

693. Sergeant Jesse W. Strong  
 694. Corporal Christopher L. Weaver  
 695. Corporal Jonathan S. Beatty  
 696. Private First Class Kevin M. Luna  
 697. Captain Orlando A. Bonilla  
 698. Private First Class Stephen A. Castellano  
 699. Specialist Michael S. Evans II  
 700. Sergeant Andrew K. Farrar, Jr.  
 701. Chief Warrant Officer Charles S. Jones  
 702. Specialist Christopher J. Ramsey  
 703. Staff Sergeant Jonathan Ray Reed  
 704. Staff Sergeant Joseph E. Rodriguez  
 705. Specialist Lyle W. Rymer II  
 706. Sergeant First Class Mickey E. Zaun  
 707. Civilian Barbara Heald  
 708. Lieutenant Commander Edward E. Jack  
 709. Sergeant Lindsey T. James  
 710. Lieutenant Commander Keith Edward Taylor  
 711. Private First Class James H. Miller IV  
 712. Lance Corporal Nazario Serrano  
 713. Lance Corporal Jason C. Redifer  
 714. Lance Corporal Harry R. Swain  
 IV  
 715. Sergeant First Class Mark C. Warren  
 716. Corporal Christopher E. Zimny  
 717. Specialist Robert T. Hendrickson  
 718. Lance Corporal Sean P. Maher  
 719. Captain Sean Lee Brock  
 720. Lance Corporal Richard C. Clifton  
 721. Sergeant First Class Sean Michael Cooley  
 722. Sergeant Stephen R. Sherman  
 723. Sergeant Daniel Torres  
 724. Staff Sergeant Steven G. Bayow  
 725. Lance Corporal Travis M. Wichlacz  
 726. Specialist Jeremy O. Allmon  
 727. Staff Sergeant Zachary Ryan Wobler  
 728. Specialist Jeffrey S. Henthorn  
 729. Sergeant Jessica M. Housby  
 730. Staff Sergeant William T. Robbins  
 731. Lance Corporal Richard A. Perez, Jr.  
 732. Staff Sergeant Kristopher L. Shepherd  
 733. Specialist Robert A. McNail  
 734. Staff Sergeant Ray Rangel  
 735. Sergeant Chad W. Lake  
 736. Sergeant Rene Knox, Jr.  
 737. Specialist Dakotah L. Gooding  
 738. Private First Class David J. Brangman  
 739. Sergeant First Class David J. Salie  
 740. Private First Class Michael A. Arciola  
 741. Specialist Justin B. Carter  
 742. Specialist Katrina Lani Bell-Johnson  
 743. Specialist Joseph A. Rahaim  
 744. Sergeant Timothy R. Osbey  
 745. Sergeant Adam J. Plumondore  
 746. Staff Sergeant Jason R. Hendrix  
 747. Sergeant Christopher M. Pusateri  
 748. Sergeant Frank B. Hernandez  
 749. Sergeant Carlos J. Gil  
 750. Specialist Seth R. Trahan  
 751. First Lieutenant Adam Malson  
 752. Corporal Kevin Michael Clarke  
 753. Specialist Clinton R. Gertson  
 754. First Lieutenant Jason G. Timmerman  
 755. Staff Sergeant David F. Day  
 756. Sergeant Jesse M. Lhotka  
 757. Corporal John T. Olson  
 758. Lance Corporal Trevor D. Aston  
 759. Staff Sergeant Eric M. Steffene  
 760. Sergeant Nicholas J. Olivier  
 761. Specialist Jacob C. Palmatier  
 762. Staff Sergeant Daniel G. Gresham  
 763. Staff Sergeant Alexander B. Crackel  
 764. Specialist Michael S. Deem  
 765. Specialist Jason L. Moski  
 766. Specialist Adam Noel Brewer  
 767. Private First Class Colby M. Farnan  
 768. Private First Class Chassan S. Henry  
 769. Lance Corporal Andrew W. Nowacki  
 770. Private First Class Min-Su Choi  
 771. Private Landon S. Giles  
 772. Private First Class Danny L. Anderson  
 773. Second Lieutenant Richard Bryan Gienau  
 774. Sergeant Julio E. Negron  
 775. Specialist Lizbeth Robles  
 777. Specialist Azhar Ali  
 778. Sergeant First Class Michael D. Jones  
 779. Sergeant Seth K. Garceau  
 780. Corporal Stephen M. McGowan  
 781. Specialist Wade Michael Twyman  
 782. Sergeant First Class Donald W. Eacho  
 783. Captain Sean Grimes  
 784. Specialist Adriana N. Salem  
 785. Staff Sergeant Juan M. Solorio  
 786. Sergeant Andrew L. Bossert  
 787. Private First Class Michael W. Franklin  
 788. Specialist Matthew A. Koch  
 789. Petty Officer First Class Alec Mazur  
 790. Specialist Nicholas E. Wilson  
 791. Staff Sergeant Donald D. Griffith Jr.  
 792. Lance Corporal Joshua L. Torrence  
 793. Specialist Paul M. Heltzel  
 794. Staff Sergeant Ricky A. Kieffer  
 795. Staff Sergeant Shane M. Koele  
 796. Specialist Rocky D. Payne  
 797. Private First Class Lee A. Lewis Jr.  
 798. Specialist Jonathan A. Hughes  
 799. Sergeant Paul W. Thomason III

