

move that as quickly as possible. Obviously, people will want to be planning for the next school year and next Head Start year.

Lastly, Mr. Leader, the highway bill. As we know, the highway bill is now more than 2 years overdue in terms of reauthorization, has been sitting for some period of time. The Senate has now passed that bill. Can you tell us when we might appoint conferees for the highway conference?

Mr. DELAY. As the gentleman knows, this House passed the highway bill some weeks ago and the Senate just finished the highway bill in their Chamber. We will probably have to consider some type of short-term extension next week, hopefully an agreed-to extension bill. And if the Senate requests a conference next week, I believe that the Speaker will be prepared to appoint House conferees next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader for that observation and hopefully we can, in fact, move on that. We not only passed it last week but we passed it a number of times before that. Mr. Leader, I would simply observe on our side and, frankly, on your side that the Senate number is a number that I think our committee certainly and this House could well approve.

□ 2030

I know the President does not like that number, but very frankly, as the gentleman knows, our own committee almost unanimously on voice vote passed out an authorization figure at, I think, 375, so \$80 billion more than the Senate-passed bill.

I would certainly hope that the Congress could exercise its will. The Senate was at 218. We were at 284. Now it is a little bit in between that. I would hope that we could move this conference as quickly as possible. It has been held up a long time and has a significant consequence for jobs, as the leader knows, significant consequence for contractors, States, municipalities, localities, and we have been a long time waiting for this passage that is now some 2 years late.

But I appreciate the leader's observation that we will appoint conferees next week, and hopefully perhaps the leader can help accelerate that conference so we can agree. And then the President, of course, will have to do what he thinks is best and make a determination, and then we might have a shocking event and he may veto a bill and send it back to us, and I am relatively confident we would work our will at that point in time.

I do not know whether the leader wants to make an observation.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the President has been criticized for not vetoing any bills over the last 4½ years, but it has become a

tradition around here to include the President as we do legislation through the House and the Senate and therefore working out any of our differences so that he would not have to veto a bill, and I do not see that the highway bill is any different than anything else we have been doing for the last 4½ years. So he is obviously a major player in this process.

The House, as the gentleman says, has expressed itself at a number. We think the President will sign the bill. The Senate has chosen to do otherwise. Hopefully, we can work this out in the conference committee so that the President will not have to mar his record by vetoing a bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I recall that Democrats, when they were in charge, had a slightly different perspective, believing we were a co-equal branch of the government. We would adopt our policies based upon what we believed to be in the best interests of this country, and that the President, as a co-equal branch of the government, would make his determination, and if we disagreed we would override his veto. As a matter of fact, I voted to override a number of vetoes that the previous Democratic President disagreed with us on.

The gentleman is right. We do not seem to do that. We have a 4½-year unblemished record, as the leader points out, of not doing anything that this President did not want us to do.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

I would just point out to the gentleman that in the good old days that he refers to, yes, this House had a great reputation for wanting to spend more money, and those days have changed in that the President is adamant about spending and spending the right amount of money to do the job and the House has concurred in that many times and have voted in the House. And it has been a pleasure to work with the President to hold down spending and make sure that every dollar is spent properly.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, does the gentleman by any chance remember the ag bill?

Mr. DELAY. Which ag bill?

Mr. HOYER. The ag bill that was passed some years ago. The President was not too excited about that spending level, as I recall. He signed the bill, nevertheless.

Mr. DELAY. He signed the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have been here for some period of time, as the leader knows, and the only bill that Ronald Reagan vetoed that was overridden by the Congress was a bill in which he said we did not spend enough money in 1983. He vetoed it because we did not spend enough money.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 23, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY PROTECTING DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-28)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the Federal Register for publication. This notice states that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, as expended in scope by Executive Order 13315 of August 28, 2003, modified in Executive Order 13350 of July 29, 2004, and further modified in Executive Order 13364 of November 29, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2005. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the Federal Register on May 21, 2004 (60 FR 29409).

The threats of attachment or other judicial process against (i) the Development Fund for Iraq, (ii) Iraqi petroleum and petroleum products, and interests therein, and proceeds, obligations, or any financial instruments of any nature whatsoever arising from or related to the sale or marketing thereof, or (iii) any accounts, assets, investments, or any other property of any kind owned by, belonging to, or held

by, on behalf of, or otherwise for the Central Bank of Iraq create obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq. Accordingly, these obstacles continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency protecting the Development Fund for Iraq, certain other property in which Iraq has an interest, and the Central Bank of Iraq, and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 2005.

