently time consuming on the order of a decade or more. For some things like efficient automobiles, the average light trucks and cars out there, some 16 to 18 years

in the fleet, the big 18-wheelers are out there 28 years. So if you are going to make any impact on efficiency in that market, you have to really wait awhile unless you think people are going to scrap their newly purchased SUV.

The next chart is from the Corps of Engineers study, and this is really an interesting chart. Remember the date of this was September '05. The current price of oil is in the \$45 to \$57 per-barrel range and is expected to stay in that range for several years. Mr. Speaker, I don't think \$70 a barrel is within the range of 45 to 57. And it has been less than a year.

So what this shows is that even the experts, these people who spend a long while studying this, when they look at the picture, they didn't anticipate the extent, the seriousness of this problem.

Oil prices may go significantly higher and some have predicted prices ranging up to \$180 a barrel in a few years. Mr. Speaker, if that is true, why aren't the leaders of our country telling the American people this?

Friends, we have got a problem ahead of us. It is not an insoluble problem; but the longer we wait, the tougher it is going to be to get through it. We really need to get started now. I don't here our leadership telling us that, Mr. Speaker. And in view of these two reports both saying essentially the same thing, I am wondering why.

Another chart from the Army Corps of Engineers study: oil is the most important form of energy in the world today. I think few would deny that. In addition to transportation, and we use 70 percent of our oil in transportation, it is the feed stock from a really large petrochemical industry. We live in a plastic world. Just look around you at all the things made of plastic. Without oil, most of them wouldn't be here.

Historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities of extractability, transportability, versatility, and cost. The qualities that enabled oil to take over from coal as the front-line energy source for the industrialized world in the middle of the 20th century are as relevant today as they were then.

And another chart from this same Corps of Engineers study, over and over, Mr. Speaker, they are saying the same thing: we face a big challenge.

Petroleum experts Colin Campbell, John LaHerrere, Brian Fleay, Roger Blanchard, Richard Duncan, Walter Youngquist and Albert Bartlett, no relative of mine, but you can pull up on the Web Albert Bartlett, do a Google search for Albert Bartlett and he gives the most interesting 1-hour lecture I have ever heard on energy and the exponential principle, have all estimated that a peak in conventional oil production will occur around 2005. This is 2006. The corporate executive officers, CEOs at Eni SPA Italian oil companies and ARCO have also published estimates of a peak in 2005. So the problem may already be here.

The next chart shows a very interesting quote from one of the experts in

this area, and this really focuses on a chart that we had just a few minutes ago. Jean LaHerrere made an assessment of the USGS report that concludes, now, USGS says that we are going to find half again the oil that we have already found. We have found about 2,000 gigabarrels, used about 1,000 of that. They say we are going to find another 1,000 gigabarrels. This is what Dr. LaHerrere says. The USGS estimate implies a fivefold increase in discovery that is over the present anemic discovery, a fivefold increase in discovery rate and reserve addition, for which no evidence is presented.

Such an improvement in performance is in fact utterly implausible, given the great technological achievements of the industry over the past 20 years, the worldwide search, and the deliberate effort to find the largest remaining prospects.

In other words, he is saying that we have been looking really hard with really good technique and we haven't found it for the last decade. There is just no justification to this euphemistic projection that we are going to find another 1,000 gigabarrels of oil.

The next chart puts this in kind of a global and time perspective. The chart on the top shows the last 400 of 5,000 years of recorded history. And it shows the beginning of the Industrial Revolution with wood, and it did begin with wood. We were making steel with wood, with charcoal, denuded the hills of New England, carrying it to England to make steel. You can visit Little Catocottin Furnace up here in Frederick County, and we denuded the hills of Northern Frederick County to make charcoal for that little furnace there.

And then we discovered coal. And on the ordinate here is quadrillion Btus. That is the amount of energy you produce. Not very much from wood down there. You see the brown.

It really got six or eight times bigger with coal. And look what happened when we found oil and gas. That is the red curve there which seems to go almost straight up. This is only about a 2 percent increase.

Albert Einstein said that the force of compound interest is the most powerful force in the universe which, after discovering nuclear energy he was asked, Dr. Einstein, what will be the next great force in the universe? And he said that it was the power of compound interest, which is exponential growth, of course.

Notice what happened in the 1970s there, and the downturn. There really was a world recession. We used less oil, fortunately, because what was happening up until that time, Mr. Speaker, is really quite phenomenal. Every decade we were using as much oil as had been used in all of previous history. What that means is that when we used half of all the oil, only one decade of oil remained at current-use rates.

Of course that is not the rate at which oil will be used. We are now about 150 years into the age of oil; 5,000

years of recorded history. That curve is now coming down. It is peaking and will be coming down. And it will come down for about another 100, 150 years. So in 200, 300 years we will have been through the age of oil.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to put this in this perspective: 5,000 years of recorded history, we found this incredible wealth under the ground. It really was incredible wealth. Just one barrel of this oil provides you the energy of 12 people working all year for you; 12 people working all year. You can buy that for a little more than \$100, 42 gallons, a little more than \$100 at the pump.

□ 1600

If you produce electricity with it, for less than 25 cents a day, an electric motor will do more work than a hard-working, athletic worker. Really incredible wealth.

What the world should have done when we discovered this, realizing that it could not be infinite, that there just had to be an end to it, that the world is not made of oil and even if it was made of oil, there would still be an end to it by and by, but it is not made of oil; we should have stopped and said, what can we do with this incredible wealth to provide the most good for the most people for the longest time? That clearly is not what we did. As this chart shows here, we just pigged out like kids who found the cookie jar, with no thought for tomorrow. We behaved as if oil was infinite, that it would be there absolutely forever. And, of course, that could not be true.

I started asking myself these questions maybe 40 years ago. I knew that oil and gas and coal could not be forever, and I asked myself what does that mean? Is it something that we need to worry about in 10 years, 100 years, 1,000 years, 1 million years? What does it mean? And a number of people have been asking themselves this question.

The next chart is interesting, and it kind of simplifies this curve. By the way, this is the same curve that we saw before, the red curve going up very steeply. All we have done here is to compress the scale on the ordinate and expand the scale on the abscissa so that now we have a more gradual curve. But it is still a 2 percent growth rate. That doubles in 35 years.

At the beginning of the little yellow there, which is the difference between what we would like to use, that is, the demand curve, and the supply curve, which is the blue-green curve, that is doubled at the end over there. So we know that took 35 years to get there because it doubles in 35 years. If we are there, and there should be a question mark after that because we are not dead certain, what this shows is that the shortage actually starts to occur a bit before the peak occurs, as you are breaking away from that nice, smooth curve. And, of course, there are going to be ups and downs, as we have seen in the price of oil. It is up \$5 and down \$4 and up another \$5 and down \$4, but ever

up and up as we go through. We face some big challenges.

What most people want to do since we are, as the President says, hooked on oil, we would like to keep that habit. We do not want to kick that habit. We would like to keep that habit. So what most people are focusing on is how do we fill the gap? The gap is that yellow. The gap is the difference between what we have and what we would like to use. And as time goes on, that gets bigger and bigger.

I would like to make the argument, and we will come back to that in a few minutes, that we probably should not be trying to fill the gap, for a couple of reasons. One is that I do not think that we can fill the gap. And the second thing is that there will be a future and we do have kids and we do have grandkids, and to the extent that we are successful today in finding and pumping what oil remains, we are dooming them to an increased crisis where they are going to have less and less opportunity to live like we have lived because our incredibly lavish lifestyle is in large measure built on this really high-quality fossil fuel energy.

The next chart shows us what we will ultimately transition to, and there is no escaping this, oil is finite. There will be a peaking. It could be now; it could be in a few years. It is not if, it is when. And there are some finite resources that we can have that we can work with, but they are finite, although they are enormous in volume. For instance, the tar sands, the Canadians would rather call them oil sands because "tar" does not have a good sound to it. But it is tar. It is not much better quality than the asphalt out here in the roadway, which flows with the hot sun, as you may notice. The cars sit on it and it sinks down. Put a blowtorch on it and it will really flow. The oil shales in our west and coal are all finite resources.

The Canadians are aggressively pursuing the production of oil from their tar sands, or oil sands, as they like to call them. But I understand that they are using more energy from natural gas to cook that oil sand to get the oil out and more energy from natural gas than they are getting out of the oil. From a business perspective, that makes good sense because that gas up there is stranded. It is in Alberta, Canada. There are not very many people there. Gas is hard to transport, and stranded gas is very cheap. So they use a cheap gas to produce very expensive oil. It costs them about \$18 a barrel, I understand, to produce it. And they are getting \$70 a barrel. That is a really good dollar/profit ratio. The energy/profit ratio is less than one; so ultimately that is not sustainable, of course, using more energy in than you get out.

The oil shales in our west, there have been some very glowing articles in the papers. I talked to the investigator there. He attended a conference out in Denver, Colorado a few months ago that I was at. And Shell Oil Company,

it will be several years before they decide whether or not it is even feasible economically to get oil out of our oil shales. There is an enormous quantity there, nearly as much as the world has found, but not all recoverable. There are estimates that 800 billion barrels may be recoverable, but at what cost? What they do out there is to drill a series of holes around the periphery, and they freeze that so that the oil that they melt out in the middle will not contaminate the groundwater, and then they cook it with steam for about a year. And then after they have cooked it for about a year, heating it up, they drill a well there and they start pumping and cooking, and they do that for another year or two, and they can get meaningful amounts of oil. But the scalability of this and the economic feasibility of this are still unknown, so they are pursuing that.

I would caution, Mr. Speaker, not to be too euphoric about their prospects of getting energy out of these tar sands and oil shales. There is a lot of energy there. It will be difficult to get it out economically, particularly difficult to have a meaningful energy/profit ratio getting it out. But it is there and we have to do the best we can to get it out as efficiently as we can.

Then coal, you will hear we have 250 years of coal, and the next chart shows that is true. We do have 250 years of coal at current use rates, at no growth. But notice what happens when there is only 2 percent growth. Now, I think that as we have less oil, we are going to have to use coal more. Hitler ran his whole economy and his military on oil from coal. So did South Africa with the embargoes that we had there. With just 2 percent growth rate, this exponential growth has an incredible effect. This 2 percent, the 250 years shrinks to about 85 years. And for most of its uses, you cannot use coal. You are going to have to convert it to a gas or a liquid. And if you take the energy to do that, you have now shrunk it down to about 50 years. And that is only 2 percent growth. I believe we will have to increase the use of coal more than 2 percent.

Now, back to this chart of the potential alternative sources:

Nuclear. Nuclear produces now about 8 percent of our total energy in this country and about 20 percent of our electricity. In France it produces about 80, 85 percent of their electricity. There are three kinds of nuclear power. Two kinds of nuclear fission: the lightwater reactor and breeder reactors. We use only lightwater reactors in this country. The only breeder reactors we ever used were in producing the fuel for our nuclear missiles. The world has a limited supply. It is hard to get good numbers on that, but the world has a limited supply of fissionable uranium, and then we will have to go to breeder reactors, which, as the name implies, produce more fuel than they use. But you also buy big problems with that, transporting it around and enriching

it, and some of it is weapons grade; so you have to deal with those problems if you want to go to fission with a breeder reactor.

I have friends here in the Congress who were devoutly opposed to nuclear. They are bright people, and when they are considering the alternative, which may be shivering in the dark if we do not have enough electricity, now nuclear is not looking all that bad to them if the alternative is shivering in the dark. Nuclear could and maybe should grow. But in this country it is very difficult to site a plant and to build it. It may take 10 years, and I understand that the plant has to be operating maybe 20 years before you get back the amount of fossil fuel energy that went into producing the plant.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on many of these things we need good numbers. It is hard to have a rational discussion when there is so much disagreement in numbers, and we really do need to enlist an honor broker so that we can agree on numbers because it is very difficult to have a rational discussion when there are such wide differences of opinion as to how much is out there of this and that.

Nuclear fusion. If we can discover that, we are home free. That is what the sun does to produce all the energy we get from the sun. And we are just a tiny, tiny speck in that whole sphere around the sun and the incredible amount of energy that comes from the sun. We are home free if we get there, by the way. But I think the odds of getting there are about the same as the odds of your or my solving our personal economic problems by winning the lottery. That would be nice, but I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that you are plotting your economic future on the assumption that you are going to win the lottery, and I do not think we ought to plot our energy future on the assumption that we are going to get fusion. I support all of the money, about \$250 million a year or so. Of course, it goes into fusion. I hope we get there. But, frequently, my hopes and my expectations are not the same thing. In this case I would not bet the ranch that we are going to get fusion energy. If we do, we are home free, and we need to continue to invest all the money that that technology can reasonably absorb.

And now we come to the truly renewable resources. And ultimately, Mr. Speaker, after this age of oil, which will end, and when I say "oil," I mean gas and coal too, which will end in about another 100, 150 years, we will be running our world on these energy sources: solar and wind and geothermal and ocean energy from tides or thermal gradients or waves. Agricultural resources, a lot of possibilities there: soy diesel, biodiesel, ethanol, methanol, biomass, cellulosic ethanol. You hear a lot of these words.

Burning our waste to get energy, that is a really good idea, and we should do more of that. We need fewer landfills, and we would have a little more electricity if we did that.

The last one here that I want to spend just a moment on, it says hydrogen from renewables. Today we are not making hydrogen from renewables. We are making hydrogen from natural gas. That is going to peak and be running down about the same curve that oil is running down. One thing is true, Mr. Speaker: We will always use more energy producing hydrogen than we get out of hydrogen. Unless we are going to suspend the second law of thermal dynamics, that will be true.

Well, if it takes more energy to produce hydrogen, why are we even thinking about hydrogen? For two reasons: One is when you finally use it, burn it, you get only water. That is not a very polluting product. And the second reason we are really interested in hydrogen is that it is one of the better things to feed a fuel cell with if we ever get economically feasible fuel cells. A fuel cell will get more than twice the efficiency of a reciprocating engine. So even though you lose some energy when you go from electricity or coal or whatever to hydrogen, you will more than get it back in the increased efficiency of the fuel cell if we ever get to the fuel cell, if it is economically feasible. And you are certainly not polluting, you are producing only water.

The next chart is an interesting look at one aspect of the agriculture, and that is the amount of energy that goes into producing a bushel of corn. On the chart we show two things: On the right is petroleum, and it shows that if you put in about 1¼ million Btus, you will get out 1 million. On the left-hand side, it shows a picture for ethanol, that if you put in three-fourths of a million Btus, you get out 1 million. And some people will tell you that this is pretty optimistic. In fact, Pimentel says it is actually negative. You use more energy producing ethanol than you get out of it. But if this is true, what that means is that today the way we produce ethanol, for every gallon of ethanol you burn, you are burning the equivalent of three-fourths of a gallon of fossil fuels, because that is the fossil fuel energy it took to produce ethanol.

The chart at the bottom shows why this is true, and it shows all of the total energy requirements of farm inputs.

□ 1615

This is BTUs per bushel of corn. The energy goes into producing a bushel of corn.

You notice that big, nearly half of it, that says nitrogen? Mr. Speaker, that is natural gas from which we make nitrogen fertilizer. Before we learned how to do that, all of our nitrogen fertilizer came from barnyard manures or guano. Guano is gone. If we wait another 10,000 or 20,000 years, there will be some more.