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Members from both sides of the aisle who have participated over the last two days in reading the names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of those fellow citizens who have fallen both in Iraq and in Afghanistan. My colleagues and I will continue this tribute on other evenings as we finish up the over 1,900 fellow Americans who have given their lives, and intend to continue by

recognizing each of our fallen heroes by name on the floor of the people's House.

On behalf of my colleagues, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the brave men and women and their families who continue to serve our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our thoughts and prayers are with you and your families.

#### HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, tonight we will be engaging in a discussion about our Nation's homeland security. I will be joined by several of my colleagues here tonight who have some very interesting thoughts and perspectives they would like to share with the American people on this most important issue. Homeland security is a matter of concern to all Americans, irrespective of their political affiliation. This is especially true in the United States Congress. The Committee on Homeland Security, of which I am a member, reflects our national concern.

In the last 6 months, our committee has sent to the floor of the House some very important legislation designed to make America's borders, ports, and transportation facilities less vulnerable to terrorist attack or other catastrophe. One such bill is H.R. 1544, the Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responders Act of 2005.

Prior to this bill, grant funding for first responders tasked with responding to homeland emergencies was provided in equal percentage to all States with an allowance upward for population. Because these funds are distributed without regard to safeguarding against risk, there were many documented abuses within the system. Of the \$6.3 billion in grants appropriated by Congress and awarded by the Department of Homeland Security since fiscal year 2002, only 31 percent of those funds have been spent. Let me repeat: of the \$6.3 billion in grants appropriated by Congress and awarded by the Department of Homeland Security since fiscal year 2002, only 31 percent of those funds have been spent.

My own home State of Pennsylvania, that State has only spent 17 percent of these homeland security funds. Hundreds of millions of dollars earmarked for homeland projects are currently unaccounted for. Moreover, in some instances, local communities received these funds, but utilized them in ways that were not consistent with the promotion of our homeland security.

□ 2130

The chart I have here, and I will have those displayed in a moment, but these charts that I have here highlight some of the most egregious examples of misspent homeland security funds:

In Washington, DC, Dale Carnegie public speaking training for sanitation workers, \$100,000 was spent. These were homeland security dollars we are talking about.

Again in Washington, DC, a rap song to teach children emergency preparedness, \$100,000.

Santa Clara County, California, four Segway scooters to transport bomb squad personnel at a cost of \$18,000.

Mason County, Washington, biochemical decontamination units left sitting in a warehouse for more than a year, with no one trained to use it, \$63,000.

South Dakota, on-site paging system for the State agricultural fair at \$29,995.

Converse, Texas, a trailer to transport lawnmowers to lawnmower drag races, \$3,000.

Des Moines, Iowa, traffic cones, State of Missouri, 13,000 HazMat suits for every law enforcement official at \$7.2 million.

Tiptonville, Tennessee, purchases totaling \$183,000 including a Gator all-terrain vehicle at \$8,700 and two defibrillators, one for use at high school basketball games, \$5,200.

Washington, DC, computerized car towing service, \$300,000. Again, we are talking about homeland security funds here.

