

2005, the Chair announce the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, chairman, and Ms. HARRIS of Florida, vice chairman, appointed on April 14, 2005:

Mr. DREIER of California;
Mr. BERMAN of California;
Mr. BARTON of Texas;
Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois;
Mr. WELLER of Illinois;
Mr. REYES of Texas; and
Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

THERE HE GOES AGAIN

(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, yesterday I came to the floor to ask my colleagues across the aisle to speak out against their party leader Democratic National Committee Chairman Howard Dean. I listed a few of the absolutely ridiculous, and in many cases offensive, comments he has made since January, but apparently I spoke too soon. It appears that Mr. Dean was not through embarrassing himself and his party and in the process offending millions of Americans.

Yesterday, in an interview, he said Republicans, and I am quoting here, "all behave the same, and they all look the same. It's pretty much a white Christian party."

Mr. Speaker, today he defended those remarks. And what is more, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, said that she thought Chairman Dean was "doing a good job."

All I can say is that I hope the Members across the aisle will let the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) know that Howard Dean should not be given a pass for his behavior, it is unacceptable, and it is offensive.

OPEN SEASON ON CHRISTIAN WHITE FOLKS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the comments of the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN). It is too bad more Members are not here, but I think it is proper for the Democrat Members of this Chamber to demand an apology of their Democrat leader, rather than the endorsement the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has given him when he dismissed the Republican Party as a bunch of white Christians.

I am not worried as a Republican. I am offended as a white Christian. I know that the season is always open for people like Mr. Dean who loves divisive politics. It is always open season on Christian and on white folks be-

cause they are the group you can kick and you can get away with it. It is politically correct.

But I am sick and tired of it, and I would call on my Democrat colleagues to ask the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) to rethink her assessment of Mr. Dean when she says he is doing a good job representing their party. And I would also call on my Democrat friends to ask Mr. Dean to apologize, maybe not to the Christians of the world, because, obviously, he does not care about them, but maybe to any of the other groups that he seems to constantly offend as each week goes by while he is chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

WHITE HOUSE ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am here to express gratitude for the free press, in England. Because it is only for the English that we can finally find out what went on in the White House with Mr. CHENEY and the oil boys. It says in the Guardian this morning, after the meeting with Mr. Blair yesterday, President Bush's decision not to sign the United States up for the Kyoto Treaty was partly a result of pressure from ExxonMobil, the world's largest oil company.

In briefing papers given before the meeting to the U.S. Secretary of State, Paula Dobriansky, between 2001 and 2004, the administration is found thanking Exxon executives for the company's, quote, active involvement in helping to determine climate policy.

The President of the United States rejected Kyoto in part, and this is a quote, rejected in part on the input from you, the Global Climate Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States runs the most secretive operation down there and does not tell us that the oil companies are running our energy policy. As long as that is what is going on in this country, we will continue to continue to be enmeshed in the Bush war and whatever goes on in Iran and whatever goes on anywhere else, and we will continue to destroy the environment.

It is time to end that, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Guardian, May 8, 2005]

REVEALED: HOW OIL GIANT INFLUENCED BUSH
WHITE HOUSE SOUGHT ADVICE FROM EXXON ON
KYOTO STANCE
(By John Vidal)

President's George Bush's decision not to sign the United States up to the Kyoto global warming treaty was partly a result of pressure from ExxonMobil, the world's most powerful oil company, and other industries, according to U.S. State Department papers seen by the Guardian.

The documents, which emerged as Tony Blair visited the White House for discussions on climate change before next month's G8

meeting, reinforce widely-held suspicions of how close the company is to the administration and its role in helping to formulate U.S. policy.

In briefing papers given before meetings to the U.S. under-secretary of state, Paula Dobriansky, between 2002 and 2004, the administration is found thanking Exxon executives for the company's "active involvement" in helping to determine climate change policy, and also seeking its advice on what climate change policies the company might find acceptable.

