

to side with these extreme organizations such as Planned Parenthood. The FDA should be concerned more about health than they are with the bottom line of what the abortion industry is making.

That is why I so strongly support Holly's Law, a bill authored by the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT). I was very glad to join the gentleman from Maryland today at a press conference promoting this important legislation. As a father, my heart goes out to the Pattersons in their grief over the loss of their daughter. RU-486 killed Holly Patterson, and the approval of this terrible drug during the Clinton administration was done in the name of political expediency instead of patient health.

Let me just say briefly, Mr. Speaker, that the FDA violated Federal law and their own standards in approving RU-486. They approved it without the submission of data from adequate and well-controlled clinical trials. They created a final approval regimen for the use of RU-486 that does not reflect safeguards employed in the clinical trials on which FDA relied. They approved RU-486 using the expedited subpart H process which is only supposed to be used to approve drugs to treat serious or life-threatening illnesses. Unless you construe the killing of an unborn child, boy or girl, to be a disease or an illness, subpart H should have never been used.

In violation of their own pediatric rule, they never tested the drug on adolescents, even though it is being used by adolescents. They have failed to impose and enforce restrictions on the use of RU-486 commensurate with the risk that it poses to women, and women are dying. They failed to require the Population Council to honor in full its post-approval safety study commitments, and let us not forget that this drug is being manufactured in the People's Republic of China.

It is important to keep in mind that with RU-486, we are talking about calibrating a poison designed to kill one person without causing harm or without killing another. The purpose of RU-486 is to chemically poison, this is the purpose of it, another human being. That it is dangerous physically and mentally and should never be sold to young people as a solution to their problems ought to be self-evident. Abortion, Mr. Speaker, is violence against children. We can do better for women. It is not in their interest that their children be killed with these powerful poisons.

I would just say finally, Mr. Speaker, that the longer this poison is on the market, administered to young people by groups like Planned Parenthood, the more unborn boys and girls and women who take it will be at risk of death and injury.

Let us not forget, as well, that Planned Parenthood is an organization

that annually performs about 240,000 abortions. They make an enormous amount of money from the abortions that they provide, either surgically or chemically; and this is now another tool in their arsenal against unborn children. They ought to be known as Child Abuse, Incorporated for the large number of children that they have killed and continue to kill with U.S. subsidies both at the Federal and the State level.

Mr. Speaker, again we call on the FDA. It is time to take this drug, this chemical poisoning of unborn children that is so dangerous to women, off the market.

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

(Mr. CUELLAR 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. NEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NEY 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 Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### NATIONAL ANTHEM PROJECT

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, this morning on the west lawn of this fine building, the Capitol of the United States, I participated in the National Anthem Project. Sponsored by the National Association For Music Education and supported by its honorary Chair, First Lady Laura Bush, as well as Jeep, Chrysler, Save America's Treasures, the Girl Scouts of America, the NBA, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Education Association, the American Legion and many, many more, this 3-year project will get America singing our national anthem again, the "Star-Spangled Banner," proudly and strongly singing it again and will help people understand the important role that music classes play in teaching our culture.

During the most forgotten American war, the War of 1812, some say the second American revolution, between the United States and England, the British invaded the United States and they torched this city, Washington, consuming numerous public buildings, in-

cluding the White House and this Capitol, leaving it, as they said, in a most magnificent ruin.

Next on their list was the city of Baltimore, not far from here. They attempted to attack Baltimore by sea. American forces under the command of Colonel George Armistead defended Baltimore in the harbor with Fort McHenry standing in the way of the British and Baltimore, and they thwarted this destruction by the British.

A young lawyer on a British ship trying to seek the release of a friend watched this 25-hour British naval bombardment of Fort McHenry throughout the night, and the next morning he saw the largest United States flag he had ever seen flying at dawn and inspired this young lawyer by the name of Francis Scott Key to write the words that later became our national anthem. He watched the flag fly as the British ships left the harbor in defeat.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the lyrics to the "Star-Spangled Banner" that we have officially called our national anthem for 75 years are foreign to many of our citizens. According to a Harris poll, fewer than 30 percent of American children can sing this patriotic song. This is somewhat tragic. We must revive America's heritage starting by equipping our Nation's music teachers with the resources they need to preserve our tradition in freedom, freedom in song.

Unfortunately, when budget cuts are made in the area of education, music classes in schools across the country are the first to be asphyxiated. But considering that so much of our history is chronicled through songs, songs like the "Star-Spangled Banner," and that three out of four Americans cite music class in their public school as the primary place they learn about American history, how can we let this trend continue? Are we going to deprive future generations of Americans the vibrant spirit of our land?

Cicero, the Roman orator, author, and politician, once said: "Not to know what has been transacted in former times is always to remain a child. If no use is made of the labors of the past, the world must remain always in the infancy of knowledge." And even though he warned us about the tragedy of this apathy of history, we have deserted our commitment to the far-reaching study of civics, civics education and American history in these United States. We must ask ourselves how many of our students can identify such names as John Paul Jones, Susan B. Anthony, Paul Revere, and Nathan Hale.

To answer this question, we have to examine where a number of the curricula in our Nation's classrooms begin the American tale. Now, in many American classrooms they do not start American history with the American Revolution. They start it with World War II to the present. They just do not have enough time, according to educators. So how can we blame our young

children who become our young leaders if they do not know our history?

Moreover, according to the Fordham Institute, which seeks to focus on effective education reforms, few history teachers ever learn much history themselves. More than half of high school history teachers did not major or even minor in history in college. As a result, teachers charged with imparting information to young Americans about the history of their country and the history of the world rely on the textbooks available to them, often textbooks that the teachers themselves had little to do with selecting or reading. At some places in the United States we still use coaches to teach history.