But most people don't know that nitrogen fertilizer today, essentially all of it comes from natural gas, almost none of it produced in our country. Natural gas is too expensive here. It is

made in other countries where gas is kind of stranded.

The next chart looks at where we are. I use an analogy here which I think is very apt. We are very much like a young couple that has gotten married and their grandparents died and left them a big inheritance, and they have established a lifestyle where 85 percent of all the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 15 percent from their income.

They look at the inheritance, and it is not going to last until they retire. So what will they do? Obviously, they have got to do one or both of two things. They either have got to spend less or make more. I use those numbers, others may use 86-14. I use those numbers because that is exactly where we are with our energy use today. Eight-five percent of all the energy we use comes from coal and oil and natural gas, and only 15 percent of it comes from some other source.

Now, a bit more than half of that comes from nuclear electric power. That is 8 percent of our total energy, about 20 percent of our electricity. The rest, 7 percent, is the true renewables. Mr. Speaker, those are the things which we ultimately will transition to.

Now this is a chart from 2000, and the solar and the wind and so forth would be bigger today. That is 1 percent in this chart of 7 percent. That is .07 percent. It is really in the noise level. We are four times bigger than that today at .28 percent. Big deal. It is a long, long way to go from .28 percent to go to something really meaningful as a contribution. But that is what we will be turning to increasingly in the future.

Notice that on this renewable sources there, the biggest one, 46 percent, is conventional hydroelectric. That will not increase in our country. We are pretty much tapped out on that. We might go to microhydro and use little microturbines in thousands of little streams across the country without affecting the environment as much as the big ones, by the way, and get about that much more energy.

But notice that solar and wind and agriculture down here, it is just alcohol fuel there; but it could be biomass, soy diesel, biodiesel and so forth, are very small amounts. Where we can get it, we ought to be getting more of geothermal. There is not much in this country. All of Iceland's energy comes from geothermal. I don't think there is a chimney in Iceland, because they don't need it. They get it all from geothermal sources.

Notice the waste to energy up there, which is 8 percent. That could grow. Instead of putting it in a landfill, there is a very nice plant up here in Montgomery County they will be happy to show you through. It is really a very handsome plant, and they are burning waste up there to produce electricity.

Just a word of caution about energy from agriculture. We must keep two re-

alities in mind. The first is that we must feed the world. Tonight, about 20 percent of the world will go to bed hungry, obviously not in this country. And we have to maintain our top soils. If you don't have top soils, you will not feed the world.

Now, if we would live lower on the food chain, if we ate the corn and the soybeans instead of the pig or the chicken or the cow that eat the corn and soybeans, we would have between 10 and 20 times as many calories to eat, because that is about the ratio. They say one pound of grain to three pounds of pig or chicken, but that is dry grain and wet pig and you can only eat about half of the pig. When you get down to the true ratio of dry to dry matter, it is about 10 to one for the steer. By the way, milk and eggs are very much more economically produced and really higher-quality proteins.

When it comes to things like cellulosic ethanol and biomass and so forth, be careful that we aren't using so much of that that we are mining our top soils of an essential element called humus. Humus is what gives tilts to the soil. It is why top soil is different than subsoil. It holds water; it holds the nutrients. If you take all of that out, you no longer have top soil.

We can get some energy from agriculture, but it will not fill the gap between what will be available and what we would like to use.

The next chart is a really interesting one. This shows on an interesting scale, this is how good you feel about your station in life on the ordinate here. Then the abyssa is how much energy you use. Notice where we are. We are way over there in the far right. We use more energy than any other society in the world.

You know, notice you can't feel very good about your station in life until you have used a meaningful amount of energy, but it is striking that this is all relative. China is up here. China feels really good about where they are. Notice how little energy the average man uses, so they are better off today than yesterday, so they feel good about it. They are improving. What I want to point out on this chart, you don't have to use the amount of energy we use to feel good about your position in life.

There are about a dozen countries over there that use less energy than we. Everybody above that line uses less energy than we and feels better about their station in life than we feel. We have lots of potential to use less energy and feel good.

The next chart shows a really interesting one on energy efficiency. There may not be this kind of opportunity everywhere, but on the left here is a usual incandescent bulb. If you are brooding chickens, you use a light bulb. It is not light you want; it is heat.

But notice that 90 percent of all the energy that comes out of that incandescent bulb, that is what is up here, I am looking up at them, Mr. Speaker, 90

percent of the energy that comes out of that is heat.

Now, if you go to a fluorescent, you have these little screw in fluorescents now, and notice, by the way, the green here is the same amount of light every time. Notice that you use demonstrably less energy, four times less energy. A 13-watt little spiral bulb will give you as much light as a 60-watt bulb. These fluorescents are very efficient.

Now notice what happens with a light-emitting diode. Notice that the amount of heat produced in a light-emitting diode is only about one-tenth of the light you get. No wonder much of new technology is moving to diodes.

The next chart is an interesting one from our country, and this shows the energy used per capita electricity consumption in California and the U.S.A. Remember several years ago they had some blackouts and brownouts in California, and we were predicting massive rolling brownouts or blackouts the following year. It did not happen.

The reason it didn't happen is because the Californians, without anybody telling them they had to, voluntarily reduced their consumption of electricity by 11 percent. And notice, the average Californian uses about, what, about 65 percent of electricity as the average in the rest of our country. It would be hard to argue that Californians don't live as well as we.

The next chart is a very interesting picture. We don't want to go there, and unless we do something meaningful to address this coming energy crisis, we could do what the Easter Islanders did. They had a good thing going for them there. They fished the oceans and the fish was there for the taking.

To make their boats, they cut down the trees. And the trees weren't growing as fast as the boats they were making, and they cut down more and more trees, and ultimately they cut down the last tree. And when those boats rotted and they could no longer fish, their society started deteriorating. When they were finally discovered, they were down to eating rats and living in caves and eating each other. They had a civilization before that which could indulge in such things as these very large sculptures that you see here.

What they did was to mine a non-recoverable resource, and they had no fallback. They had no alternative to fall back on.

The next chart shows kind of where we are and where we need to go. So far, Mr. Speaker, it may not be obvious that we have a really bright future ahead of us, but I think we do. We have some big challenges here. Challenges and opportunities are two faces of the same thing, and I would like to think of them as opportunities.

I think that what we need to address this problem is the equivalent of a program that embodies the total commitment of World War II. I lived through that war. There were no automobiles

made in, what, '43, '44 and '45. There was gas rationing. I can't remember people grumbling about the gas rationing.

Everybody had a victory garden who could. They were encouraged to do that. It was the patriotic thing to do. We started daylight savings time so you could have some time after work in the evening to work on your victory garden.

Everybody saved their household grease. I am still not quite sure what they did with that, but we took it to a central repository.

The point is everybody was involved. It was the last time in our country that everybody has really been involved, and we need a program that involves everybody. We also need a program that kind of has the technology focus of putting a man on the Moon, because there are some really big technology challenges here.

Thirdly, this program needs to have the kind of urgency that we had in the Manhattan Project, because time is really of the essence here. We don't have the luxury of a leisurely approach to solving this problem.

There will be an increasing deficit of oil in the world and in our country; but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I think the biggest deficit today is leadership, both here and in the world.

With so many experts, and these two studies, and again I go back to the two studies, here they are, paid for by our government, saying that we are at or nearly at peak oil and pointing to the dire consequences if you haven't prepared for that, I don't see our leaders in our country or in the world standing up and telling their citizens that we face this problem.

This chart shows what we need to do. The first thing we need to do is to buy some time. How do we buy time? Right now there is no surplus energy available to invest in alternatives, like building a nuclear power plant, like finding a really good way to make ethanol, to make a whole lot more solar panels, to make a whole lot more wind machines. By the way, wind machines are producing electricity at 2.5 cents a kilowatt hour. That is very competitive.

If we can have a very aggressive conservation program that you can do quickly, we can free up some oil, which buys us some time so that we can invest in these alternatives.

Then we need to use this wisely. Somehow we need an entity which is making judgments as to what is the best uses of the limited resources of both time and energy that we will have.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we need to invest three things to get these alternatives. We need money and we need energy and we need time. Of course, in this Congress, we never worry about money, we just borrow that from our kids and our grandkids without their approval. But we can't borrow time from them, and we can't borrow energy from them.

Thinking about our children and grandchildren, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make an argument that there is a moral dimension to the challenge we face. To the extent that we are able to go out there and get these remaining resources to fill the gap, to continue life as we know it, we are going to be denying our children and our grandchildren access to these energy sources.

Right now, we are telling them although we cannot do it, we cannot even come close to running our government on current revenue, not only will they have to run their government on current revenues, they will have to pay back all the money we borrowed from their generation.

I am having a moral problem with going out there with the techniques that we have to get this gas and oil and coal, the little that remains, more quickly. We will certainly be denying our children the opportunity to do that.

Somehow we have to have an organization which makes decisions. We have only limited time. We have only limited energy. How will we invest it? What is the wisest way to invest it?

There are many benefits that can come from this. One of the benefits, Mr. Speaker, I can imagine Americans going to bed in the evening feeling really good about the contribution they have made that day to this problem. This shouldn't be viewed as a problem; this should be viewed as a challenge. Life is really easy in our country. Most people don't have to really stretch to do well.

I think that our people would marshal. We have the most creative, innovative society in the world; and if our people only knew that there was this problem, I think that all of our energy, our creativity, our innovation could be marshaled to address this.

We have no alternative but to be a role model. We use a fourth of all the world's energy. We are a role model. We need to be a good role model for this transition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, with the realization that if every American is challenged to address this problem, that there is a way out, we will have a bright future. But the later we start, the more difficult that transformation will be. We should have started a decade ago. We can't turn back the hands of time, but we can from now on do what we should have been doing in the past.

□ 1630

RELIEF FOR SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA FROM RITA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, next month the Gulf Coast will prepare for

yet another Hurricane season. As we prepare for this year's storm season, it is important to remember that two category 3 storms hit the gulf coast last year.

In late September, the eye of Hurricane Rita made landfall in Cameron Parish in the southwest corner of Louisiana. The storm inflicted devastating damage to my district in southwest Louisiana as well as to the districts of my colleagues from southeast Texas.

In the coming weeks, House and Senate conferees will meet to determine a final bill to provide important relief to residents on the gulf coast. Today we are not here to compete with one another, but to together ask our colleagues to consider our needs and to remember Rita.

Unfortunately, more than 6 months after Hurricane Rita hit the coast of southwest Louisiana and southeast Texas, our road to recovery is not yet complete. Hurricane Katrina is off the front pages. Hurricane Rita is off the back pages.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the people of southwest Louisiana, and our friends in southeast Texas are not asking for a Federal handout. We do, however, need the Nation's support and the support of this body to recover and protect ourselves from future disasters.

This Hurricane supplemental is especially critical to my constituents in southwest Louisiana. Homes are destroyed or uninhabitable. In Cameron Parish, 90 percent of the homes were reduced to slabs of concrete. Students and teachers in southwest Louisiana are still waiting on Federal education disaster assistance to rebuild.

Our farmers are also hurting. Last year, farmers in Vermilion Parish planted 75,000 acres of rice. This year that number has been reduced to only 25,000. And this is why. This is why, right here. This is a picture just 4 weeks ago in my district, some 7 or 8 miles inland from the coast. These were rice fields that have been virtually destroyed due to tremendous saltwater damage that Hurricane Rita has left in its wake. Before Rita, this field was a thriving rice crop.

And you can see, this is another field. Same thing. All this white in here is salt deposition. This just 4 weeks ago, over 6 months from Rita. And we are still coping with this.

We owe it to these farmers to work as hard for them as they do for their families and neighbors in southwest Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, our industries are hurting as well. The Lake Area Industry Alliance, home of a vast petrochemical complex which serves the entire U.S., reports damages to its facility of nearly \$50 million. This picture here was taken in the immediate aftermath of the storm.

They show the Henry Hub, just one of the many energy facilities in my district that supply much of our Nation's energy industry. This facility alone

supplies close to 40 percent of the natural gas for our country, and was off line for a considerable amount of time following Hurricane Rita. It highlights the strategic interest that southwest Louisiana plays to our energy industry and why we must ensure that this infrastructure will be protected from storms.

This is another photo of the same area, more close up, showing the tanks. We had about 7 or 8 feet of water in this area. One way we can protect our energy infrastructure is to expand drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf. This can provide a long-term oil and gas supply that would serve the bridge to renewable energy sources.

Most importantly, it would also provide States with critical revenue sharing from any oil or gas leasing off their coast, allowing States like Louisiana to fund our own protection from future disasters.

Mr. Speaker, despite our many challenges, the people of southwest Louisiana remain determined to rebuild their communities and businesses. Parents look forward to the day when their children can once again attend schools and churches in a safe and comfortable environment.

Travelers look forward to a day when they can escape the summer heat with a trip to Holly Beach in Cameron Parish. Farmers look forward to the day when they can once again tend to their fields.

Mr. Speaker, southwest Louisiana has already begun to plan for our future. It is up to us as Members of Congress to help them realize it.

EQUITABLE FUNDING FOR HURRICANE RITA

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman MEEK from Florida, for allowing me to reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my good friend, Congressman BOUSTANY from Louisiana, in urging our colleagues not to forget the victims of Hurricane Rita as they determine priority funding in the Hurricane supplemental bill that is before the House and the Senate today.

You may know, but, of course, last August Hurricane Katrina, the sixth largest Hurricane in gulf coast history hit the gulf coast. It sent a human tide of over half a million evacuees to Texas. And while our State was struggling with the unprecedented effects of that storm, its own coast took a direct hit from Hurricane Rita, the fourth largest storm in gulf coast history, just 3 weeks later.

As Hurricane Rita grew into one of the most intense storms in recorded history, steering a path through Texas and along the Louisiana border, our State, and especially southeast and

east Texas were in the midst of its unprecedented response to Hurricane Katrina.

So our region not only took in evacuees, tens of thousands from Louisiana, and are thrilled that we did, we also took in 2.7 million evacuees from Hurricane Rita, the largest in history.

Then the hurricane shifted; Hurricane Rita went right up those same communities that had already done so much. Rita delivered a devastating blow to the region. As this photo illustrates, the resulting physical damage was massive.

The town of Sabine Pass was leveled. Further inland, entire communities, including houses, businesses, bridges, roads and utilities, were severely damaged or destroyed by Hurricane-force winds and torrential rains.

Over 75,000 Texas homes were damaged or destroyed in Rita, \$1 billion of our timber crop, the largest economic driver in east Texas; and today, 10 percent of our Rita evacuees have yet to return. Without homes or without places to work, we are again in a real fight for our lives.

Today we have a number of our Texas leaders, southeast Texas Recovery Team in Washington meeting with the White House, meeting with House leaders, meeting with FEMA and HUD to talk about how Texas can recover.

We had, as I said, 75,000 homes damaged or destroyed. Many of those have temporary blue tarps on today that are starting to deteriorate or blow off. When the hurricane season hits, we will put more and more people out of their homes.

We are asking for about \$1 billion in community development block grant funds in housing to help repair those homes, to help get people back in their homes, to help southeast Texas recover.