Other papers suggest that Ms. Dobriansky should sound out Exxon executives and other anti-Kyoto business groups on potential alternatives to Kyoto.

Until now Exxon has publicly maintained that it had no involvement in the U.S. government's rejection of Kyoto. But the documents, obtained by Greenpeace under U.S. freedom of information legislation, suggest this is not the case.

"Potus [president of the United States] rejected Kyoto in part based on input from you [the Global Climate Coalition]," says one briefing note before Ms. Dobriansky's meeting with the GCC, the main anti-Kyoto U.S. industry group, which was dominated by Exxon.

The papers further state that the White House considered Exxon "among the companies most actively and prominently opposed to binding approaches [like Kyoto] to cut greenhouse gas emissions".

But in evidence to the UK House of Lords science and technology committee in 2003, Exxon's head of public affairs, Nick Thomas, said: "I think we can say categorically we have not campaigned with the United States government or any other government to take any sort of position over Kyoto."

Exxon, officially the U.S.'s most valuable company valued at \$379bn (£206bn) earlier this year, is seen in the papers to share the White House's unwavering scepticism of international efforts to address climate change.

The documents, which reflect unanimity between the company and the U.S. administration on the need for more global warming science and the unacceptable costs of Kyoto, state that Exxon believes that joining Kyoto "would be unjustifiably drastic and premature".

This line has been taken consistently by President Bush, and was expected to be continued in yesterday's talks with Tony Blair who has said that climate change is "the most pressing issue facing mankind".

"President Bush tells Mr. Blair he's concerned about climate change, but these documents reveal the alarming truth, that policy in this White House is being written by the world's most powerful oil company. This administration's climate policy is a menace to humanity," said Stephen Tindale, Greenpeace's executive director in London last night.

"The prime minister needs to tell Mr. Bush he's calling in some favours. Only by securing mandatory cuts in U.S. emissions can Blair live up to his rhetoric," said Mr. Tindale.

In other meetings documented in the papers, Ms. Dobriansky meets Don Pearlman, an international anti-Kyoto lobbyist who has been a paid adviser to the Saudi and Kuwaiti governments both of which have followed the U.S. line against Kyoto.

The purpose of the meeting with Mr. Pearlman, who also represents the secretive anti-Kyoto Climate Council, which the administration says "works against most U.S. government efforts to address climate change", is said to be to "solicit [his] views as part of our dialogue with friends and allies".

ExxonMobil, which was yesterday contacted by the Guardian in the U.S. but did not return calls, is spending millions of pounds on an advertising campaign aimed at influencing politicians, opinion formers and business leaders in the UK and other pro-Kyoto countries in the weeks before the G8 meeting at Gleneagles.

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.

MAY JOBS NUMBERS

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. Mr. Speaker, when is President Bush going to level with the American people about the U.S. economy? This past weekend during his weekly radio address he said the economy is on the right track. The President's statement came one day after disappointing job numbers showed our economy only created 78,000 new jobs in May, the smallest number in almost 2 years.

Keep in mind the economy has to create 150,000 each month just to keep pace with more workers entering the workforce. Last month's numbers created only half that number.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush has yet to create his first job since coming to office 5 years ago. In fact, the economy has to create an additional 24,000 jobs just to get back to where it was when he took office in 2001.

Let us compare President Bush's 5-year jobs record to past Presidents. No other modern day President has presided over an economy where not a single job was created over a 4-year period. The Center for American Progress averaged the number of jobs created by modern Presidents who served 2 years. The Center determined the average number of jobs created by those Presidents through 52 months was 5.9 million jobs. The largest job creation came under the last two Democratic Presidents to serve two terms, President Clinton, who created 11.9 million jobs during his 52 months of his Presidency, followed by President Lyndon Johnson who created 7.6 million jobs.

It is hard for me to believe after hearing these numbers President Bush could possibly be satisfied with the fact that his policies have yet to create one single private sector job. It is also hard to believe that congressional Republicans seem satisfied with these abysmal job numbers.