Montgomery County, Maryland, 8 large screen plasma television monitors for \$160,000.

Prince Georges County, Maryland, digital camera system used for mug shots at a half million dollars.

Newark, New Jersey, air-conditioned garbage trucks at a quarter million dollars.

H.R. 1544 seeks to rectify this deplorable situation by awarding grant funds based on risk. It requires that moneys be disbursed to those areas where threat vulnerability and consequence of attack is the greatest. It provides priority assistance to those first responders and first preventers that in fact are facing the highest risk. It streamlines the process by which local authorities can apply for and receive terrorism preparedness grants. It establishes specific flexible and measurable goals for the Department of Homeland Security and promotes the development of national standards for first responder equipment and training. It encourages regional cooperation to increase emergency preparedness. It follows the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission which had this to say about the prior funding formula: "Homeland Security assistance should be based strictly on an assessment of risks and vulnerabilities. Federal Homeland Security assistance should not remain a program for general revenue sharing. It should supplement State and local resources based on the risk or vulnerabilities that merit additional support. Congress should not use this money as pork barrel." That was the 9/11 Commission.

By directing grant funding to threatened areas without regard to politics,

H.R. 1544 has become a key part of the national security reforms necessitated by the September 11 attacks.

The second piece of legislation that reflects the Homeland Security Committee's bipartisan commitment to the preservation of homeland security is H.R. 1817, the Homeland Security Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006. This act promotes our national security in a number of different areas. To help secure our porous borders it authorizes funds to hire 2,000 new border patrol agents. In addition, it provides \$40 million so that local law enforcement agencies have access to the training required to apprehend illegal immigrants, some of whom may be involved in terrorist activities. To safeguard the cargo coming into our ports, it provides money to promote risk-based screening of containers in transit to the United States. The Container Security Initiative, or CSI, is a Department of Homeland Security initiative or program that places customs employees at 36 foreign ports to target and inspect these containers before they can gain entry to the United States. H.R. 1817 not only funds the existing program, but also makes provisions to expand inspections to approximately 50 ports.

Finally, with regard to deterring a nuclear or biological attack, the act promotes the improvement of the department's intelligence-gathering capabilities that is necessary to detect incoming threats and to develop the means to prevent these efforts.

H.R. 1817 provides the authorization to maintain the funds necessary to keep the country secure, while H.R. 2360, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006, appropriates the moneys required to do the job. Our committee has approved \$30.85 billion for operations and activities of the Department of Homeland Security. This represents an increase of \$1.37 billion over fiscal year 2005 and \$1.3 billion above the President's budget request. As with the authorization bill, border security is a high priority in this legislation. We have appropriated \$1.61 billion for border security and an additional \$3.2 billion for customs enforcement, which will allow the Bureau for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, to hire an additional 150 criminal investigators and 200 immigration enforcement agents. We have appropriated \$188 million to develop vehicle and cargo inspection technologies and we have given the Coast Guard \$2.6 billion to perform its homeland security missions.

H.R. 2360 also helps local first responders perform their vital homeland security mission. Among other expenditures we have earmarked \$200 million for a first responders training, \$400 million for State and local law enforcement terrorism prevention programs and \$600 million for firefighter grants. Since September 11, 2001, Congress has provided over \$32 billion to first responders. Again, since September 11, 2001, Congress has provided over \$32 bil-

lion to our first responders, including terrorism prevention and preparedness, general law enforcement, firefighter assistance, airport security, seaport security, and public health preparedness. And this year's share of that funding comes to approximately \$3.6 billion.

Finally, H.R. 2360 goes a long way toward helping us to maintain security at our transportation hubs and places deemed to be critical infrastructure. We have directed moneys for air cargo security, rail security and trucking security. We have earmarked \$1.3 billion toward research and development, including \$651 million to develop radiological, nuclear, chemical, biological and high explosives countermeasures designed to protect power plants, other industrial properties, and the people that work in or live near those particular facilities. These programs are expensive, but no mission is more important than safeguarding the country against the threat of attack by chemical, biological or nuclear agents, unthinkable attacks, and we are doing all we can to protect ourselves.