We are also asking for equal treatment. These are all photos from the Beaumont Enterprise and their special edition on Rita, showing the damage from this region. But as we rebuild, we find that, unfortunately, the Federal Government split Hurricane Rita along State lines, literally provided one assistance to our Louisiana neighbors, and a different level to our Texas neighbors, which is terribly unfair and creates a terrible burden on our Texas communities, many of whom are poor, many with very high minority and poverty rates, all of them eager to help our Louisiana neighbors, but also eager to try to recover ourselves.

So we are up here asking for the same 90/10 reimbursement rate of FEMA that our Louisiana folks have received for the exact same hurricane, same storm, same damage. Different treatment, same storm. It ought to be the same storm, same damage, same treatment.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with this. This Congress, our government, are charged with a duty to wisely allocate precious taxpayer dollars. This hurricane supplement has become a magnet for some less-than-justified projects.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this: that the Hurricane Rita assistance in schools of 90/10 and in housing are not only fair and justified, but will go a long way toward helping these communities who did so much for our Louisiana neighbors and are doing so much today to help them recover at a time of terrible need.

LADIES OF THE GULF

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. MEEK for allowing me to make some additional comments with my friends, Mr. BRADY from southeast Texas, and Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY from Louisiana.

The area of the State of Texas that I represent, Mr. Speaker, borders Louisiana, and also borders the Gulf of Mexico. And today we had another storm hit not Texas, but Washington, DC. Individuals from southeast Texas and east Texas, government leaders, community activists, chambers of commerce presidents, came to Washington to make the case for what occurred in the last 6½ months in southeast Texas.

By way of review, the ladies of the gulf came into the Gulf of Mexico last fall. The first of those, Katrina, came through, became the sixth largest hurricane, most powerful hurricane to ever hit the gulf coast. And when that occurred, 450,000 people from Louisiana went west. They crossed the Sabine River into Texas. Many of them came into my district.

Many of those people are still there. Several thousand kids are still in school in Texas from Louisiana. So many people are in Texas from Louisiana that we have a mayor's race in New Orleans this Saturday, and the two candidates campaigning for mayor in Louisiana have billboards all over the Houston area soliciting votes from people in Louisiana that happen to be in Texas.

Katrina was mainly a water-damage hurricane. The waters rose, caused damage, the waters stayed a long time. One of the towns of course hit was New Orleans. The national media focused on Katrina day after day after day. But 3 weeks later, another lady of the gulf came. Her name was Rita. She became the fourth most powerful hurricane to ever hit the gulf coast. She hit western Louisiana and east Texas, part of the area that I represent.

The largest evacuation in American history took place in Texas because of Hurricane Rita. Over 2 million people evacuated their homes. In Beaumont alone, 8,320 people were airlifted out of hospitals, in the middle of the night with C-130 transport planes, to 14 different States.

The first responders before Hurricane Rita hit loaded their police cars, their emergency equipment, their fire trucks, their front-end loaders, and

even helicopters on two enormous cargo ships that were in the Port of Beaumont. Those ships deploy cargo to the war in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The community, because of Hurricane Rita, was left without electricity for over 3 weeks; 75,000 homes were destroyed. Several thousand homes to this day have not been repaired, and people are still living under blue roofs.

That part of the gulf coast, Mr. Speaker, is a petrochemical area, refinery area. Eleven percent of the Nation's gasoline is refined out of that small area in southeast Texas. Thirty percent of the Nation's aviation fuel is manufactured there. And the Port of Beaumont, as I mentioned, that deploys one-third of the military cargo going to Iraq and Afghanistan.

But this hurricane was not a water-damage hurricane, although there was a storm surge. It was a wind-damage hurricane, and people lost their homes not to rising water, to losing their roofs and water coming in because of rain.

And that whole issue is being dealt with, or not being dealt with, with the insurance companies because of their refusal in many cases to even pay for the damage because it was not water damage, it was wind damage.

But be that as it may, the devastation affected the rice industry. This part of southeast Texas is a rice-growing area. As with Dr. BOUSTANY and his area, this part of the Nation supplies a lot of rice for not only the United States but other nations.

This year the rice farmers lost their second crop, that is the crop that they make money on. And now, rice season is back upon us. But to show you the devastation from Hurricane Rita, I talked to the owner of two John Deere stores there in southeast Texas that supply the farm machinery for the rice farmers.

He says he has not sold one piece of farm machinery this year because the rice farmers cannot afford to buy them. Those rice farmers now, many of them will go out of business and that land will be turned into something else. But be that as it may, Hurricane Rita was not one of those issues that caught the National attention, because local officials, many of them that were here today, took care of business as soon as Hurricane Rita showed up. There was very little loss of life.

And because apparently for no loss of life, that was not a story that the national media sought to portray. Mr. Speaker, we just hope in the supplemental that two things occur: that the people of Louisiana are treated not unfairly, but the people in Texas are treated equal to the people in Louisiana.

Rita was a hurricane just as powerful as Hurricane Katrina, and that the funding be the same, and that the line between Louisiana and Texas, the Sabine River, not separate fairness; that fairness go across the river and treat all Americans the same.

□ 1645

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill today:

H.R. 4297, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(b) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

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, it is an honor to come before the House once again. I would definitely like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing me to have this hour, this 30-something hour, Democratic leader NANCY PELOSI and also Mr. STENY HOYER, our whip, and our chairman Mr. JAMES CLYBURN and also Mr. LARSON, JOHN LARSON, our vice chair of our caucus.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor every day that we are in session, almost every day, to share not only with the Members how we should work in a bipartisan way leading on behalf of this country, but also to share with the American people how important that its elected representation here in Washington, DC, need it be Democrats, Republicans, Independents, that we come together under one flag and we salute one flag to make sure that we fight on behalf of what they need, not what the special interests may need here in Washington, DC.

I can't help but segue out of that opening into this historic day in American history. This historic day, and it wouldn't be anything that I would say that we should put forth a House Resolution to designate it as some sort of special holiday, but I think the Members need to be made aware of what happened 5 years ago on this day that might have put into motion, I believe had a lot to put into motion of what the American people are feeling now, not only on the east coast or in the Midwest or on the west coast or north or south, but what they are feeling of the sound of the ring at the gas pump when they are pumping gas into their tank, the feeling that they have when they can no longer carry cash because all of the cash is being spent on fueling their tanks to be able to give their children a ride to school or be able to help a sick loved one to a doctor's appointment, or a small business person trying to figure out how he or she is going to go up on the cost of their service or the product that they provide to a given company because of these gas prices.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be a Member of Congress with a conspiracy

theory; and so that is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, the 30-something Working Group, we have gone back to looking for the facts of how do we get to where we are now, where did we fall short as a Congress on behalf of the American people. Now, when I say fall short, I want to make sure that the Members don't get confused.

I think here on the Democratic side of the aisle that we have done a very good job, if not an outstanding job, of trying to represent the people that wake up every day and want to provide, want to put forth their best role, their best foot in this great democracy of ours. I think on the majority side that it has been well documented that there has been access into energy policy here in this country in government-funded buildings where special interest was top shelf. That is a heavy charge, but let me just back it up here.

2001 on this day, not yesterday, not tomorrow, but on this day, Vice President DICK CHENEY and his energy task force had a secret meeting bringing together big oil companies, energy lobbyists, CEOs, and other special interests to craft the administration's energy agenda, an agenda to deliver Big Oil big dividends. This is well documented within the media, this is well documented as it relates to testimony in some committees before Congress. Big five oil companies, \$32.8 billion in the first quarter profits this year, free drilling rights on public lands, \$9 billion in subsidies; \$20 billion over 5 years, and waived royalty fees, another gift that was given out of this energy policy.

Big Oil comes through for the GOP. Big Oil gave 84 percent of their campaign contributions to Republicans in the last 24 months. Bush-Cheney got more than \$2.46 million in 2004 as it relates to campaign contributions. More than \$70 million to the Bush and Republican Congress since 2000.

Democrats want to take this country in a new direction, and I think it is important that we point out some of the things that have taken place.

Now, some may say, Well, Congressman, I mean, that is good, you pointed that out. But, Mr. Speaker, I must go down memory lane to remind the Members and also the American people that this meeting was well denied by many: What are you talking about, a secret meeting? What do you mean? We do everything in the sunshine here in Washington, DC. We have transparency. We believe that we are here on behalf of the American people.

Well, let me just say that, and I want to point to an article that I pointed out last week, and I think it is important because we come to Washington every week for the business of the people and I think it is important that we point this out. This is a Washington Post article that is dated November 16, 2005. As a matter of fact, it was on the front page: White House documents show that executives from big oil companies met with Vice President DICK CHENEY's

energy task force in 2001, something long expected by environmentalists but denied as recently as last week by industry officials testifying before Congress.

We should have a problem with that. The document obtained, this week, November of 2005 by the Washington Post, shows that officials from ExxonMobil Corporation, Phillips, Shell Oil Company, and BP of America, Inc., met in the White House complex with CHENEY's aides who were developing a national energy policy, parts of which became law, parts of which are still being debated.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we bring that to the attention of the Members and remind them as we Members come to the floor, especially on the majority side, and start talking about, well, you know, I don't know how we got here. I don't know why these oil prices are the way they are. And I am going to show that chart there in a minute, but like it is some sort of, like it is someone there like a puppet, like pulling the strings and, I don't know how the puppet is moving.

Well, let me just remind the Members with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, that when we tried to come forth with an energy policy last year that would be meaningful for all Americans, not just some, and definitely not the folks that were invited to the White House. Now, I don't know and I don't know this as a fact, but I would have a pretty strong, I guess you can, like some people say, you could take this to the bank that everyday Americans were not called to the White House and asked how energy policy should be put forth in this country, because all of these subsidies were being placed on the table for these big oil companies.

And when it was reported, I remember very vividly, Mr. Speaker, that some folks said, well, it is in innovation, that is the reason why we are meeting with them. They are the professionals. Well, why while they were giving their advice, they were cutting their deal. And I think it is important for us to again say what this means to the American people.

Gas prices across America doubled. Big Oil profits quadrupled. I have already gone over that, but Big Oil has profited in a way that no other time in the history of this Republic, and I think it is important that people understand that we, those of us that are on this side of the aisle, Democrats, we believe in investing in the Midwest and not the Middle East. It is far too expensive, and I think we have figured that out and I think the Republican majority hopefully will get the message.

The bottom line is, like the commercial, Mr. Speaker, got milk? The bottom line, have you gotten enough? Have you gotten enough of the backroom deals? Have you gotten enough of the secret meetings that are later revealed? Because there are some people of good will that will share this with the American people. I mean, on this

side of the aisle we have called for and I am going to talk about an amendment that we put forth that was voted down on party lines that made a lot of sense; but I guess because Democratic Members put forth that amendment on behalf of the American people, I guess it wasn't good enough, because we weren't invited to the meeting.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I go back to the only way we can have bipartisanship here in Washington, DC, like I have mentioned before in other floor speeches, is that the leadership has to allow bipartisanship. You can't come from a minority position or the minority here in this House, as the Democrats, and say, well, we want to work in a bipartisan way. That is a statement. The action is the leadership, the Republican leadership of this House and this Congress say, well, we want to work in a bipartisan way and we will; we will let the minority Members know, the Democratic Members know when we will come together in a conference committee. We will sit down with Democrats to craft legislation, energy policy, prescription drug policy, health care policy. You name it. Social Security policy. We will come together in a bipartisan way to make sure that we put forth the will of the American people. But that was not allowed.

We are calling for on this side, we ran our amendments in committee and here on this floor, relief for consumers and farmers and small businesses, investigate and punish price gouging by big oil companies. Investigate and punish price gouging by big oil companies. Stop billions in tax breaks and subsidies and handouts that are ongoing to big oil companies. Keeping Americans, Americans home-owned and home-grown out of poverty of paying so much for energy prices. Increase production and use of American biofuels. Increase cars and trucks that run on ethanol. Make ethanol and biodiesel more available at the pump. Increase energy independence and create good-paying jobs in rural America, research and development to create cutting-edge technologies and biofuels.

Now, I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, because some folks may say, well, you know, Congressman, that is great, that is some great points there, but it is here on the innovation agenda. This is like the quick read on our promise to the American people on innovation. And we have a number of folks that have endorsed this innovation agenda and that are Democrat and Republicans, not only in the area of education and broad-band technology but also as it relates to energy independence in 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, that is not an if we do get in the majority, when I say the Democrats get in the majority, that is when we get in the majority what will happen. That is a promise. That is not something like a campaign slogan and saying that, well, you know, we filled our, you know, we will represent you well. No, that is the plan. And the

Members can go on housedemocrats.gov if they want to get information on the innovation agenda. It is just that simple. Just like that. It is just that simple.

The energy plan is right here. Ready, set, go, Mr. Speaker. Ready for bipartisanship or a Democratic majority. I think it is going to take a Democratic majority to get us to where we need to be to be able to put forth the kind of leadership that is needed in energy level.

Again, Mr. Speaker, not talking fiction but fact. I hold in my hand here a report that was done by the minority staff and the Government Reform Committee talking about the Bush administration energy policy and the 5-year review of what it is going to cost Americans in the long run. We know this, Mr. Speaker, because we have tried to offer and head off what is happening right now. And I think it is important that the Members understand. That report is out there in case Members want to take a leadership role on the Republican side and say maybe we need to start working with the Democratic side on some of these issues.

□ 1700

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, to point out that as we look at these record-breaking prices at the gas pump, that we look at the subsidies and cut out the talk about is there price gouging or not. I think the American people are going through a major head-scratching session throughout this country of saying I am paying through the nose; they are saying there is a gas shortage; but meanwhile, these big oil companies, even though they show up on the Today show trying to explain to Americans why the prices are what they are, they are getting another membership at the golf club. Forget, let alone buying golf clubs, they can buy these country clubs now because it is record-breaking profits, and it is very, very unfortunate that that is the case.

I want to say that last fall, Mr. Speaker, we had an appropriations amendment on the floor that we put forth that would have increased the opportunities for another look at the innovation, make sure that it falls on the side of the American people, that we do not use environmentally sensitive land to be able to carry out the will of big oil companies who just want to continue to do what they have been doing over the years but, hopefully, ahead in the area of biofuels, more emission vehicles and also innovation. We have talked about the innovation, and I think it is important we brought that to the attention of the American people.

I also have to, Mr. Speaker, share with you today, I have given the Web site out. I just want to make sure because I want to make sure the Members are able to follow me. Let us talk a little bit about border security, and I think I am now going to talk a little

about it because a lot has been said, very little has been done. I think it is important to look at the facts of what is actually taking place here, and I do have some facts here, and I also have a solution, something that folks like to talk about but they do not like to enact.

We talk about immigration and border security, the President gave a speech last night and said that we need to protect the southwest border, we need to protect America. My goodness, if we do not do it, we do not know what is going to happen. We have got to keep the terrorists out.

Well, last I checked, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of terrorists and well-known terrorists, even a recent documented case in Washington State of a terrorist coming through the Washington-Canada border and all along the northern border and some other places here in the United States. So to say that it is all in the southwest United States, that that is the issue and we need to deal with it, I think that there are some other underlying issues that are there. And I just want to share with you that when you look at a leadership that has been in place, Mr. Speaker, for oh, well, I know 6 years with a Republican President in the White House, Republican-controlled House, the double-digit years, and now look up and say we have a problem where we have to send the National Guard—the National Guard to the border?