Mr. Speaker, this state of affairs is why I am proud to support campaigns like the National Anthem Project and encourage my fellow Americans to help us regain our appreciation for this legacy. Luckily, I come from Texas where the knowledge of our State's history is not neglected, but hallowed. In fact, State standards mandate the study of Texas history first in the fourth grade and then more comprehensively in the seventh grade. Lone Star students among other topics learn about the Texas Revolution, the establishment of the Republic of Texas, and subsequent annexation to the United States.

As my colleague Senator ROBERT BYRD has said, "An American student regardless of his race, religion or gender must know the history of the land to which they pledge allegiance. They should be taught about the Founding Fathers of this Nation, the battles they fought, the ideals that they championed, and the influences they have made throughout the world. They should be taught about our Nation's failures, our mistakes, our inequities. Without this knowledge, they cannot appreciate the hard-won freedoms that are our birthright."

So, Mr. Speaker, to reclaim and be the home of the brave and the land of the free, as our "Star-Spangled Banner" recites, we must learn our history, know our history, teach our history to our kids and be proud of our history; and we must get America singing about the United States of America.

#### TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the last 2 days were a whirlwind, but I am not going to criticize the speed in which we moved at this time, 2005, to move TEA-21. Why? Because we have been trying for almost a session to pass a transportation reauthorization bill that really provides jobs and mobility to America. So I rise today to applaud both Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for the very complicated and complex legisla-

tion that was passed trying to embrace all of America: rural, urban, suburban, all of the hamlets and counties and large cities and small cities, all of the true aspects of mobility in this Nation.

I heard this morning on one of our networks, our cable networks, that in order to address the question of an energy shortage besides the fact that I come from Texas and we are known, my particular district, for being the energy capital of the world, but I think good common sense, no matter where you come from, would suggest that mobility is an important part of energy conservation, and mobility dealing with trains and transit systems, buses that are more conservation, if you will, sensitive, electrical cars, hybrids, all of those are on the table and I am glad to say that as we look toward the energy bill, we will be looking at those issues; but the transportation bill addresses them as well.

Let me cite, Mr. Speaker, a few of the concerns that I have and also a few of the accolades. Let me first of all say that I believe that we are a United States of America, small States and large States. I happen to come from a donor State. That means that we send more money to the Federal Government than we get back. It is not a question of selfishness. It is a question of spreading the wealth across the United States per person. I am glad to note that this good sense of the United States House came together to increase the donor State return so that Texas gets more money on its return as it is investing in the United States Government while not hurting the smaller States. That is the donor State equity, and I would say that we as members of the Texas delegation and other large States were willing to work with the leadership to make this happen.

Might I also say that I am disappointed in all of the amendments that came about on the toll roads. These are roads that you pay to go on. I know if I look at most of my constituents, they wish we did not have toll roads. But I certainly think it is unfair if a local jurisdiction decides to provide some sort of relief for low-income workers, many of whom are driving the 1990, 1980 vintage cars, maybe some of you have those cars, and are day laborers or hourly workers and really cannot afford to get to work. They have no mass transit which we are trying to promote. They cannot get to work. That was passed and I hope it is taken out in conference where local jurisdictions can give relief, meaning a lower rate, to those low-income workers who are driving cars who are trying to get to work. Would you not rather have them working than to be on the public benefit, if you will, because they cannot get to work?

That brings me as well, Mr. Speaker, to a provision in my constituency that is called the Safe Clear program. It means that you are automatically moved off a freeway in my jurisdiction in Houston without any option to call

any relatives or to move in another direction. It is an automatic tow. We had an enormous crisis and many of these tolls are on interstate highways. I hope that we will have the monitoring of this program, though it has been fixed by city council and they have tried to work with the State, they were concerned, but the United States Government Department of Transportation should be monitoring what we call the Safe Clear program in Houston, Texas, in order to avoid what we call impeding of interstate commerce.

Let me also cite a very important issue in my district and that is Metro. That is our mass transit that has been struggling for 20 years to get on the books.

□ 1600

We finally got over 50 percent.

Many of you in your communities may be facing this. You want mass transit, and two people do not, and those two people have been holding it up. That is what has been happening in Houston, Texas. I would beg of the Department of Transportation not to be engaged in politics, that is what you are engaged in, and expedite the approval process so that people who want to get on mass transit in jurisdictions like Houston, Texas, and maybe other parts of the Nation, can get an expedited approval so they can move forward with the dollars and get people out of their cars and into effective mass transit.

Our metro system now, with only 7.5 miles, has some 30,000 riders per day. It connects the Medical Center and students to downtown Houston. It is imperative that we work on that.

Again, I want to applaud those who brought a resolution to the donor problem, and I want to likewise be mindful of the fact that as we move towards this bill, let us take out the poison pills, those provisions such as not allowing some individual relief, let us take out the poison pill of not allowing local toll jurisdictions to use their profitable dollars to invest in other mobility projects.

This is a good bill, but we need oversight, and we certainly need to move those transit projects forward that are sitting and waiting on the FTA's desk.

#### ENSURING TRANSPORTATION EAR-MARKS STAY BELOW THE LINE

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the transportation bill. I offered an amendment earlier today, and time constraints prohibited me from really explaining the amendment, what I was seeking to do and the problem with the bill as it currently is or may become once it gets through conference.

During debate on the bill, the chairman of the committee said that every