□ 2015

You do not hear any of my Republican colleagues questioning the President's economic proposals of the last 4 years.

You also do not hear President Bush or congressional Republicans voice any

concern over the sharp cut in manufacturing jobs that has taken place on their watch. Since President Bush took office 5 years ago, our economy has lost 2.8 million manufacturing jobs, including 7,000 more in May. Yet neither the President nor congressional Republicans are willing to do anything to strengthen the manufacturing sector. In fact, congressional Republicans have blocked Democratic initiatives to help the manufacturing industry. Instead, they are more interested in passing \$36 billion worth of tax incentives for large corporations to ship American jobs overseas.

The weakness of the job market is also showing up, Mr. Speaker, in the continued stagnation of workers' earnings. It is almost hard to believe, but wages have actually declined since the end of the recession. Again, according to a report from the Center For American Progress, real average hourly earnings declined to \$16 in April of this year. That is 7 cents lower than the earnings mark at the end of the recession in November 2001. This means that over the last 4 years, on average, American workers are not getting paid any more than they were when our economy was actually in a recession.

It is no wonder Americans are trying to squeeze every last dollar out of every paycheck. While wages have stalled in my home State of New Jersey, health care, college tuition, child care and gasoline costs have increased an average of \$6,000 for a New Jersey family every year.

President Bush and congressional Republicans tell the American people that the policies they have implemented over the last 4 years are working. If the President and congressional Republicans believe this economy is on the right track, I shudder to imagine what a wrong-track economy would look like.

Mr. Speaker, polls show only 32 percent of the American people think the economy is moving in the right direction. It is clear the Republican way of growing this economy simply is not working. If they would only admit that the economy is a concern, maybe we could begin to fix it collectively. I think it is time for a new economic plan that creates millions of high-paying jobs, penalizes companies that send job overseas, and helps companies confront skyrocketing health care costs. Our economy will not be back on track again until the middle class stops feeling squeezed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). 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.)

SMART SECURITY AND THE NPT CONFERENCE

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, I am more than disappointed by reports that last month's conference to review the nuclear nonproliferation treaty was not a success. At the treaty review conference, representatives from more than 150 nations met at the United Nations headquarters in New York for a month of meetings to address the most urgent global threat we face, the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This conference provided a great opportunity for the global community to improve its collective efforts to prevent other nations from developing nuclear weapons capabilities, deter terrorists from obtaining nuclear weapons, and ensure that the current nuclear states work to reduce their nuclear stockpiles.

Let us not forget that the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, which the United States ratified in 1972, does not just declare that non-nuclear states cannot develop nuclear weapons. It also states that the countries currently in possession of nuclear weapons must work to reduce their stockpiles, with the ultimate goal of getting rid of nuclear weapons altogether. Clearly, the goals for the treaty review conference were challenging; but the United States could have, and should have, made headway by living up to our international commitments.

Unfortunately, a major reason that the NPT conference was considered a failure was America's focus on the threats posed by Iran and North Korea, while at the same time failing to agree to reduce our own nuclear arsenal. The United States currently possesses more than 10,000 nuclear weapons. In fact, at the same time the NPT conference was taking place, the Bush administration and many Republicans in Congress were actually pushing ahead with plans to fund a new nuclear weapon, the so-called bunker buster bomb. The Bush administration's continued pursuit of nuclear weapons, while demanding that Iran and North Korea disarm, demonstrates a rare level of supreme arrogance and hypocrisy, even for this most arrogant of Presidential administrations.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree that the threats posed by Iran and North Korea must be taken seriously. If we fail to take the proper diplomatic actions, both nations could soon possess a sizable and dangerous nuclear arsenal. But why would we expect other countries to dismantle their nuclear infrastructures unless we maintain our nonproliferation commitments?

SMART security, H. Con. Res. 158, which is a Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism, is a positive approach to this very challenge. SMART security promotes efforts to reduce the buildup of nuclear weapons and materials, using the cooperative threat reduction program as an