These three bills, taken together, the First Responders Act, the Homeland Security Authorization Act, and Homeland Security Appropriations Act reveal that the gentleman from California (Chairman COX), an extraordinary man who the President quite wisely nominated to become the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, he has done an outstanding job. Chairman COX and the rest of the Homeland Security Committee possess the highest possible commitment to keeping our Nation safe from terrorist attack and from other catastrophic events. While all these measures were thoroughly debated in the committee, they all passed to the floor with relative ease, a testament to the timeless adage that so aptly characterizes our political process. In America, debates over homeland security, like those regarding partisan politics, end at the water's edge.

And with that I would like now to turn to some of my colleagues who have joined me here tonight from the Homeland Security Committee, each of whom, many of whom, bring very interesting skills and background to this issue. And the first Member of the committee I would like to draw your attention to introduce is a good friend, my colleague from the 10th district of Texas. In addition to working on the International Relations and Science Committees, he also serves with me on, as I mentioned, the Homeland Security Committee where he is assigned to the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack and the Subcommittee on Management, Integration and Oversight.

My colleague is a former Texas deputy attorney general and chief of terrorism and national security in the Department of Justice for the Western Judicial District of Texas. Further, because of his expertise in homeland security affairs, the Governor of Texas

appointed him to be the adviser to the Governor's office on homeland security. So with that, I would like to introduce to all of you my good friend from the 10th District of Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for managing this important debate on probably what is the most important issue facing this Nation today. As we heard the names of the men and women who served in Iraq and Afghanistan who paid the ultimate sacrifice just a few minutes ago in this Chamber, I say to the families, we remember. We thank you. We will never forget.

Every day I meet, it is part of our job, we meet with the families who have lost loved ones over there. And they all tell me the same thing, and that is, finish the job; I do not want my son to have died in vain. And finish the job we will. We thank you for your sacrifice fighting this war on terror abroad so that we do not have to face it here at home. And it has made this Nation more secure in our homeland.

Back home, this Congress has moved faster than ever in passing legislation, which, among other things, fulfills the 9/11 Commission's recommendations by bolstering the security along our borders and sending the badly needed funding to those areas of our Nation that terrorists still see as targets. Indeed, recently the Homeland Security Committee visited Ground Zero. The tragic events of 9/11 are still very much alive and well in that city. We met with the police commissioner. We met with the Liberty Street Firehouse, the fallen heroes, the families who survived that tragic day, who lost so many people. And I can tell you, you can feel it. It is as if it happened just yesterday.

And everything we do in this Congress is to provide the tools necessary to ensure that another 9/11 never happens again in this country. The need for this hard-hitting legislation comes from the United States grave and growing problem with undocumented aliens. An estimated 8 to 12 million undocumented aliens are here in the United States, and it is also estimated that two slip across the border for every one that is apprehended. That means that almost 3 million undocumented aliens enter our country every year; to put it in perspective, roughly the size of the city of Dallas. And in the post-9/11 world, these figures no longer represent just an immigration problem, but rather one of national security.

This Nation is being compromised by our inability to identify those who are coming into our country. And I am convinced that the first step we need to take to solve this problem is to secure our borders and to better enforce the laws currently on the books. Congress knows that immigration plays a major part in our national security. Accordingly, we have provided more than \$1.5 billion in spending for border protec-

tion, immigration enforcement, and related activities in the 109th Congress.

When combining the homeland security authorization and appropriations bill that the House has passed, Congress has supplied funding for all 2,000 new border patrol agents that were recommended by the 9/11 Commission and fully authorized by last year's intelligence reform bill. These agents will have greater authority to detain and incarcerate illegal immigrants, instead of sending them back into our communities with a notice to appear in court, something very few abide by.

Indeed, we do not have to look too far back in history to see an example of this when Ramsey Yusef entered our country in 1992 and was apprehended. He too was given a notice to appear. He too failed to show up to the hearing, and instead he joined his fellow colleagues from the bin Laden academy to join the first al Qaeda cell in the United States. He then conspired to blow up the World Trade Center. Fortunately, he was not successful. But that day would come later and his dream would be realized with Osama bin Laden's dream to bring down the towers that fateful day.

□ 2145

But I say to you, the days of this catch-and-release policy are numbered. Congress has also worked hard to ensure that when border patrol agents catch undocumented aliens, we now have somewhere to hold them before they are extradited. Congress has funded over 4,000 new detention beds to help our Federal law enforcement uphold our Nation's immigration laws.

