

(1) the issue of which such bond is part is an issue of the State of Alabama, Louisiana, or Mississippi,

(2) the bond is a general obligation of the issuing State and is in registered form,

(3) the proceeds of the bond are distributed to one or more political subdivisions of the issuing State,

(4) the maturity of such bond does not exceed 5 years,

(5) the bond is issued after the date of the enactment of this Act and before January 1, 2008, and

(6) the bond is designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for purposes of this section.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may only designate a bond for purposes of this section pursuant to an application submitted to the Secretary by the State which demonstrates the need for such designation on the basis of the criteria specified in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the criteria specified in this paragraph are—

(A) the loss of revenue base of one or more political subdivisions of the State by reason of Hurricane Katrina,

(B) the need for resources to fund infrastructure within, or operating expenses of, any such political subdivision,

(C) the lack of access of such political subdivision to capital, and

(D) any other criteria as may be determined by the Secretary.

(3) GUIDANCE FOR SUBMISSION AND CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations or other guidance which provide for the time and manner for the submission and consideration of applications under this subsection.

(c) FEDERAL GUARANTEE.—A bond described in subsection (a) is guaranteed by the United States in an amount equal to 50 percent of the outstanding principal with respect to such bond.

(d) AGGREGATE LIMIT ON BOND DESIGNATIONS.—The maximum aggregate face amount of bonds which may be issued under this section shall not exceed \$3,000,000,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.)

#### AMERICAN MILITARY PRESENCE FUELING IRAQI INSURGENCY

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt that the Bush administration has it Iraq's policy totally wrong, the actions taken yesterday in

both Houses of Congress shattered that notion. In the Senate, 79 Senators voted in favor of an amendment designating the year 2006 as a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty. The amendment also requires the President to provide Congress with a quarterly report detailing United States policies and military operations in Iraq.

And in the House, the Out of Iraq Caucus, led by Ms. WATERS, introduced a discharge petition to force the House to openly debate the Homeward Bound legislation. Homeward Bound is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE). It is H.J. Res. 55, and it calls for bringing our troops home no later than October 1, 2006. The petition must be signed by 218 Members of Congress and then will force a debate on the floor.

This debate would include 17 hours of open debate, allowing every Member of Congress a chance to offer an amendment or talk about the war in Iraq from their very own perspective. Regardless of where my colleagues stand on the war and regardless of their political affiliation, I urge them to sign onto this discharge petition because we are long overdue for a conversation here on the floor about Iraq. It is a conversation that we need to have because it has been a long time.

Anyone watching at home may remember the last time Congress debated this matter. It was May 25 when I introduced an amendment to the defense authorization bill, an amendment asking the President to put together his plans for bringing our troops home and to provide those plans to the appropriate committees in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, 128 Members of this House voted for that amendment, and if the vote were held today, I am sure we would have many more than 128 votes. Of those 128 votes, 5 were Republican, 122 were Democrat, and one was our Independent from Vermont.

Unfortunately, we cannot have that vote again because the Republican leaders in Congress will not allow it. They will not bring important Iraq legislation like the bipartisan Homeward Bound legislation up for debate on the House floor. Think about it, the last time we debated this vitally important issue was nearly 6 months ago, and that was the first time and only time we have talked about it since the beginning of the war.

Since Congress will not have this debate, we have had to resort to taking matters into our own hands. That is why we are working to bring Homeward Bound to the House floor, and that is why 61 of my colleagues joined me in sending a letter to the President last week urging him to make four key policy changes in his position on Iraq.

First, we asked him to engage in greater multilateral cooperation with our allies. We simply cannot keep 160,000 American soldiers in Iraq and hope for the situation to just change

for the better because it is our very military presence that is fueling Iraq's growing insurgency.

□ 1830

Instead, the President should actually eat a little crow, admit his mistakes and ask our allies, the same ones we offended in the buildup of the war, to establish a multinational interim security force for Iraq, possibly run by the United Nations or NATO. The U.N.'s Department of Peacekeeping Operations would be particularly well suited to managing this task, as a matter of fact.

Second, the U.S. must pursue diplomatic and nonmilitary initiatives. If we seriously want democracy to take hold in the Middle East, then we need to get serious about changing our role from that of Iraq's military occupier to its reconstruction partner.

Instead of sending troops and military equipment to Iraq, let us send teachers, scientists, urban planners, and constitutional experts as a larger diplomatic offensive, one that will allow us to regain our lost national credibility while, at the same time, creating Iraqi jobs and bolstering Iraq's economy.

Third, let us prepare for a robust, postconflict reconciliation process. There is no shortage of national healing that needs to occur in Iraq after nearly 3 years of death and 3 years of destruction. That is why we should encourage an international peace commission to oversee Iraq's postconflict reconciliation. This group would coordinate peace talks between the various factions in Iraq, providing all Iraqis with a sense of ownership and hope over their country's future.

Finally, and most important of all, we must bring our troops home. The human cost of this war has been absolutely staggering. To save lives, end the war and prevent our Treasury from spiraling even further into debt, we need to end this war.

#### ENERGY INDEPENDENCE IS THE GOAL

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I come from agriculture country in southeast Georgia, and it is always remarkable to me that 2 percent of our population feeds not just 100 percent of the American population but a great deal of people all around the world. In fact, one thing that is even more interesting is that our ag production outpaces our ag consumption. We have more food than we can eat because our farm supply is so strong. Very vital of course to have food, but it is also vital in our society to have energy and fuel for our cars. Yet the world demand and the world supply are almost even. And the gentleman knows from the gulf coast what

havoc Katrina played not only on the 90,000 square miles of the gulf coast, but when it comes to energy and gasoline supply, indeed all of America. In fact there was a world disruption because of that.