Well, I guess it would be easy if Democrats were in control anytime during that time, because you can point at the Democrats and say that is the reason why we have to send the National Guard, because it has been mismanagement of the government and we have not adhered to the number of recommendations and reports that have been coming out over the years saying that we have to increase the number of border patrol agents and because of the lack of oversight and the lack of follow-through and executing any of that; we have found wasteful spending from the Department of Homeland Security, need it be secure borders or whatever the initiatives were dealing with cameras and sensors and all. We were so busy giving out these contracts to the special interests that no one bothered to hold the light of accountability over these contracts, and so we find ourselves in these quick fix, make money for folks, that can influence this process over what should happen in a functional government.

Let me get that Gingrich poster if I can. I want to bring Mr. Gingrich, not Mr. Gingrich, Speaker Gingrich, Mr. Speaker, who delivered the Republican majority to the Republicans, and this is what he is saying. He is saying, "They are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that cannot function." They, Mr. Speaker. When you have a former Speaker of the House that said "they" that means he is separating himself. "They" means

that they are no longer the people I knew when I was there. "They," they is like a group of people that the relationship may not be what it was, but I do not know what they are doing. They are over there. They are not on our side.

I guess that is what the Speaker is saying, and so I think it is important for us to look at the reason why this Republican Congress, Mr. Speaker, is being seen as they, even by individuals that were in the leadership of bringing about and delivering the majority.

Border. There are 1,000 fewer border patrol agents than were promised in the 9/11 Act. There was a lot of discussion around the 9/11 Act that passed off this floor, but there are 1,000 fewer than what was promised to the American people. The Republican-controlled Congress has broken the promise it made in funding additional border patrol agents, immigration enforcement officers and detention beds, especially in the 2004 Congress when it enacted the Intelligence Reform Act, or better known as the 9/11 Act, which mandated an additional 2,000 border patrol agents being hired over each of the 5 years.

But the President's subsequent budgets have failed to include adequate resources to implement the act. Indeed, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget called for only 210 additional border agents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had to read that part, and I am going to stop right there for a moment, because sometimes when they have the newscast on these cable stations, they run the breaking news at the bottom. I wish I had one of those ticker tape little areas under the President last night to read out in the fiscal year 2006 budget; that is, 2006 budget only called for 210 additional border patrol agents. That is the facts. That is not something from the Democratic Caucus. That is not something that I was walking down the street and just said, hey, I am going to say to the President. No, you can look in his budget, you can look it up on line, you can look in the White House Web sites archives, if they have not taken it off just based on I said something about it.

Now the President is ringing the bell saying, let us send 11,000 National Guard troops down to the southwest border even if there are documented cases of what is going on on the northern border.

The Republican Congress has not done much better. In the fiscal year 2006, they only funded an additional 1,000 agents, only 1,000, even though the 9/11 Act called for 2,000 agents per year. I am going to read off, Mr. Speaker, a little later on the amendment that we put forth here on this floor that was voted down by Republicans and voted for by Democrats.

The act also mandated an additional 8,000 detention beds, but only in the fiscal year 2006 the Congress funded only 1,800 additional detention beds. Again, I must add, one may go on prime-time television, say another thing, but the

facts state different. We call it the Potomac Two-Step.

The President and the Republicans continue to underfund the border patrol. The President's fiscal year 2007 budget does not fully fund the authorized level of border patrol, while the Democratic budget substitute does.

The fiscal year 2007 House homeland security appropriation bill that was marked up in subcommittee last Thursday falls 800 border patrol agents short and 3,130 detention beds and 500 immigration enforcement agents short of the authorized levels that was passed off of this floor just a few years ago.

Again, I mean, I am so glad that God has given me breath to come to this floor to share this with the Members and the American people, because if we look at the prime-time address or some sort of press conference, we will never get down to what is actually happening here in Washington, DC. I can tell you, on this side of the aisle, we have had enough of this kind of talk and lack of action.

Now, let me just pull out here that this border security, Mr. Speaker, is a nonpartisan issue and should not be a Democrat-Republican issue. It should not be, well, that Independent in the House has a proposal, that Independent. It should not be former Members of the House, Speaker of the House, calling Republican majority "they," as though they are not working in a way that they should work on behalf of the American people. Not my words, but Speaker Gingrich's words.

I can tell you that it is important that we move in the direction of making sure that we do not cater to certain major conservative voices, telling the President let us send 11,000 National Guard troops. Let me break that down for the Members in case some of the Members probably do not understand what that means.

I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. Last I checked, we had an issue as relates to end strength. We do not have the necessary personnel to even take on the obligations that we have now. We have men and women in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan and other very dangerous places, in the Horn of Africa, at this time. And when we talk about the National Guard, that means someone in your neighborhood will be called up for, what, for 2 weeks to go to the southwest border. For 2 weeks, they are going to be trained, mobilized, fed and dropped on the southwest border, for 2 weeks at a time.

I am going to tell you what that means for Members like me, Mr. Speaker, and there are 20-some odd Members from Florida, 25, 26, 27, and counting the two Senators. But this means for Florida that our Florida National Guard, hurricane season is starting in 3 weeks, have to have in their mind that they are going to the southwest border to protect only the southwest border and not really carry out a

mission of homeland security against terrorism. That means that those individuals that have been deployed and pulled away from their families from some area of 12 months to 14 months at a time, in Iraq now, has to come back home, kiss the kids, hug the wife, and then head off for 2 weeks over to the southwest border.

Now, this is something that has been going on for some time now and something that we have been calling for to be changed.

In addition, I hold in my hand here, Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 Commission report, at least the cover of it, a report card, the final report of the 9/11 Commission, dated December 5 of 2006. And this report card basically, and I will come down before the week is out to bring my copy of the 9/11 report to the floor, and I can read into the record verbally several pages of that report of things that should be taking place now or should have been taking place, and it has not.

The 9/11 report basically called for exactly what we passed here on this floor: 2,000 additional border patrol agents annually, okay; almost coming to the tune of 12,000 additional border patrol agents; of making sure that we are able to deal with attrition, we are able to make sure that we have professionals that are on the border. Being a border patrol agent is not just something you can hop up and just try to do tomorrow. Making sure that we move from a G-11 status to a G-13, which means that there is higher pay, paying these men and women for being the professionals that they are and making sure they have the kind of force that they should have.

Border patrol is not something that should be enforced or carried out when the poll says that we are not doing anything. It is something that is to protect the United States of America and it should not be a knee jerk.

□ 1715

Everything cannot be: Well, what if this? Well, we will send the military. What if we? We will send the military. We have a volunteer force. They signed up to stand up and do what they have to do on behalf of this country. My hat is off to them. They allow the veterans who, Mr. Speaker, serve in this Chamber, and also we represent throughout this great country of ours, they fought to allow us to salute one flag. And that is something I don't take lightly.

But when you have a Republican-controlled Congress that doesn't believe in bipartisanship, in working together, I think it is important to be able to point out some of these issues that are of great importance.

When you start looking at guidelines for government sharing of personal information, that is a "D." Wow. That is in the news today. That is their report from 2005. When you start looking at checking bags and cargo screening, that is also a "D." I wonder how they came up with that? That has been in

the news recently. When we start looking at the issue of critical infrastructure assessment, that is also a "D." When you start looking at the issues of how do we deal with FBI security workforce, that is a "C." When you start looking at the guidelines for intelligence oversight reform, that is a "D." When you start looking at unclassified top-line intelligence budgets, that is an "F." When you start looking at the issues of moving in the direction of securing our borders, also very low marks.

I think it is important that we point this out, and this will be on our Web site for your perusal, the Members, if they want to take a look at it. I think it is important to talk about the issue at hand, of what the President has shared with us last night, and to talk about it being willing to endorse something. And we will put a copy of that amendment that we put forth on the homeland security piece and what it called for on the Web site as well.

Well, in December of 2005, Democrats had a motion to recommit on H.R. 4437. In that amendment we called for an increase of border patrol numbers, border patrol officers by 3,000 additional agents, totaling 12,000 in total, and to expand the new training facility to be able to handle the capacity of training those officers.

We called for increased border patrol agents and inspectors, pay agents, from G-11 to G-13 that I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, that would put these agents on par with other law enforcement agencies so that we don't end up being the training ground for other law enforcement agencies that then take the dollars we have put into training, recruiting, and all of those things that goes into bringing those individuals on; that they are not taken away by other law enforcement agencies.

Immigration and customs enforcement, which are ICE officers, 2,000 additional agents and 250 additional detention officers.

This is a plan, Mr. Speaker. This is not something where you just jump up on television and say we are going to send 11,000 National Guard troops. That is not a plan. That is a Band-Aid. And I want those comments of what Republicans are saying about that plan.

We have here where we also call for 100 additional U.S. attorneys. U.S. attorneys. One hundred additional U.S. attorneys to be able to handle the cases. We don't want them sitting in detention centers taking up all that bedspace. That is 400 in total to be able to deal with the prosecution of individuals that come into the country illegally, and also those smugglers.

We are also calling for immigration judges, 75 additional immigration judges. We called for Coast Guard, 2,500 additional enforcement personnel, or 10,000 in total.

It is also important to be able to deal with the investigations of fraudulent schemes and documents, so we called for 1,000 investigators that would be

able to investigate those fraudulent documents so that we can have, guess what, competence.

We are finding in the Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Speaker, the reason why these procurement officers are going through so much trouble and not being able to have oversight over these contracts is that we haven't put the individuals there to oversee the contracts. So the contractors, those that come in, government contractors know they can come in and take advantage of the government and there are several months before we figure out what is going on, or before the Department figures out what is going on.

The amendment also calls for a thousand entry inspectors and K-9 enforcement teams, 375, that would take the place of many personnel individuals. These K-9s have been an effective tool in the effort against terrorism in U.S. enforcement throughout this country and along the borders.

I think it is important to look at a plan, not a Band-Aid. Now, speaking of a plan and a Band-Aid, let's talk for a minute about these 11,000 troops. An L.A. Times article today. In California, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger said he agreed with the President on the need for a border overhaul and immigration policies, but he criticized the plan of the National Guard on the border. Border State Governors were not consulted about the proposal in advance, and there are many outstanding questions about the impact of the President's proposal on Californians, he said in a statement. It remains unclear what impact only 6,000 National Guard troops will have on securing the border, says Schwarzenegger. I am concerned that asking the National Guard troops to guard our Nation's borders is a Band-Aid solution and not the permanent solution we need.

I just wanted to say that Governor Schwarzenegger, being a Governor in a State, a large State, where usually the National Guard reports to the Governor of that State, until they are federalized I mean, I would be concerned if no one at least had a conference call and said, hey, we are thinking about doing this; Governors, what do you feel about that? Okay, let's just take that out. Let us just talk about the way they do things here in Washington, DC. Let us just talk about Republican Governors, and say, what do you think about this; and how do you feel about how your National Guard can play a role in this? Well, that is from Governor Schwarzenegger.

Here is a Member of Congress, Congressman JONES of North Carolina. This is his quote. "If Bush had done this 2 years ago, we could have seen a real solution that might have improved the environment for the debate about what we should do now."

That is from that same article, and we will have this on our Web site a little later on today for the Members that would like to have that information.

We put forth that amendment, Mr. Speaker, going back to the amendment

which was voted down on partisan lines, I guess because Democrats had an idea and a solution, not just a Band-Aid.

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, for us to take a step back and to make sure that the American people know that we should all be on their side. And I do believe my colleagues in some areas are on their side, but there are too many people listening to the special interests here in Washington, DC.

We have a plan. We put our energy plan on the table. It is on Housedemocrats.gov. It is there. It wouldn't just be on the Web site, it would be implemented if the Republican majority would work in a bipartisan way with Democrats in putting forth these plans. Maybe we wouldn't be paying more at the pumps if the Democrat proposals and amendments that were on this floor at the time we were dealing with energy policy on price gouging, there wouldn't be a question whether there was price gouging or not because there would be enough U.S. attorneys to be able to deal with it. The oil companies would know there would be a \$3 million fine, plus prison time, jail time.

It is criminal to spend \$56 to fill up the tank of an F10 Ford truck. It is criminal to have folks running around here putting \$10 at a time in their tank and only getting three gallons, if that, in some cases to make it back and forth from work. And I think it is important that people understand what is happening.

I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, to the American people and the Members, and I just want to mainly talk to the Members, that we have time. We have time for a revelation, a paradigm shift for the majority to say we are willing to work with Democrats in a real way. But guess what? History doesn't speak to that. Recent history and the history of 5 or 6 years doesn't speak to that.

I am very concerned that people are paying for a one-sided policy, a Republican majority policy, a White House policy, a rubber-stamp policy, Mr. Speaker, of saying, Mr. President, whatever you want, we are willing to fund it. We are willing to give tax breaks to billionaires that we cannot afford; we are willing to give tax-free giveaways to the oil companies, which has never happened in the history of the country; we are willing to turn our heads and ignore real price-gouging policy and laws because somebody from the oil companies may end up going to jail.

Well, let me tell you what is happening. Gas prices are so high now that I know, I mean, I know for a fact that crime will go up because of gas prices. People are going to do what they have to do to fill their tanks or to put some gas in it. And I am not encouraging that. I used to be a State trooper. I want those individuals to be dealt with. But I wonder why we would put

the country in the posture it is in now to benefit the few oil companies that are out there?

We can talk about the rubber stamp a little further, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important that not only when we talk about oil, we talk about immigration. As I said, when I talked about the incompetence of one-sided policymaking without working in a bipartisan way, I just want to say that it seems like the Republican majority here in the House are afraid of foreign people but not afraid of foreign money.

When I talk about foreign money, Mr. Speaker, I have to get this chart here. I bring this chart out again. I have talked about this chart so much until I see it sometimes when I close my eyes, because I cannot help but point out again to the Members on the Republican side, the majority that is setting forth the policy and that has put this in motion and has been a part of history-making in the wrong way.

There are 42 presidents, Mr. Speaker. This is a fact. This is the U.S. Department of Treasury. This is not a 30-something report or the Kendrick Meek report. In 224 years, \$1.01 trillion has been borrowed from foreign nations. These are the Presidents and these are their pictures. Four years, 2001 to 2005, the President, along with the Republican Congress, pictured down here, have borrowed \$1.05 trillion from foreign nations.

Well, who are these nations? Well, we have put together, the 30-something Working Group, we wanted to break this down so that the Members will know what they have done. Republican Members would know what they have done, because we have called for pay as you go, and we will talk about that, not just borrowing as we go from foreign nations, putting this country in an economic posture it has never been in in the history of the Republic. I am not talking about in the last 2 years or 20 years or last 100 years, but in the history of the Republic.

So what the majority Republican Congress has done has enabled America from being how it was prior to the arrival of the Bush administration and the rubber-stamp Republican Congress.

Japan owns \$682.8 billion of the American apple pie, where they have bought our debt, Mr. Speaker. These are not my numbers, these are the U.S. Department of Treasury numbers. China, \$249.8 billion of U.S. debt.