Our Federal law enforcement officers are being stretched too thin and being asked to do too much. According to current law, immigration laws can only be enforced by Federal law enforcement officials. Couple that with existing sanctuary policies in most of our big cities and one can easily see why our Federal officers have such a difficult time enforcing the laws on our borders.

This is why I offered an amendment to the Homeland Security Authorization Bill that would fund local law enforcement training at Federal facilities in order to create a force multiplier so that our Federal law enforcement gets the assistance it needs.

These additions will crack down on illegal immigration in between our borders and ultimately lessen the threat of terrorism.

Congress has also passed legislation to make America's first responders more expeditious and more effective by improving the process by which they receive their resources. The Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responders Act guarantees that the States with the biggest risk and the greatest threats receive the necessary funding to protect their communities. My home State of Texas, for example, currently ranks last in the amount of homeland security dollars received per person.

And that in a State which claims an international border, the Western White House, and a prominent State capital.

Texas and other States like New York should be receiving more money than those other States with fewer targets. And by closing these gaps in the defense of our homeland, we have learned what our weaknesses are and how to better prepare for, defend against, and preempt a terrorist plot.

Those like al Qaeda who wish to do harm to America have a track record of being patient and conspiring until they succeed in their terrorist agenda.

In my former job, I was chief of counterterrorism in the Justice Department, I had the Mexican border, the State capital, I had the President's ranch. I can tell you the threat is very much still alive in this country, and we need to give law enforcement every tool necessary to protect us and to fight this war on terror not just abroad but at home.

And with that in mind, this body has moved to address that threat. The House passage of the 2006 Homeland Security Authorization and Appropriations Act and Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responder Act send a clear message to our enemies that we will not stand idly by while they plot to do harm to our Nation.

As the President stated, we will not waiver, we will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail. Peace and freedom will prevail.

Mr. DENT. The next speaker tonight who will be joining us in this discuss on homeland security is another good friend who brings to us a great deal of experience. I would like to introduce to you now my colleague from the third district of California. In addition to working on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Budget, he also serves with me on the Committee on Homeland Security where he is assigned to the Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment.

My colleague is a former attorney general for the State of California, that State's top law enforcement officer; and he is strongly committed to enhancing the quality and depth of congressional oversight of our government's intelligence gathering and analysis in the provision of homeland security. I would like to introduce the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and commend him for having this Special Order.

When we talk about homeland security, we have to talk about those investigative techniques that are necessary for us to be able to forestall terrorism, terrorist attacks on our homeland; and one of the points I would like to make is prompted by comments that aids to the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Judiciary of the United

States Senate said that he would introduce legislation aimed at limiting the government's ability to detain material witnesses indefinitely.

The reason I mention this is that this is just a part of an overall criticism of this technique of the investigative community. As a matter of fact, the New York Times recently described it this way: that we, that is the Federal Government, are "thrust into a Kafkaesque world of indefinite detention without charges, secret evidence, and baseless accusations." Dozens of people, some were held for weeks and even months and the majority were never even charged with a crime. The Times seethes, did "the Bush administration twist the American system of due process."

An interesting article appeared today in the National Review by Andrew McCarthy, who is a former Federal prosecutor who has actually prosecuted some of the major terrorist cases in this country, that aptly responds to these criticisms of this effort by the Federal law enforcement community.

He says, In point of fact, material witness detentions have been with us for decades pursuant to duly enacted law, that is, section 3144 of title 18 of the U.S. Code. They were used countless times prior to 9/11. Hysteria aside, it should come as no surprise that these are detentions without charges since by definition the person being detained is being detained as a witness, not being charged with a crime.

What would require baseless accusations would be to hold such a person as a defendant, which is precisely what the government refrains from doing in detaining on material witness law. The proceedings, moreover, involve secret evidence only in the sense that all proceedings before the grand jury, whether they involve terrorism, unlawful gambling or anything in between, are secret Under Federal law. The left of course well knows that when investigative information about its champions seeps into the public domain, it routinely complains about the reprehensible violation of grand jury secrecy rules, a useful diversion from dealing with the substance of any suspicions.