2005 COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON U.S. TRADE AND INVESTMENT POLICY TOWARD SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-29)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with title I of the Trade and Development Act of 2000, I am providing a report prepared by my Administration, the "2005 Comprehensive Report on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy Towards Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act."

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 2005.

CAFTA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today most recognize we are part of a global economy, probably no more so than in my home State of Oregon. Unfortunately, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, CAFTA, is not the step forward that new trade agreements should represent.

For me it is clear that CAFTA does not include adequate environmental and labor standards. It is time to put the dispute resolution process for labor on the same solid footing as we do for commercial issues. Most acknowledge that CAFTA countries lack the financial resources and technical expertise to enforce good labor and environmental practices, but we are not providing funding that could help overcome these obstacles.

Additionally, CAFTA would seriously harm these countries that rely heavily

on their agricultural sectors. Our egregious farm bill has locked us into subsidies that do not promote free trade and have already caused much harm to other countries' farmers. We need to pay attention to the hard lessons NAFTA imposed on struggling Mexican farmers.

Couple these issues with our reluctance to help American workers hammered by trade and technological change, and CAFTA is not an agreement that I can support in its current form.

SAVE FILIBUSTER

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to abuse this body with their blatant disregard for the rules. They are clearly manufacturing a crisis about the judicial nomination process, saying it is in trouble. They would have us believe that none of Bush's nominees were being confirmed.

But that just is not true. Let us remember that 95 percent of the Bush nominees have been approved, in contrast to 35 percent of the Clinton nominations. So instead of following history, they figure altering the Senate rules in their favor is the ultimate solution so that they can force ten nominees through the system.

Republican leaders in Washington are absolutely out of control. They are so afraid of our democracy failing their interests that they must continue to bully in order to get their way. The American people do not want a Congress controlled by bullies. Bullies who are willing to sacrifice a 200-year-old democratic process that has withstood such debates as the 24-hour filibusters of the Civil Rights Act in 1960s.

This abuse of power must end.

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.

CAFTA AND OUR TRADE DEFICIT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly a year since the President signed the secretly negotiated CAFTA agreement and has begun the process to bring it forward to the House for an up-or-down vote. No amendments allowed. It is a perfect agreement, of course.

It is only perfect in that it mirrors all of our most recent failed trade agreements, such as its predecessor, NAFTA.

Some would say this is about helping the American economy, putting Americans to work, to help our exporters. That is what they said about NAFTA. And it turned out that the people of Mexico, the aggregate buying power of everybody in Mexico who spent every peso on American goods was slightly less than the State of New Jersey. It was never about the purchasing power of the people of Mexico and the idea that somehow they were going to buy American goods and put Americans to work here at home. It was always about United States capital, multinational corporations, chasing cheaper labor into Mexico and now further into Latin America; chasing lack of environmental standards and enforcement into Mexico, particularly the maquiladora area, which is a total environmental nightmare, further into Latin America; in chase of the lowest standards, the lowest common denominator, the most abused labor.

And that is what CAFTA is all about. It mirrors the NAFTA agreement. Like the NAFTA agreement, it will deliver the same thing. They told us we would gain 140,000 jobs with NAFTA. Well, we lost close to half a million jobs because of NAFTA. CAFTA will be the same.

When we are doing something that is failing the Nation and the Nation's workers and driving down wages here at home and trying to pull down our standards of consumer protection, environmental protection, labor standards, then maybe it is time to think about doing something different, and perhaps the House of Representatives is on the verge of doing that. Perhaps they are beginning to listen to the large majority of the American people. We are going to run a trade deficit this year of \$2 billion a day.

□ 2045

Every billion dollars represents tens of thousands of lost jobs, the export of our industrial base, and, now, the export of our knowledge base.

We cannot continue these same failed policies as the President would have us do. I have heard that they have begun the purchasing phase of the CAFTA agreement.

Now, most Americans would wonder, what is the purchasing phase? Well, they have tried the strong-arm phase for the last year. They still do not have enough votes to jam another failed trade agreement through the United States House of Representatives. So I am told by friends on the other side of the aisle that they are about to begin the purchasing phase.

The White House is open for business. What do you need? How much does it cost? What can we do for you? It is not any argument that this is somehow going to deal with our trade deficit, help raise wages here at home, help provide jobs here at home; it is all about what deal can we cut for you so these same multinational corporations can continue to move jobs offshore, and, in this case, a little closer to