□ 1730

China didn't make us do it. It is the policies coming out of the White House rubber-stamped by the Republican majority. If we worked in a bipartisan way, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority can be able to say, well, you know, both parties made this mistake. Oh, no. History reflects and the present reflects the reality of that statement, or the lack of reality of it. The U.K., \$223.2 billion of U.S. debt that they bought. The Caribbean nations, \$115.3 billion of U.S. debt that they have

bought, not because American people said, hey, let's just go out on a credit card and spend money. It is because the Republican majority said, let's go out on a foreign credit card and spend the money and do things that we can't afford to do like \$11 million in National Guard troops that will be activated that we will pick up the bill for because of a lack of policies in taking on the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. I can't say that enough.

Taiwan, \$71.3 billion Taiwan owns of our debt. OPEC nations. OPEC nations covering Florida and Georgia, \$67.8 billion. OPEC nations have a lot to do with the oil situation right now that are providing most of our crude.

Germany, \$65.7 billion they have bought of the U.S. debt. Korea, \$66.5 billion; Canada, \$53.8 billion of U.S. debt.

Now, I can talk and speak boldly on this issue, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you why. There is only one party here in this House that has balanced the U.S. budget, period. Not one, not one with an echo in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, Republican that is presently serving or served when the budget was balanced can say that they took their voting card out and they voted to balance the budget where the surplus is as far as the eye can see, until the President was elected and the Republican Congress was emboldened with a rubber stamp. Now, deficits as far as the eye can see. Record-breaking borrowing.

How do you borrow in 4 years \$1.05 trillion? How does that happen? Mismanagement and tax giveaways and special deals to special interests, that is how that happens. Somebody said, okay, well, Congressman, if this was a two-way conversation, well what about that thing we call the war? What about the thing we call 9/11? Well, what was World War II? What was World War I? What was the Great Depression? There were many other challenges that the United States of America has had over the history of 224 years prior to the Bush administration coming into power and the Republican Congress being handed a rubber stamp. So I don't think the Members would be able to explain this chart or explain the facts of incompetence or explain the fact that they have had a rubber stamp in their hand ever since President Bush has taken to the White House and the Republican majority has had their way of saying, Mr. President, whatever you want, we will do it. And that is how we got to \$1.05 trillion in 4 years. That is how that has happened.

I think it is important that, again, when we talk about issues and we point out the problem, guess what, Mr. Speaker? The solution will follow, or the attempt for a solution.

We talked about pay as we go. Some policymakers call it PAYGO, but I just want to make sure everyone understands what we are talking about in Washington because a lot of times we use acronyms and we lose people. We lose people that elected us to come up

here and represent them. So we use these acronyms sometimes not only to cut down a speech or what have you, but to also carry out that dance that happens up here that is called the Potomac 2-Step. If we use enough acronyms, it will lose the people and they won't know exactly what is going on up here. But we on the Democratic side believe in spelling this thing out for everyone.

Congressman JOHN SPRATT from South Carolina, one of the most honorable Members of this House and ranking member on the Budget Committee, put forth a substitute amendment on House Concurrent Resolution 95 in the 2006 budget resolution that instituted pay as you go.

Now, what does that mean? Now let's just make sure that we break this down just in case a Member of the House or Senate or a staff member or just, you know, everyday-Joe or -Sue doesn't understand when we say pay as you go. That means what many of us do every day. If we are going to buy something, we have got to know how we are going to pay for it. If we are going out and we want to buy, I don't know, a radio, and you go out and you buy that radio and the radio costs \$100, well then you step back. You can be at one of our favorite American department stores and you say, well, if I am going to buy that radio, where am I going to get the money? Do I have \$100 in my pocket? That is the first question that you ask yourself. Then you say, well, maybe I can't afford it. Or do I want to put it on this credit card?

Well, what the Republican Congress has done is that they have been taking out the credit card and they have just been charging everything, not only charging everything, charging it to foreign nations, the power of people that have, not people, but countries that have bought our debt not based on what everyday Americans have done as it relates to irresponsible spending and a lack of planning; it is because what the Republican Congress has done. These are our leaders that have been elected to lead.

Now, maybe I know this country will be better off financially if there was a bipartisan approach towards fiscal responsibility, but it has not been. And the Republican Congress has put forth, has endorsed and rubber-stamped everything the administration handed down.

So Congressman SPRATT, along with the Democrats, said, let's institute pay as you go. If you put it in the budget and it is going to be something that you want to spend money on, you better say how you are going to pay for it in real money, not funny money, not borrowing from foreign nations and weakening the economic opportunities on behalf of this country. That is what that amendment did. And guess what? Here's the vote right here. It failed. Not one Republican, 228 Republicans vote against it. It is roll call vote 87, March 17 of 2005.

Well, if that one vote, I mean, you look at these two opportunities here, Mr. Speaker. They are the only opportunities that the Republican majority allowed us to even bring something to the floor. We had to work hard to get that to the floor.

If the Democrats were in control of this House, which I hope the American people will allow Democrats to be in control of this House, A, we will work in a bipartisan way; B, we will institute pay-as-you-go policies, and we will cut out countries buying our debt and owning a part of the American apple pie.

Mr. SPRATT, again substitute amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 393 of the 2005 budget resolution. Again, 224 Republicans voted, zero voted for pay-as-you-go policies. Roll call vote 91. March 25 of 2004.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point those two things out because I want to make sure that people know that we are taking every opportunity on this side of the aisle to put this country back on track of fiscal responsibility. I can't tell you how many times that I have shared that with the Members, and I can't tell you how many times the Members have come to this floor with the rubber stamp in their hand. And I am going to tell you, I am going to show you what that rubber stamp looks like in reality, because I want to make sure that the Members that are checking this debate out see exactly what we are talking about.

This rubber stamp comes in the form of a voting card. This is my not only ID but voting card. And the President wants to give tax breaks that we can't afford to billionaires. Done. Let me vote for it. The President said that we should give unprecedented tax breaks to big oil companies in the time they are making record profits. Done. Let me vote for it. That is fine. Whatever the President wants, so shall he spell it out, we will rubber-stamp it and endorse it. Should we deal with issues as it relates to no plan for a war in Iraq? President said we should. Done. That is what the Republican Congress is saying.

And so here on the Democratic side, we are saying, hey, you know something, and this thing that we call a democracy, Mr. Speaker, we talk about a three-tier government. We talk about a legislative branch. We don't have to talk about it. It is in the U.S. Constitution. We have an executive branch, and we have a judiciary. If the American people want to do away with the Republican rubber-stamp Congress, you know what to do. You want to see this rubber stamp thrown out the back door, then you know what to do. If you want Members to come with their voting card to vote on behalf of the American people and not the special interests and what the White House has said that should be done, you know what to do.

Because the thing about it, Mr. Speaker, and the only thing that I feel

good about these days is that November is coming soon and that the American people are so fed up that maybe, just maybe, and I think we are beyond maybe right now with the scare tactics that will be coming from special interests because they know their day is coming. Their day is coming with the American people, and we will have tax breaks, real tax breaks for the middle class; we will have an energy policy that we will say will be energy independent in 10 years. They know that will happen. They will also know that we will have a true prescription drug and a true health care policy that small businesses and large businesses will be able to provide health care for their employees, and that will be done. They know that we will also move with a pay-as-you-go policy and not a borrow-and-spend policy from foreign nations that will also happen. And so I think that it is important that everyone understand that we are here on their behalf.

As I say, as I get ready to close, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is imperative that the Members understand that this is fact and not fiction. If it was fiction, I could not walk around this Chamber and this House of Representatives and this Capitol and speak to Members on a day-in-and-day-out basis. It is not personal. It is just business. And it is the business of the American people.

Let me get the chart here so that I can make sure that Members can get more information.

Housedemocrats.gov/30-something. You can get all the charts that we have shared with you here today and the reports. That is housedemocrats.gov/30-something. We encourage e-mails and anything that Members want to share with us.

Mr. Speaker, what is very unfortunate is the fact that on the eve, or last night, at 12 midnight the clock ran out on seniors here in the United States of America as it relates to the prescription drug plan. On that night, when there should have been great celebration by the Republican majority, what was going on? Going back to the movie "Wag the Dog." No, let's talk about immigration on the deadline of the sign-up time for prescription drugs.

So that goes to show you, Mr. Speaker, that it is something their trying to change the debate of the deadline and seniors being confused and now seniors being penalized the next day after. And so I just want to make sure that the Members know that there are some people that are paying attention to what is going on, and they are called the American people. And you do have time to change, and you do have time to bring about this paradigm shift, but history doesn't speak to it.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing me to come to the floor with another 30-something hour. We look forward to being back on the floor tomorrow if we have the opportunity.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as always I profoundly appreciate the privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker, and to stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, make remarks for a period of time about issues that are so pertinent to our day. The future and the history of this country, many times, has been turned right here on this spot, Mr. Speaker, and we would like to believe that we are reflecting the will and the wishes of the American people but adding the level of knowledge and judgment has been endorsed by us, endorsed in us by the voters and the United States of America and the 435 congressional districts, Mr. Speaker.

And I would point out as I listened to the discussion here in the previous hour that the word Republican, Mr. Speaker, is not a profane term. No matter how one says it, I am proud to be a Republican. I am proud to stand up for the values of fiscal responsibility and personal responsibility and limited government and lower taxes and lower regulation, a strong national defense, a vision that goes beyond the horizon for a strong energy policy that will expand the size of the energy pie and drill in ANWR and drill in the Outer Continental Shelf of Florida especially, so that we can get some natural gas into this country and some gasoline and some diesel fuel out of ANWR and out of our Outer Continental Shelf and expand our ethanol and expand our biodiesel and our wind energy, our renewable energies and clean-burning coal and expand our nuclear generating capability, along with a number of other, hydrogen, for example, a number of other energy alternatives.

□ 1745

All of these things are Republican principles, and all of these principles are blocked by people on the other side of the aisle who say the word "Republican" as if it were a four-letter word, Mr. Speaker.

And, furthermore, they say the word "democracy" as if the United States of America were a democracy. Our Founding Fathers knew better than that, Mr. Speaker. In fact, at one time there was a display down at the National Archives that demonstrated the pure democracy that they had in the Greek city-states perhaps 3,000 years ago. Our Founding Fathers studied that pure democracy, and they saw where they blackballed the demagogues and banished them from the city-state for 7 years because they had such an effective, rhetorical skill that they would sometimes lead the city-state and the masses that would follow that rhetorical skill in the wrong direction. That was for the diminishment of the greater good of the city-states in Greece.

That is why the Founding Fathers did not set up for us a democracy, Mr. Speaker, but they set up a constitutional Republic, a representative form of government. And our job here, we owe our constituents and we owe all Americans because we swear an allegiance to the Constitution, we owe all Americans our best judgment; and sometimes that best judgment might not be the best thing for our particular district but the best thing for the United States of America. It is not a matter of whether we take the poll of the public and vote the way the polls are. If we wanted to do that, if we wanted to have a pure democracy, it would be far easier today in the Internet era than it was during the days of the city-states when the Greeks had to bring all of their of age males, the people who got the chance to vote in those days, into their coliseum or their city center where they would debate the issues of the day and the majority vote won. So they would introduce a motion, and if a majority vote prevailed, then that was the policy of the day until it changed.

There were no guarantees or protections for minorities, for example. There were no constitutional protections like our Constitution. Our Bill of Rights, in particular, is drafted to protect the rights of the minority against the will of the majority and, in fact, to protect the rights of the majority against the whims of a court. All of those protections are in our Constitution. But continually I hear the word "democracy," "democracy," "democracy," as if that were somehow such a high and shining ideal, that that solved all of nature's ills and cured everything that there was on the globe. Truthfully, our Founding Fathers came to the conclusion sometime well before 1789 that a democracy would not succeed in this country and, understanding human nature, a democracy just simply could not succeed; so they crafted out of whole cloth a constitutional Republic: a balanced three branches of government, checks and balances on each one. Not three equal branches of government, but three that were balanced with the natural tension between the judicial branch of government, the legislative branch of government where we stand, Mr. Speaker, and also the executive branch of government where the White House stands.

That is what we have. We have a constitutional Republic, a representative form of government. And our job is to be as informed as we can be; to be in tune with the events of the day; look into the future and anticipate what the future might bring; prepare this country for the future as much as our vision can allow; receive all the input across America; sort the good ideas from the bad, the wheat and the chaff, so to speak; and implement the policies that are best for America and debate them here on this floor.

That is the challenge that the Constitution lays out for us, and that is

the challenge that our Founding Fathers envisioned: a deliberative body and a constitutional Republic, a representative form of government. Not a democracy.

And we have Republicans and we have Democrats that have divided themselves in this country in a two-party system, which our Founding Fathers did not envision. But when you look at the structure of the legislative branch, it is inevitable that we have a two-party system because we have a winner-take-all system. That means that the majority in the House and the majority in the Senate select the committee chairs and they make their appointments to the committees in greater numbers, sometimes by one or two, sometimes by a little more than that, in each of our committees so that the majority party has majority control of each of the committees.

If the public is unhappy with the direction that that is going, then it is their ability to go to the voting booth and elect people from the other party who would then come in power, as the power changed here in 1994 because the people at that time were fed up with the kind of policies that were rejected in the elections of 1994 when the Republicans took over the majority here in the House of Representatives.

That is the system that we have, Mr. Speaker. I am proud of the system we have. It is the best in the world. It is far superior, I believe, to any kind of a pure democracy and superior to a parliamentary form of government because we have a guaranteed protection of rights, and those are limited in their scope and the government's powers are limited, although sometimes we go beyond our constitutional authority.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, brings us to a point, a point within this great national debate, an issue that was envisioned again by our founders, and we have a constitutional responsibility here in the Congress to establish an immigration policy. Our founders envisioned it, it is referenced, and it is our duty to have this debate and to shape a policy that is good for America.

We are having a national debate, finally, and this national debate is a national debate that was, as I recall, called for by Pat Buchanan in 1996, Mr. Speaker, when he said we must have a national debate on immigration. He knew then and I knew then that this issue was getting out of control and out of hand. It was only 10 years since Simpson-Mazzoli, the 1986 amnesty legislation that was signed into law by President Reagan. And it was designed to provide amnesty and it was an admission of amnesty then, they did not try to redefine the word "amnesty," to about a little more than 1 million people, 1.2 million, perhaps 1.3 million people. And the trade-off for amnesty for a little over 1 million people was enforcement, employer sanctions, strict enforcement of laws that required employers, and I was one at that time, Mr. Speaker, to fill out the I-9 forms,

check the identification of the applicants for jobs in my company, and verify who they were and carefully dotted the I's and crossed the T's of the regulations, because I was sure that there would be a Federal agent who would walk into my office, demand to see the I-9 forms for all of my applicants, make sure they were in order and make sure that I had taken a look at their Social Security number and their driver's license, at a minimum, and verified who they were.

Well, I filed all those records, Mr. Speaker, and I carefully followed the law. And here we are, 20 years later, and no one has come along to check my I-9 forms. And I have to say I believe that would be consistent with the vast, vast majority of the employers in America who have followed the law but slowly begin to realize, month by month, year by year, that there was not going to be enforcement. And as we see illegal workers flow into our communities and take up jobs all around us, we begin to realize there was not anyone enforcing against those companies either.