Mr. McCarthy goes on, There were many, many people who were identified in that investigation of having had some connection or another with the 19 suicide attackers and their al Qaeda support network. Some of those connections seem intimate, some attenuated; but all of them had to be run down. Just imagine what the 9/11 Commission would have said if they had not been.

So here is the problem, says Andrew McCarthy. You identify a large number of people who at a minimum have information that might be vital to protecting against terrorist attacks and who might in fact be terrorists or at least facilitators. It is very early in the investigation, so you do not have sufficient evidence to charge them with a crime or to say conclusively either

that they are not dangerous or they are willing to tell you what they know rather than flee.

What do you do? It would be irresponsible to do nothing, but you cannot watch these people 24-7. There are not anywhere close enough agents for that. Well, the law does not require you to do nothing. The law which existed before 9/11 but used here permits the government to detain people for a brief time in order to compel their information either in the grand jury or some other court proceedings.

Contrary to what you might think from the latest spate of coverage and from the comments to aides of the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee on the Senate side, the government may not sweep innocent people up and hold them in secret.

While grand jury proceedings are supposed to be kept from the New York Times, for instance, they are not kept secret from the court. A prosecutor has to go to court and get a material witness arrest warrant. This means the arrest does not happen unless the government satisfies a Federal judge that there is a reasonable basis to believe, A, the person at issue has information that would be important to an ongoing investigation and, B, the person might flee without providing that information to the grand jury or the court unless the person is detained until his testimony can be secured.

And that is not all. Mr. McCarthy goes on to tell us the arrested witness, even though he is not being charged with a crime, is given the same kinds of protections that are afforded to actual defendants. The witness must promptly be presented upon arrest to a judge so that a neutral official can advise him of why he is being held. More significantly, counsel is immediately appointed for him at public expense if he cannot afford an attorney. Indeed, if he is a foreign national, the United States is obligated by law to advise him that he is right to have his consulate advised of his arrest. And frequently the consulate will not only obtain counsel on behalf of its citizen but will also closely monitor the case, including by demands for information from the U.S. State Department.

The lawyer is given information about why the witness is being detained. Counsel is permitted to be present at any interview of the witness by the government. And although counsel is not permitted to accompany the witness inside the Federal grand jury, no witness, material or otherwise, has that right, the government is not permitted to interview the witness outside the grand jury unless counsel allows it.

In addition, at any time during the course of the detention, counsel is permitted to make a bail application to the court; and if the judge is satisfied that the bail offered vitiates the risk of flight, the witness is freed on the promise to appear for his testimony.

Furthermore, if at any point the length of detention or the condition of

the witness's confinement actually offend the witness's fundamental rights, counsel may submit a habeas corpus petition seeking the witness's immediate release.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, how is that Kafkaesque? How is that somehow putting people outside the bounds of law? How is that having this administration twisting the Constitution in some way?

It is, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, this kind of hyperbole, this kind of misstatement which makes it more difficult for us to do our duty with respect to homeland security. We need to have those investigative tools that have been used against organized crime, that have been used against organized drug dealers and organizations. We need to be able to use those same investigative techniques, those same prosecutorial tools against those who would destroy us as a Nation, against those who have allied with those who have said it is their duty to kill any American, man, woman or child, anywhere in the world, combatant or non-combatant.

We are in a new world, a world of terror, in which we have to respond in ways that, yes, are consistent with the Constitution, but ways that allow us to protect ourselves in a proper and forceful way. And these kinds of criticisms that come from the outside, whether it is with respect to Guantanamo or whether it is with respect to the use of laws which allow our application of the law against material witnesses, these kinds of attacks weaken our ability to do the job.

And with respect to my second point, let me talk briefly about what we have done here in the House of Representatives to respond to the demand for us to respond to this unique challenge that is the challenge of terrorism.

One cannot criticize a Congress for responding as best it could in the direct aftermath of 9/11. One cannot criticize Congress for doing as Congress always does in attempting to respond to some problems, throwing money at it. But one can criticize Congress at a time it has to take a pause and look at what it has done and seen what it can perhaps do better. And that is what we have done with the various bills that we have passed out of the House that were mentioned by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

One of the things that we did in that was respond to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission report when they said homeland security assistance should be based strictly on an objective, non-political assessment of risks and vulnerabilities. These assessments should consider the threat of an attack, localities vulnerability to an attack, and the possible consequences of an attack.