In the United States, we consume over 20 million barrels of crude oil a day, nearly 25 percent of the consumption for the entire globe; and yet the United States only has about 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. Worse than that, we import from countries about 60 percent, and these countries are not always our friends. A lot of it comes from the Middle East: Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait. We have got some from South America, Venezuela. We all remember last week what Hugo Chavez of Venezuela did to the President when he was down there to give him a warm welcome.

Because energy is a national security risk, I have introduced today, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a number of Republicans and a number of Democrats, the Fuel Choice American Security Act of 2005. And what this bill does is it seeks to get us off Middle East oil by the year 2015. We will not be free from importing oil from around the world; but when it comes to the Middle East, we will be able to say, We can buy from you, but we do not have to buy from you.

Our bill does a number of things. Number one, it sets a goal. It says that by the year 2015 we will have reduced our oil consumption 2.5 million barrels a day. That is a 10 percent reduction and that would get us free from the Middle East.

It also requires that the General Accounting Office scores energy-related bills that we consider on the floor of Congress, and it gives Members of Congress a clear idea does this bill make you more dependent on foreign oil or less dependent; and does it move you closer to that goal of energy or fuel independence by 2015, or does it move it further away.

Secondly, what this bill does is it provides incentives to automobile manufacturers and to consumers to buy more and produce more energy-efficient automobiles. We double the tax credit for the purchasing of hybrids. We encourage automobile manufacturers to use light materials in the manufacturing of their cars. We put money, or incentives into municipalities to move towards the plug-in flexible fuel fleets when it comes to automobile taxicabs and so forth.

We give incentives to gasoline companies so that they will switch pumps so that when a consumer pulls in, they can have their choice of fuels for their automobiles. We also say that when you purchase tires you ought to know how many miles per gallon those tires should help you get. People do not even realize it, but if you inflate your tires right, you get more miles per gallon. And our consumers do not know that.

The third thing our bill does is it increases energy choice by investing

more money into biomass, and that could be any kind of biomass there is. It also takes the import tax off of ethanol from other countries. In Brazil today, 40 percent of the cars run on ethanol. In America, only 3 percent do. Brazil actually has surplus ethanol. We have a goal, we call it E 10 by 10. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is one of the champions of it. It says 10 percent of the gasoline will have ethanol in it by the year 2010. We are in agreement with that.

But the domestic production of ethanol through the corn supply alone will not get us there. We need to have corn, we need to have sugar, we need to have pine needles. We need to have whatever can get us that ethanol supply. But in the mean time, why are we taxing a source of energy from a country like Brazil? What we need to do is take that export tax off there, and that is what our bill does.

And finally, we ask the Federal Government to audit their agencies to figure out what can you do to save gasoline. One example, I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. Think about Saturday mail delivery. We pay 100 percent of the fuel cost to deliver 30 percent of the mail that we do on Monday through Friday. In this day of e-mail, do we really need Saturday mail delivery anymore?

Those are just some of the things the bill does, Mr. Speaker. It does move us towards energy independence by the year 2015, which is what we need. And I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for letting me get in front of him.

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

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

#### WHO IS IN CHARGE, MEXICO CITY OR WASHINGTON, D.C.?

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, when it comes to U.S. immigration policy, who is really in charge? Is it Mexico City or Washington, D.C.?

On almost a daily basis, Mexican officials seem to interfere with the immigration matters and U.S. laws. Mexican officials on both sides of the border are righteously indignant about American policies pertaining to the security of our border. Many American officials are oblivious to the problem as well. There is a continuous moaning and groaning rhetoric complaining we should not prevent illegals from entering the sovereign United States.

I want to make it clear again that I fully support immigration, legal immigration. It is not fair to America, nor is it fair to those who are trying to

enter our country lawfully that every year thousands of people enter our country illegally. We must stop sending the wrong message to the world that we will wink at illegal immigration. It appears to me that the leaders of Mexico give lip service to our immigration and border security laws. Mexico must stop encouraging illegal entry to the United States and the disrespect for the dignity and sovereignty of this country. So I ask, When it comes to U.S. immigration policy, who is in charge? Is it Mexico City or is it Washington, D.C.?

Let me give you some examples. I will start with our open borders. You know, our government does not acknowledge the term open borders or porous borders, but that is exactly what we have. I have recently visited the United States-Mexico border and witnessed firsthand the lax security in place there. It takes very little effort for illegals to cross or hire someone to cross them into the United States and enter this country illegally.

Some estimate that 5,000 people a day cross illegally into our country. Some of them even do it with the help of the Mexican Government. The Foreign Ministry of Mexico distributes a pamphlet called "Guide to Crossing the Border." I have shown this on the floor before. It is produced in English and Spanish, and it is essentially a book of sneaking into the United States. The Mexican consulates encourage this illegal conduct as well. Their purpose is not to help their citizens break American law, but that is what occurs. Passing out these guides is a disgrace to our laws and encourages illegal behavior. This lone act of a document showing people illegally how to come into the United States is a disrespect for America's borders and encourages the daily invasion of illegals into the United States.

So once again I will ask the question, When it comes to United States immigration policy, who is in charge? Mexico City or Washington, D.C.?

Consulates also hand out matricula consular cards which illegals use for identification purposes. This card resembles a driver's license and has become widely accepted as a form of identification to get services at U.S. banks, car dealerships, and American insurance companies. Even in some States they are allowing individuals to purchase or get a driver's license based on this document. The consulate issues these cards to people who are illegally in the United States. This is an absurd policy because these people are in our country illegally, yet we are helping them set up a residence in our country.

The Mexican Government has heavily lobbied the Federal Government of the United States to use these cards as identification cards, but so far the Federal Government does not do so. So Mexican consulates are going to local communities and local governments and trying to get them to accept this document. And some do, unfortunately.