And as a company, if you look at your competition and they are hiring cheap, illegal labor, labor that they may not have to have Workers Comp on, probably do not have health insurance on, probably do not provide for a retirement benefit, maybe do not pay overtime to, maybe pay them off the books, sometimes on the books, all of those competitive advantages and be able to bring people to work, work them when you need them, and simply discard them when you do not need them, more like a machine than a worker; that kind of workforce in the hands of your competition makes it very difficult to hire people who are legal to work in the United States, green card holders, American citizens, lawful residents, people who have lawful presence in the United States, and pay them the wages necessary and the benefits necessary.

We for years and years provided health insurance and mostly retirement benefits and year-around work in a seasonal business so that we had high-quality employees. And we have been able to compete for now going on what must be 31 years that we have been in business, and in that period of time we have been able to keep people on year round and be able to have long-term employees, but compete against those people who have discount employees.

And we had testimony in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, to that effect and people who have lost their business because of that kind of competition, who refused to break the law, refused to hire illegals, and saw their competitiveness diminish on them to where they could not function any longer. And that is the kind of thing that is happening across America.

Well, the scope of this is far bigger and far worse than I described. And so that 1 million people that turned into 3

million people that received amnesty in 1986, we know that the counterfeiters kicked into gear when the amnesty was passed and signed by President Reagan, Simpson-Mazzoli in 1986, that is why it went from 1 million to 3 million, because a large percentage of that extra 2 million that got added on there were people who came into the United States, rushed in here illegally, and then had to have counterfeit documents to demonstrate that they had already been here, like maybe a heating bill or a light bill or a gas bill or a telephone bill, some kind of a document showing that they had been here, maybe a paycheck or two or four or five.

Those kinds of records were generated by the counterfeit industry back then so that people that just came into the country after Simpson-Mazzoli was signed could find themselves on the path to citizenship, to receive the amnesty. And the people that worked with that paperwork very well know this, Mr. Speaker. It is something that I have not heard come out in the testimony and the discussion and the debate. The people who are for guest worker/temporary worker will do or say almost anything except respond to the facts at hand. That is one of the facts. And if the people who are advocating for guest worker/temporary worker are right and there are only 12 million people here, then I will submit that you will see that number at least double and probably triple before they get finished processing all of the counterfeit documents for the people who allege that they were here longer than 2 years so that they can get the path to citizenship.

Those are the circumstances we are dealing with. And the strategy of the people who are coming into the United States know that we have actually had seven amnesties since 1986. The most famous was Simpson-Mazzoli. There are six others that were listed throughout that period of time. Sometimes we missed some people with amnesty and maybe they were not adept enough to bring their counterfeit documents to the front; so we had to go ahead and pass another amnesty for this 400,000, another amnesty for these 300,000; and pretty soon we have logged seven amnesties since 1986 and including 1986, Simpson-Mazzoli.

This Congress, the Senate, is poised to pass the eighth amnesty in 20 years. And the numbers in this country have grown and grown and grown and no one really knows how many. But we have testimony from the Border Patrol, and I agree with this number, and the President made it in his speech last night, that they turned back more than 6 million illegal crossers at the border since he came into office 5½ years ago.

The numbers that I know are numbers for 2004. The Border Patrol intercepted on our southern border 1.159 million and presumably turned back 1.159 million. They only adjudicated for deportation 1,640. That would be a fact.

For 2005 the statistical number is 1.188 million that were intercepted at the border, collared at the border, I say, and turned back. I do not know the number that actually were adjudicated for deportation.

But the Border Patrol also testified, Mr. Speaker, that they stopped one-fourth to one-third of the illegal entrants into the United States. One-fourth to one-third; 1 out of 4, 1 out of 3, as the best that they can hope for. So if 4 million come across the border, which would be the statistical number, 4 million, and we turned back 1 million, that means each year the population of illegals in this country grew by 3 million. And, yes, some of them turned around and went back and some of them died and some of them became citizens through some fashion; so maybe that number of growing illegals is not quite 3 million. Maybe it is not even quite 2 million, but I do not believe it is less than 2 million myself, and I do not know that it is only 4 million that came across the border.

I was down on the border a week ago last weekend, Mr. Speaker, and I spent 4 days on the ground down there, in the Tucson sector mostly, but overall, the Arizona-Mexico border. And I asked a question consistently of the people who work that border, and these would be officers who have been there for a period of time. They had hands-on experience. And I took the testimony that I received here in the Judiciary Committee, in the Immigration Subcommittee, the testimony of the Border Patrol's stopping one-fourth to one-third, that being 1.2 million in a year, and also the President's statement that in his administration they have turned back more than 6 million. I pointed out the 25 percent interception rate, perhaps the 33 percent interception rate. And of the people who have hands-on experience on the border, no one would agree to that number. No one would say, "I think that is an appropriate number." They all had a number lower than that. The most consistent number that they gave me in their judgment was we stopped perhaps 10 percent. Ten percent.

Now, I am not sure I can calculate how we could have 10 million come across the border and only stop 1 million out of 10 million.

□ 1800

So maybe some of those people come back over and over again and keep trying. We are re-catching a lot of the same people, and they try until they get here.

One thing I don't accept is the idea that a high percentage of them go back to Mexico, for example, because those who walk across 5 or 10 or 20 miles of Mexican desert to get to the border, who walk across 10 or 20 or 25 or even 30 miles of American desert to get to the highway, where they can get picked up and get a ride, it is so difficult to come in and the journey is so arduous, it might require three to six

days on the ground in the desert with little water and a little bit of food and having to travel mostly at night, that kind of arduous travel into the United States isn't going to be taken lightly, especially if they pay a coyote \$1,500 to come into the United States.

You can't afford to come back and forth a lot, if that is your path into the United States. So I think a significant percentage of those who come into the United States will stay here, for those who succeed in traveling into the United States.

The numbers that are here are so astonishingly large, and the American people are so, I don't want to say ill informed, they have not had access to empirical studies that show what would happen to the immigration numbers in America if the modern version of Simpson-Mazzoli, amnesty plus the path to citizenship that was advocated by the President last night, if that should become something that would be policy.

So I submit as I picked up the paper this morning, Mr. Speaker, and began to review some of the language that is in here, and after I had listened to the speech last night, I was aware there was a study being done by Mr. Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, a very careful, conservative study that kept low assumptions and tried to keep low numbers so it would be credible and believable by the American people, rather than high numbers that might be somewhat suspicious. These are low, careful numbers in this study.

This study, and it is in the headlines of the Washington Times, it says the bill, and this would be the Hagel-Martinez bill from the other body, the bill would permit as many as 193 million more aliens in the next 20 years, by 2026.

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that: the bill permits up to 193 million, that is million with an M, more aliens in the next 20 years, until 2026.

Now, this 193 million would be 60 percent of the current U.S. population over the next 20 years. According to Mr. Rector, the magnitude of changes entailed in this bill are largely unknown, but they rival the impact of the creation of Social Security or the creation of the Medicare program. Mr. Rector is a senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation that conducted this study.

He also backed down a little bit from that and said that is the high number. But if we go to the low number, the lower number of his prediction, he said it is more likely that about 103 million new immigrants actually would arrive in the next 20 years. 103 million.

It just so happens that the population of Mexico, Mr. Speaker, is 104 million, or it was until maybe the last couple of weeks when the population got diminished substantially again. We are taking in from across that border some Central Americans, the vast majority are Mexicans, we are taking across that border 11,000 a day. That

adds up to 77,000 a week, roughly a little bit smaller than the population of Sioux City, Iowa, which pours across our southern border every single week. And we don't seem to be outraged by the magnitude of that kind of a migration, to use a nice term for it. An invasion, to use a more accurate term for it.

We saw people marching in the streets, Mr. Speaker, and particularly in the streets of Los Angeles, half a million or maybe more than that in the streets. Some of the people that were there just got across the border illegally the night before, and they picked up the flag of another nation and joined hundreds of thousands of their former fellow countrymen and marched in the streets and demonstrated because they want to be made citizens of the United States of America. Even though they have defied our laws and they defy our majority rule, they demand that we provide for them citizenship and all of the benefits that go along with it, the welfare benefits and the vast welfare state that we have would grow dramatically if we went down that path and granted that citizenship.

But there is the image of more than half a million people with flags from their home countries, mostly Mexican flags, pouring into the streets of Los Angeles, demonstrating in the streets Los Angeles.

Then what I hear from the liberals in America, Mr. Speaker, I hear them say, well, why would you be offended because someone flies a flag from their home country, they are proud of their home country?

It is true we fly Irish flags on St. Patrick's Day. In the small town where I live of Kiron, they fly the Swedish flag on the flagpole from time to time. It is true we do celebrate our heritage from our other countries. Those are appropriate things to do in this country, provided that our allegiance is to Old Glory and to the United States of America and the flag of a foreign country is simply a flag that demonstrates heritage.

But when you fly a flag of a foreign nation like a Mexican flag above the American flag on the same flagpole, and the American flag upside down, that is not a message of celebrating your heritage if you come from that country. That is an insult to the United States of America. The upside-down American flag is a sign of distress, and in fact I think there is distress in this country if we tolerate things like that without objection, if we move on and think there is nothing wrong and stick our heads in the sand while 11,000 people every day pour across our border.

This is the magnitude of immigration, far greater than anything we have ever seen in the history of the country. I am doing the research now, Mr. Speaker, and I expect to come back to this floor, perhaps sometimes this week, with the totals for all the num-

bers of legal immigration in all of the history of America.

I am willing to speculate here tonight that the total for all of the legal immigration, those that came through Ellis Island, those who came through other ports such as San Francisco or Seattle, those who came to the United States in a legal fashion without violating American laws and accessed a path to citizenship, and those who have built this country with those born in this country and teamed up and worn the uniform and fought under that American flag, those people that are the heritage of this country but came across here legally, I believe are far outnumbered by even the lowest number that is presented by this study that is printed here in the Washington Times today, far outnumbered by the 103 million, which will be the lowest number projected under the only empirical study that we have to work with, Mr. Speaker; 103 million people in 20 years. The population of Mexico in 20 years.

This bill, Hagel-Martinez, advocates for adopting all people from Central America, including Mexico, into the United States. It is the same thing as annexing everything down to the Panama Canal minus the natural resources. This is moving the Rio Grande down to the Panama Canal without taking the natural resources, but moving all the people up here into the United States so that they can, yes, go to work here; yes, contribute to our economy; but also access the welfare benefits, which will cost significantly more to fund them than the amount of the economy that they generate.

Now, someone out there is thinking that is not true, because I have heard them say in the public arena for months and months and perhaps for the last couple of years that all immigrants that come into the country, legal and illegal, grow our economy, and so therefore we can't get along without them because they are the reason our economy is growing.

I will submit there is a difference between highly educated, technically skilled immigrants who come in here on an H-1B program, who are going to step in here and make \$75,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, and someone who comes in here who is illiterate in their own language and doesn't have a high school education.

But I submit that those Americans who are high school dropouts put more pressure on our welfare than those who have graduated from high school. High school graduates put more pressure on our welfare system than those who have a college education or college degree.

A significant majority of illegals who come into the United States are illiterate in their own language. They don't have a high school degree. Those that do have, there are only 7 percent that have a diploma. More than that have a high school education, but at least 60 percent do not. Statistically,

there is no way to avoid the facts that people that match those demographics are going to put more pressure on the welfare roles here in the United States. The demographics of the illegal immigrants coming into the country show that there is 45 percent out-of-wedlock childbirth. That is another guarantee for poverty.

So if you are underemployed and your children are not being born in wedlock, the pressure on this society to fund your well-being, to be able to provide the welfare benefits is tremendous.

There was a study that was done by the former Secretary of Education who laid out something that is just an empirical fact. If you want to solve the pathology of America, a solution to that is get an education, get married, stay married, get a job, keep the job. That solves most of the pathologies of America. Statistically it is an easy thing to sort out.

But if we are going to bring into this country 103 million to 193 million people, with the majority of them without a high school education, the majority of them not literate in their own language, Mr. Speaker, the burden on us is going to be great; and it is going to cost us at least \$50 billion a year.

The study goes on, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to pick up where I left off, and that is the balance of this study shows that the Senate is ignoring the scope and the impact of the bill. It goes on and says the impact this bill will have over the next 20 years is monumental. It has not been thought through. That is the Hagel-Martinez bill. It says the population would grow exponentially, because the millions of new citizens would be permitted to bring along their extended families.

The bill includes escalating caps which would raise the number of immigrants allowed as more people seek to enter the United States. These escalating caps essentially go up as the request for more and more H-1Bs or temporary workers or agriculture workers raises the number, and the cap that grows out of this takes us out to this.

Even the chain migration that comes from family members, when one accesses citizenship or even green card holder access, then they can bring in their parents. Certainly if they are married, they can bring in their spouse, their dependent children. Then those people then extend that out and then they offer the opening to go to their family members and their extended family members. This chain migration continues on and on.

I have stood on this floor and submitted that everybody that comes into this country on average would have about four family members at a minimum they would want to ask into the United States once they access this path to citizenship, and those four family members I thought was a rather conservative estimate. This study, Mr. Speaker, only claims six-tenths of a family member total with regard to the

chain migration. That formula that is here I believe is significantly understated. This number will be much greater.

So this 103 million people over the next 20 years, I will submit, by 2026 will be larger than that, because chain migration, in my opinion, and I am not critical of the Rector study except to say I think it is very conservative and I think the numbers will be quite great, we are really talking about emptying out Central America into the United States and a population that is perhaps as much as two-thirds, at least more than 60 percent of the population of the United States of America, increase that much again. We can see in 20 years a population growth here in America that would take this 300 million on up to 500 million, and by the next generation we are well on our way to 1 billion people here in America.

□ 1815

Now I am not saying that we cannot feed them. I am not saying we could not build the infrastructure. But what I will say, Mr. Speaker, is we need to have our eyes wide open. And America needs to have a debate on this cost.

But the numbers aside, the pressure aside, the \$50 billion a year and the escalating number, the cost to the taxpayers to fund the deficits that are created by the pressure on the public services and on the welfare roles, all of that aside, to me the central point is this, America is a Nation of laws.

It was founded and people will say it is a Nation built by immigrants. Well, every Nation is built by immigrants. I think that it is a redundant point, except we have got more richness from our immigrants here than maybe any country in the world. But we are founded on the rule of law, Mr. Speaker.

That is the principle that I wish to take. And the advocacy last night in that address from the Oval Office was an advocacy for a path to citizenship for people who have broken the laws in the United States, and those who have broken the earliest and the longest and the most often would be the ones rewarded first.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I hear, well, we have to make people go to the back of the line. We cannot put them to the front of the line and reward them with citizenship when other people have followed the law.

But there is not a way to do this under Hagel-Martinez without people going to the front of the line. They are already in the front of the line. They are already in the country. They already have roots down. They already have jobs. And some of them already have families.

And the advocacy last night was, give them a path to citizenship. Yes, make them learn English and demonstrate good citizenship, pay their taxes, and then the reward for that is going to be this precious reward of citizenship.

And then help us choose the next leader of the free world. Send some

people to Congress here who have capitalized on contempt for the rule of law, Mr. Speaker. That is the path that is being chosen by the White House.

That is the path that appears to be chosen by the United States Senate. It is an erroneous path. It is a path that is not thought out. And the cost to this society, again Mr. Speaker, is tremendous.

I advocate for this. There is no requirement that when we do enforcement, as the House passed under H.R. 4437, we can do enforcement without guest worker. We can do enforcement without temporary worker. In fact, we must do enforcement before we can have a legitimate debate on guest worker or temporary worker. That is our duty and that is our responsibility.

We take an oath to uphold the Constitution and the rule of law here on this floor. We passed that legislation off the floor. And that is the first responsibility of the President of the United States, is to enforce our laws, protect our Nation and enforce our laws.

In this case the two things are tied together. But guest worker and enforcement of our laws are not linked together, Mr. Speaker. They are separate subject matters. We can do enforcement without doing guest worker.

And the President argues to the opposite. In fact I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if you simply want to have guest worker or temporary worker, if you designate anyone who wants to come to the United States as Hagel-Martinez does essentially, anyone who is not a felon, anyone who is not objectionable and does not have a record, that they would have a path to come to the United States.

That is simply opening up our borders to everybody but a few undesirables. If you do that, then you do not need to have border control, Mr. Speaker, because you have already allowed everyone into the United States who wants to come, and they do not even have to hurry, they can come in their own good time, because now we will put it into statute that we are going to have an open door and a red carpet.

And that the people who lined up the right way were really wasting their time, they should have rushed to the United States, come across the border, gotten themselves a job and simply waited for amnesty number eight over the last 20 years, so that in the next 20 years we can have 103 or 193 million people here in the United States, at a cost of least \$50 billion extra a year, an expansion of our welfare state, and one of the most significant transformations of America that this country has ever seen.

Now there are other things that matter. And it matters, culture matters, and values matter. And I think for the most part, those who are coming across from our southern border are consistent with the American culture and American values, they are Christians, for the most part they are Catholic.

They think a lot of families, even though the illegitimacy rate is high, they are tightly bonded together as families and they work together as families. Those are rich qualities. They go to church as families. And they work together as families.

Their commitment to assimilation is not questioned. I would question that after seeing the streets of Los Angeles. But we need to reach out to that, and we need to promote assimilation to the people who are here legally.

But the people who are here illegally need to go home, they need to go home and grow the country that they came from, solve the problems there. You know, Mexico seems to think it would be an insult to them, and they will say that it is, if we would build a wall from San Diego to Brownsville and seal off the border. And it would be, I am going to say, 90 percent effective if it is patrolled right.

And I have drawn up a design for a wall like that, Mr. Speaker. But Mexico says, no, we would be offended by that, in fact we do not like the idea that the National Guard would be coming down to the border, because that sends the wrong message, you are talking about militarizing the border.

But meanwhile, Mexico pushes their young people into the United States, tells them, come here, go into the United States, enter the United States illegally, stay there, get a job, send your money back home, do not learn the language, do not assimilate into the culture, effect the policy of the United States vis-a-vis Mexico in favor of Mexico.

That was a stated policy by the former minister for Mexicans living in the United States named Juan Hernandez, who now is a high profile individual apparently here in the United States, and claims to be an American citizen, I expect he is.

But that was the Mexican policy, unload your excess young people into the United States, and go tell them, do not build an allegiance with the country who has welcomed you, but keep your allegiance with the country that you left, send your money back down there and vote in the United States, and speak up in the United States and vote on a bilingual ballot, I would add.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for producing multi-lingual ballots of any kind here in America. There is a requirement when you are a naturalized citizen that you demonstrate proficiency in English. And so therefore if you come into this country legally and you acquire citizenship, which is a requirement for voting in America, you will have been required to demonstrate proficiency and literacy in English.

That means then that you can go into a voting booth and vote in any voting booth in America on an English language ballot, not another language ballot. And the only other scenario by which one might be sitting in the United States and eligible to vote and not have command of the English lan-

guage would be if they were born here in the United States, they had birth-right citizenship, which I reject that idea, but it is our practice today, someone with birthright citizenship, and by the time they get to be 18 and register to vote, they go into the voting booth and they had not had enough exposure to English to be able to understand a simple ballot, and so we would give someone who was born in America, an American citizen, lived in an ethnic enclave, never learned English, and give them that interpreter in the voting booth so we can find a way to coddle them and be an enabler, just like an enabler for an alcoholic, hand them a bottle of booze so they do not cure themselves.

But why do not we give them an incentive then, if they are not learning English in their enclave, let them learn English when it is time to go to vote. They could take pride in that. They could assimilate into the society. They can be far more successful, make more money and contribute more to this society and live a richer, fuller life.

But we have a bilingual provision in the Voting Rights Act. That was wrong on its original premise. It is wrong in the language that is there today. It will be wrong when it comes to the floor of this House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker. It needs to be amended. And I intend to seek to try to amend that legislation, that being another piece of this overall puzzle, Mr. Speaker.

But what I am for is, I am for building a wall from San Diego to Brownsville, 12-foot high, concrete wall, pre-cast panels, dropped into a footing that has got a notch in it and a cut-off wall so it is hard to dig underneath, the kind of stability that it needs, something that will look like the barrier that the Israelis built to defend themselves and protect themselves from the bombers that were coming over from the West Bank.

That barrier has been 95 percent effective, even though people are determined to come across to kill people. We can do something very similar to that for less money than the Israelis are spending.

Now but the scope of the dollars that we are spending on our southern border are astonishing, Mr. Speaker. I would submit that the authorization request for the Border Patrol, for the air and marine division, for ICE, for the Customs border protection division all together that will be allocated for our southern border, and this would not include significant resources and assets that come from the National Park Service and other agencies down there that have jurisdiction in the area, that request is over \$6 billion for the 2,000 miles of our southwest border, over \$6 billion.

Now when you divide that out, it is a little less than that, say a 2,000-mile border just for round numbers. You come back with a cost-per-mile, Mr. Speaker, of \$3,181,336 per mile.

\$3,181,000 per mile to defend our southern border, to stop 10 percent, maybe 25 percent, probably not 33 percent of the illegal traffic.

So we have got maybe 25 percent effectiveness for a price of \$6 billion. So when we quadruple that then to go to \$24 billion to defend our southern border at 2,000 miles. Would that get 100 percent control of the border? I say not. Not without a physical barrier that is effective.

And so for \$3 million a mile, \$3,181,000 a mile, I wondered what would happen if we applied the free enterprise solution to this task? What would happen if we simply put out a request for proposals and offered companies that had insurance, that had professional credentials, that could bond the job, to bid a section of the border under an open, competitive, low-bid contract that met standards?

And if there were companies out there that wanted to be in control of security in the border between San Diego and Tijuana, let them bid for that for an appropriate price and see if that competitive bidding will come up with some more creative ways and some more effective ways to control our border.

Me, I would be interested in, had I been back in the private sector where I spent 31 years in the construction business, all together about 35 years in the construction business, 31 years in the construction business actively owning and operating.

But I would be interested in the stretch across the desert where you did not have intense, I will say intense urban areas to deal with, that stretch across the desert, some of it does not have a marker at all.

If you go down into New Mexico, there is a concrete pylon that stands on the horizon. And you look across that horizon, you go to that one, you look at the next horizon, and you can see the next one, and the next one. As far as you can see with these high-powered big old brass transits that they had back in those days when they laid that out.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine that was about 1848 or so when they laid out the border between Mexico and the United States, horizon to horizon, concrete pylons that high, poured, set on the border.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only marker. And so when people walk across the desert, they do not know where the United States is and where Mexico happens to be. I would want to bid that stretch of the desert. But I do not think they want to pay me \$3 million to protect that stretch of the desert.

But you know for \$1 million a mile, I could do quite a job. So could many American companies enter into a contract and say, I want to bid this 100 miles of border, and I will bid you X dollars per mile. And I have got insurance. I have got bonding. I will perform.

And if anybody gets across here, we will have the Border Patrol count the

footprints of those that get across and dock it from my contract so that there is a penalty if I am not efficient.

Now, we do could do that, and we could control this border in a year. We could have the contractual structures all in place. Some of those people will say I want to build a wall. I want to build a wall to keep people out. And I want to bid this accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I drew up a little diagram for a wall that I think would be effective. And I did this, Mr. Speaker, because we have a little trouble dealing with concepts. And so this wall that I propose works something like this.

I would go in and build a concrete footing, and this concrete footing would be perhaps 2 foot over, 8 inches down, put you a notch in there like that, and that would be the footing. This would be about 4 foot deep in here. This would be about 8 inches of footing all together.

This would be 6 inches wide in there. And then I would put on a precast concrete panel that would be about 12 feet high. It would drop down into this notch and go up like this.

□ 1830

Now this, Mr. Speaker, is a very rudimentary drawing of the kind of concrete wall that I would construct, and this kind of wall is very simple, and it would be cheap to make. You could trench this and you could slip-form that with a machine. And then this represents a 6-inch-thick wall from a cross-section end, just like if you were going to slice a loaf of bread and look at it from the end. Twelve feet high, I would put wire on top, a little constantine wire on top, perhaps 4 feet of that sticking up there, 12 feet of concrete sticking up out of this footing. These could be precast panels, you could set those in, it wouldn't be hard to make a mile a day of that with a small crew. It would go very quickly once the footing was poured.

This kind of a wall, allowing a little bit for sensors and some of the bells and whistles that one would have, this kind of a wall can be built for about \$500,000 a mile, when we are spending \$3 million a mile, Mr. Speaker, for our Border Patrol to drive back and forth and watching maybe 75 or more percent of those illegal border crossers get through. This kind of a wall, if patrolled, if managed, if maintained would cut down on illegal crossings by, I am going to say, at least 90 percent. And if it is well manned, it can go very close to 100 percent.

Now, people say walls don't work. Then why do we put fences around prisons? Why is there a fence around the White House? How many people got across the wall in Berlin? How successful was that? Extraordinarily successful, I would say, Mr. Speaker. And then those who say that the Berlin Wall was an offense to humanity, I would agree to that. But the Berlin Wall was a wall that was built to keep people in. This

wall would be a wall that would be built to keep people out, and that is a 180-degree philosophical difference. It should not be offensive to people who live in freedom to have to protect their freedom by building a wall. That is the most cost effective thing we can do. For every \$6 that goes down to the southern border to fund our Border Patrol down there for 2007, for every \$6, if we would just take one of the \$6, we can construct this kind of a structure for 2,000 miles along our southern border, and you know that it would make the Border Patrol far more effective and that they would be able then to be able to utilize their time chasing people down and actually catching people and deporting them instead of being flooded by this mass of humanity that comes pouring across the border every single day.

It would make the Border Patrol more effective, and it would honor their work. It would save lives, Mr. Speaker.

I visited the location where a young forest ranger park officer named Chris Eggle was killed in the line of duty 3½ years ago just across the border. There was a drug smuggler, they were under the Mexican police who were in hot pursuit of a drug smuggler who drove across the border where there wasn't a barrier, and his vehicle broke down on the U.S. side of the border where the Mexican person, the Mexican police officers continued in their pursuit at least to the border, and Chris Eggle came in with his partner, closed in on the suspect, and the suspect let off four automatic rounds of an AK-47 and Chris Eggle was killed on that location.

I visited that location, Mr. Speaker. If we had had even a vehicle barrier fence which exists there today in the Oregon Cactus National Monument, Oregon Pipe Cactus National Monument, that vehicle barrier would have saved Chris's life. This kind of a barrier would have easily saved his life.

Every major city in America has at least one police officer who has been killed in the line of duty by an illegal here in the United States of America. That is over 70 police officers who have been killed in the line of duty by illegals. All of their lives would have been saved if we had enforced our border as I propose, Mr. Speaker. And that is just the police officers.

The numbers of those who die at the hands of those who should have been apprehended and deported escalate day by day by day. Twenty-eight percent of the inmates in our prisons in the United States between our city, our county, our State, and our Federal penitentiaries, 28 percent, Mr. Speaker, are criminal aliens. They didn't all come into the United States illegally, but they were unlawfully present here when they became criminal aliens and sent off to prison. That is the percentage of crime that is being created that could be prevented if we enforced our laws.

And that is why 13 people every day die at the hands of negligent homicide, generally a drunk driver who is unlawfully present in the United States. Twelve people every day die at the hands of a first-degree murderer, second-degree murderer, or manslaughter violently at the hands of someone who is unlawfully present in the United States, a criminal alien here in the United States. That is 25 people a day.

This is slow-motion terrorism taking place in the United States. I am not implying that everyone who comes across this border is a criminal, or, I will say, wishes the American people ill will, Mr. Speaker. I will apply that everyone who comes, I won't just imply, I will state that every one who comes into the United States illegally is a criminal. They are guilty of a criminal misdemeanor for illegally entering the United States, and I find it ironic to see the demonstrators in the street carrying signs that say, "I am not a criminal." Well, does the other sign say, "I am an illegal alien, but I am not a criminal"? You can't have that in the United States of America. If you are in the United States illegally, then you are guilty of a criminal misdemeanor that is punishable by 6 months in the penitentiary and then deportation. That is the law here in the United States. Denying it with a poster in the streets doesn't make it not so. It is the law, regardless of whether H.R. 4437 passes which makes it a felony to enter into the United States.

The reason for that is so that the law breakers will be entered into the NCIC computer database, the National Crime Information Center computer information database and we can keep better track on them. Sometimes because it is a misdemeanor, they don't get booked, they don't get printed, and their prints don't go into the records so that they can be searched and scanned. Sometimes we don't know whether it is catch and release for two or three violations or whether it is seven or whether it is 20 different violations, because it is not always recorded the way it needs to be. And sometimes they are not booked at all. Sometimes they are simply released because of the urgency of the moment.

The drugs that come into this country, Mr. Speaker, it is an astonishing number. The Federal Government keeps track of these things, and their number is at 90 percent of the illegal drugs in America come across the border of Mexico. That is the Federal Government's fact. And it is not one that they very much relish repeating, but it is the Federal Government's fact: 90 percent of the illegal drugs, amounting to, amounting to \$60 billion, that is with a B, \$60 billion worth of illegal drugs.

And you match that up with the slow-motion terrorism that comes with the loss of 25 American lives every day at the hands of criminal aliens. Far more have lost their lives at the hands of criminal aliens than were victims of

September 11. And you couple that with \$20 billion that is wired into Mexico every year from the wages of many of those who are illegally working here and another \$10 billion that goes to the Central American countries, \$30 billion of wages wired south and \$60 billion worth of drugs hauled north, and you have got a \$90 billion economic problem. You have got a \$90 billion drain on the gross domestic product of the United States of America, and it is a \$90 billion injection into the economy of Mexico.

And people wonder why Vicente Fox doesn't step in and do something about the meth labs that are in northern Mexico, the marijuana smuggling and the marijuana harvest that is taking place, about the thousands of pounds of drugs that pour into the United States, one report, 2 million pounds of illegal drugs in a year. Two million pounds.

And I watched down there, Mr. Speaker, as we took 18 bales of marijuana, each about 10 pounds or more, out from underneath the bed of a pickup. Eighteen bales of marijuana smuggled into the United States. And the officers who made the interdiction said sometimes 200 pounds, and this was maybe 180 pounds, maybe as much as 200 pounds, sometimes 200 pounds is a decoy; it is simply a decoy, Mr. Speaker, and the effort to run the gauntlet with 180 to 200 pounds of marijuana would just distract the officers so that they can get by with a 2,000- or 2,600-pound load in another vehicle going through the gap that was created while they were distracted picking up the 200-pound load. That is a lot of drugs, Mr. Speaker, and a lot of damage here in the United States of America.

And I don't make excuses for the drug users here. There is a demand here that draws those drugs into the United States. We need to deal with that, too, Mr. Speaker. But meanwhile, we can raise the cost of the transaction; we can make it a lot harder to get those drugs across the southern border.

If we could shut off this southern border and just simply allow legal entrants into the United States at our ports of entry, if we could do that, then at least in theory, and if we could do it overnight, we could cut off 90 percent of the illegal drugs in America. That means some people will not get their drugs, some people won't go on drugs, some people will wean themselves off. Every time that happens, there is another life that has been improved, another standard of living that has been improved. Sometimes a life has been saved. Sometimes a little boy or a little girl gets a new pair of tennis shoes instead of their daddy or mommy buying drugs. Sometimes that daddy or mommy gets off drugs and spends their time raising their children and loving their children and nurturing them in the fashion that God intended, Mr. Speaker. Every time we can make an improvement in that drug equation, we are improving the lives of children in America somewhere sometime.

And so I would submit that we need to enforce this border. We need to build a wall similar to this design that I have with a 4-foot wide footing, a 6-inch wide notch in that footing, probably have to brace it right there and right there. I didn't draw that in. And then at least a 4-foot deep cutoff wall, and then drop in a 12-foot high pre-cast concrete panel, 12-foot high, 10 feet long would be my guess.

So that, as we lay those panels out, every time you set a panel you build another 10 feet of wall. We could do this for less than \$500,000 a mile, a half-a-million-dollar a mile, for one out of every \$6 that is spent protecting our border today before the increases that will be necessary for 6,000 more National Guard troops on our border. This is a capital investment that could be amortized over 40 years or more, and it doesn't cost that every year. It is only one-sixth of budget. That is a one-time expenditure and then a small maintenance fee, and we could easily fund the maintenance fee by requiring fewer personnel down on the border because this would be so much more effective.

So I would submit, Mr. Speaker, we need to have enforcement first and enforcement only until enforcement established, and the American people will agree that the administration has made a real commitment to uphold the laws of the United States of America including our immigration laws. Seal the border, end birthright citizenship because that is another magnet: 300,000 to 350,000 babies born in America that in the practice of birthright citizenship can start the chain migration to bring their families in.

The misconception idea that somehow all family reunions have to take place north of the Rio Grande instead of south of the Rio Grande, I don't know how that ever got started into our verbiage and accepted as an institutional commitment by the United States of America. Seal the border, end birthright citizenship, shut off the jobs magnet. That means sanction employers, require them to use the basic pilot program, the instant-check program so that they check their employees. And I don't mean just the perspective employees or those they have just hired, but check every employee so we can process that through and let those go who are not lawfully present and can't legally work here in the United States, and pass the New IDEA bill, the new Illegal Deduction Elimination Act, IDEA, I-D-E-A, Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. That lets the IRS enforce the law.

When they do a normal audit, which they do on many of the larger companies every single year, they would run the employees' Social Security numbers that are on the 941 form through the instant-check program on the Internet. Punch those Social Security numbers in there, and it will go out to the Social Security Administration database and the Department of Homeland Security's database, NCIC again,

and identify if that number, that Social Security number and the other identifiers that would be entered with it would identify someone legal to work in the United States.

If an employer uses that method, they would get safe harbor, Mr. Speaker, and the IRS would not bother them. But if they didn't use the instant-check Internet-based program, or if they did use it and ignored the results and hired them anyway, then the IRS would deny the deductibility of those wages. So the business expense that would be wages, say \$10 an hour, would be denied. Now that is no longer an expense; that goes over into the profit column presumably, and that \$10 an hour that was a write-off or an expense becomes taxable income. And if they are a corporation in a 34 percent bracket, that is a \$10 an hour wage, then the 34 percent tax on it plus the interest plus the penalty kicks that fee up to about \$6 an hour added to the \$10, and your \$10 an hour worker becomes a \$16 an hour illegal worker, and the notice goes off to the Department of Homeland Security that we have an employer here that is violating the law, step in and sanction that employer also with the fines that are appropriate for the violations that are in place.

We can shut off this jobs magnet, Mr. Speaker. And if we do that, attrition, the time when people make a decision to go back home, they can go back home with the skills they have learned here, they can go back home with the free education that we provided for tens of thousands of children, an educated nation south of us that can be renovated by the new blood that comes from us saying we are going to be a nation of laws, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1845

We must be a Nation of laws. We must defend our borders. We must defend our sovereignty, and if we do not do that, we will not have a country. The American people know that, Mr. Speaker, and I wish that the people over in the other body and the advocates for this thing called a guest worker or temporary worker knew that.

When you grant citizenship to someone, they are no longer a temporary worker. Citizens do not go home. We do not have temporary citizens, and we must not have 103 million to 193 million new residents here in the United States, unless the American people debate that and say that is what they want. If the American people want to open up their doors to that kind of numbers of people, then they should step up and say so.

Until that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to stand on the rule of law, defending our borders, enforcing our laws, and perhaps if that enforcement can take place for 3 to 5 years, we can have then a legitimate debate on those who would be left in this country and how to deal with them in an appropriate fashion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for approximately 10 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess for approximately 10 minutes.

□ 1856

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-466) on the resolution (H. Res. 815) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4200, FOREST EMERGENCY RECOVERY AND RESEARCH ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-467) on the resolution (H. Res. 816) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4200) to improve the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to promptly implement recovery treatments in response to catastrophic events affecting Federal lands under their jurisdiction, including the removal of dead and damaged trees and the implementation of reforestation treatments, to support the recovery of non-Federal lands damaged by catastrophic events, to revitalize Forest Service experimental forests, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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 Mrs. BLACKBURN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mr. BOUSTANY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today and May 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and May 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, May 23.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and May 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4297. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(b) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 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:

7516. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Percentages for Direct and Counter-Cyclical Program Advance Payments (RIN: 0560-AH49) received May 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7517. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Forest System Land Management Planning (RIN: 0596-AC43) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7518. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—*Bacillus Thuringiensis* VIP3A Insect Control Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for its Production in Cotton; Extension of a Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0282; FRL-7722-7] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7519. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Benzaldehyde, Captafol, Hexaconazole, Paraformaldehyde, Sodium dimethyldithiocarbamate, and

Tetradifon; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0322; FRL-8065-1] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7520. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—*Pantoea Agglomerans* Strain C9-1; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0267; FRL-7772-6] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7521. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Approval of Clean Air Act, Section 112(I), Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Perchloroethylene Dry Cleaner Regulation Maine Department of Environmental Protection [EPA-R01-OAR-2006-0119; A-1-FRL-8049-9] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7522. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R04-RCRA-2006-0375; FRL-8161-2] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7523. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—OMB Approvals Under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Technical Amendment [FRL-8161-7] received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7524. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Technical Amendments to the Highway and Nonroad Diesel Regulations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0224; FRL-8161-9] (RIN: 2060-AN78) received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7525. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration'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; Partial Withdrawal; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0170 FRL-8167-4] received May 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7526. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Update of Continuous Instrumental Test Methods [EPA-OAR-2002-0071; FRL-8165-1] (RIN: 2060-AK61) received May 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7527. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives; Removal of Reformulated Gasoline Oxygen Content Requirement [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0170; FRL-8167-5] received May 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7528. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Virginia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R03-RCRA-2006-0381; FRL-8165-7] received May 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7529. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendments to Stage II Vapor Recovery at Gasoline Dispensing Facilities [EPA-R03-2006-0314; FRL-8165-2] received May 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7530. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Large Municipal Waste Combustors [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0117; FRL-8164-9] (RIN: 2060-AL97) received May 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7531. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of High Altitude Area Navigation Routes; South Central United States [Docket No. FAA-2005-22398; Airspace Docket No. 05-ASO-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7532. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of High Altitude Area Navigation Routes; South Central United States [Docket No. FAA-2005-22398; Airspace Docket No. 05-ASO-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7533. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the St. Louis Class B Airspace Area; MO [Docket No. FAA-2005-22509; Airspace Docket No. 03-AWA-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7534. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Palm Springs, CA [Docket No. FAA-2005-23184; Airspace Docket No. 05-AWP-14] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7535. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Kennett, MO [Docket No. FAA-2005-22746; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-32] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7536. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Kennett, MO [Docket No. FAA-2005-22746; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-32] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7537. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Beatrice, NE [Docket No. FAA-2005-23375; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-35] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7538. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Wenatchee, WA [Docket No. FAA-2005-20417; Airspace Docket

05-ANM-06] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7539. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Restricted Area 2507E; Chocolate Mountains, CA [Docket No. FAA-2004-19051; Airspace Docket No. 04-AWP-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7540. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Offshore Airspace Areas; Gulf of Alaska Low and Control 1487L; AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-22708; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-32] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7541. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Chignik, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-22855; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-35] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7542. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Holy Cross, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-22854; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-34] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7543. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Toksook Bay, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-22856; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-36] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7544. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions of Class E Airspace; Koyuk Alfred Adams; AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-22111; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-14] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7545. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Toksook Bay, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-22856; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-36] received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); 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. BONILLA. Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental report on H.R. 5384. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. Ordered to be printed. (Rept. 109-463 Pt. 2).

Mr. WALSH. Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental report on H.R. 5385. A bill making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of

Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. Ordered to be printed. (Rept. 109-464 Pt. 2).

Mr. PUTNAM. Committee on Rules. H. Res. 815. A resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 109-466). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Committee on Rules. H. Res. 816. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4200) to improve the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to promptly implement recovery treatments in response to catastrophic events affecting Federal lands under their jurisdiction, including the removal of dead and damaged trees and the implementation of reforestation treatments, to support the recovery of non-Federal lands damaged by catastrophic events, to revitalize Forest Service experimental forests, and for other purposes. (Rept. 109-467). 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. WELLER:

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an additional two-month period in 2006 for enrollments in the Medicare Advantage plans and for the Medicare prescription drug benefit without any late enrollment penalty for months before the end of such two-month period; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 5388. A bill to provide for the treatment of the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 5389. A bill to establish improved mandatory standards to protect miners during emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 5390. A bill to provide for the expansion and coordination of activities of the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to research and programs on cancer

survivorship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 5391. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide eligibility for certain additional dependent children for annuities under the military Survivor Benefit Plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 5392. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to direct the President to extend the availability of unemployment assistance made available in connection with Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5393. A bill to provide for the Department of Housing and Urban Development to coordinate Federal housing assistance efforts in the case of disasters resulting in long-term housing needs; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 5394. A bill to waive application of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to a specific parcel of real property transferred by the United States to 2 Indian tribes in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5395. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Energy Freedom Bonds to finance programs to facilitate the research, development, and deployment of clean renewable energy technologies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 5396. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to employ additional categories of mental health professionals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 5397. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated followup care once newborn screening has been conducted, to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 5398. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to exclude from the definition of renewable fuel any fuel that is imported or derived from any matter that is imported; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 65: Mr. JINDAL.
- H.R. 115: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 128: Mr. HOYER.
- H.R. 303: Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 408: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 503: Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. WAMP, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 515: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 663: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 699: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 717: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 752: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 783: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 821: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 964: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 968: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1103: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1366: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1408: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1425: Mr. OWENS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1471: Mr. BARROW, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 1498: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1518: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1554: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1598: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1697: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1951: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2035: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2047: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 2072: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2088: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 2456: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 2684: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2804: Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 2961: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3055: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3173: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3427: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3476: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 3781: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 3883: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 3936: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4259: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 4293: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4315: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 4364: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 4384: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 4398: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 4479: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 4542: Mr. SWEENEY and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4547: Mr. DELAY and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 4622: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 4623: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4633: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 4672: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 4695: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 4727: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 4739: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4755: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 4843: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 4894: Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 4922: Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 4992: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 5005: Mr. CARTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 5013: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MACK, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 5014: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 5118: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. REYES, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 5131: Mr. NUNES and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 5139: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5140: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5141: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5142: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5150: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 5159: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 5166: Mr. HOYER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BEAUPREZ, and Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 5200: Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 5201: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RENZI, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 5204: Mr. BACA, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5225: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 5230: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 5248: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5293: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5310: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 5316: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 5333: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FARR, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 5347: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 5352: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 5354: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 5362: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5365: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. WYNN.

H. Con. Res. 380, Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. BARROW.

H. Res. 155: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 222: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 295: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 316: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H. Res. 363: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 740: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H. Res. 749: Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 756: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H. Res. 759: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 773: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H. Res. 790: Mr. FORD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. CARSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Res. 795: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mrs. CUBIN.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 4217: Mr. KUHL of New York.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of the rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 753. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report on the National Animal Identification Plan, including the lessons learned and the effectiveness of the pilot programs funded in fiscal year 2007, an analysis of the economic impact of the proposed National Animal Identification System on the livestock industry, and the expected cost of implementing the National Animal Identification System.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 21, line 4, insert before the period at the end the following: “: *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 of this appropriation shall not be available until the Secretary of Agriculture submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the National Animal Identification Plan, including the lessons learned and the effectiveness of the pilot programs funded in fiscal year 2007, an analysis of the economic impact of the proposed National Animal Identification System on the livestock industry, and the expected cost of implementing the National Animal Identification System”.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 5, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Page 13, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$500,000)”.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. PAUL

AMENDMENT No. 4: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new sections:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or administer the National Animal Identification System.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. CARTER

AMENDMENT No. 5: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 7__. The Secretary of Agriculture may use not more than \$3,600,000 of funds made

available under section 522(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)) for program integrity purposes, including the data mining project.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 7__. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who make loans available under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) to processors of domestically grown sugarcane at a rate in excess of 17 cents per pound for raw cane sugar or to processors of domestically grown sugar beets at a rate in excess of 21.6 cents per pound for refined beet sugar.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT No. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the National Animal Identification program.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT No. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$178,120,000.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. LUCAS

AMENDMENT No. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 7__. The amounts otherwise provided by title II of this Act for “NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE—CONSERVATION OPERATIONS” are revised by reducing the amount made available for National Headquarters salaries and expenses, and by increasing the amount made available for conservation technical assistance, by \$50,000,000.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. SCHWARZ OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 7__. It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should use the transfer authority provided by section 442 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7772) to implement the strategic plan developed by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for the eradication of Emerald Ash Borer in the States of Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MS. BORDALLO OF GUAM

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 13, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 15, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

H.R. 5384

OFFERED BY: MR. CHABOT

AMENDMENT No. 12: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. __. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agriculture Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

H.R. 5386

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new title:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. Each amount appropriated or otherwise 3 made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 5386

OFFERED BY: MR. PUTNAM

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE _____—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sec. _____. No funds provided in title I may be expended by the Department of the Interior—

(1) for the conduct of offshore natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities placed under restriction in the President's moratorium statement of June 12, 1998, in the areas of northern, central, and southern California; the North Atlantic; Washington and Oregon; and the eastern Gulf of Mexico south of 26 degrees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude;

(2) to conduct offshore natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area for any lands located outside Sale 181, as identified in the final Outer Continental Shelf 5-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Program, 1997–2002; or

(3) to conduct natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.