Secondly, they told us, Congress should not use this money as a pork barrel. Third, they said, Federal homeland security assistance should not remain a program for general revenue

sharing. Fourth, they told us, the Federal Government should develop specific benchmarks for evaluating community needs and require that spending decisions be made in accordance with those benchmarks. Fifth, they told us, each State receiving funds should provide an analysis of how funds are allocated and spent within the State.

Finally, they said, each city and State should have a minimum infrastructure for emergency response.

□ 2200

This is precisely what we have done with the two bills that have been mentioned before. We have said that rational risk assessment should drive our strategy, should drive our tactics and should drive our funding.

The House Committee on Homeland Security, with the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman COX), reported out the Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act. This bill will reduce the across-the-board formula for providing homeland security funds to State and local responders from .75 to .25 percent. Therefore, under this bill, a greater amount of funds will be disbursed solely based on risk assessment.

In April of this year new-Secretary Michael Chertoff testified before our committee regarding the need within DHS to promote risk-based prioritization and management. He said one of the goals before him is to "build a culture in which the disparate pieces of information are being transmitted to our analysts so that they, who have the benefit of the fuller picture, can properly analyze all of our information and inform our decision-making." We do need to make informed decisions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having this Special Order this evening for us to have an opportunity to recount some of the things that are necessary for us to do to provide for the defense of our homeland and understand that this threat remains.

The biggest challenge we have here today is that the longer we are successful in forestalling terrorist attacks, the more difficult it is to explain to people why we need to continue to keep our defenses up, the harder it is to explain that these things do not happen by happenstance. Rather, it is because of strong work done by brave men and women involved in the protection of our homeland that allow us to be safer than we would be otherwise.

The worst thing we could possibly do is to not maintain our persistence and our dedication, our true dedication to doing those things that are necessary to protect it, despite the criticism of those who easily look at law enforcement, look at homeland security, the community, and saying they are going too far too fast.

Contrary to that, we know we have not done enough, and while we in the

Congress are required to provide the oversight to ensure that there are not abuses in the system and to ensure that no prosecutor, no law enforcement agent takes advantage of those tools we have given them, we also must make sure that they are not cowed by criticism from doing the job that they need to do.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN). I think we have heard quite clearly from these individuals who have tremendous and deep experience in law enforcement in their States. They bring a perspective here that is very valuable to the Committee on Homeland Security and, frankly, to the security of our Nation.

The next person I would like to introduce tonight also has a great deal of experience in law enforcement. Actually, he has 33 years of experience as a first responder. He was the sheriff of King County, Washington. That is the Seattle area, for those of you not from the State of Washington, but the gentleman from Washington's (Mr. REICHERT) Eighth District, again, is just loaded with experience as a first responder or a first preventer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), my colleague, former sheriff and extraordinary member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania and commend him for sponsoring this hour tonight.

We have heard about the Faster Smarter First Responder Act. We have talked about risk assessment. We have talked about the PATRIOT Act. We have talked about better cooperation and those things that we have done as members of the Committee on Homeland Security to support first responders.

As a freshman Member and law enforcement officer of 33 years, as my friend has indicated, I am honored to be a member of the Committee on Homeland Security to represent the thoughts, ideas, needs and concerns of first responders across the Nation. The role of the first responder has changed since September 11, and it is important that we recognize that and equip them accordingly. In the first months of this session, we have given them priority risk-based funding and brought them into important homeland security decisions.

What I want to do tonight is to really focus on where the rubber meets the road and to just take a moment to look back and then take a look forward.

Where were first responders in 1972 when I started out as a cop, as a 21-year-old, naive police officer? The things that we did back in 1972 through the 1970s and into the 1980s was to respond to crime, to operate from our police cars and answer burglary calls and

respond to other crime needs in our community and work with local police departments and local school districts.

Then in the 1980s, we moved ahead and we actually ended up with some additional tools. We look back to 1972, and we think about what did we have for tools? We had a police car, a gun and a badge essentially, and a pair of handcuffs. As we moved forward into the 1980s and into the 1990s, we ended up with tools like DNA, an automated fingerprint identification system, and I know it sounds funny, but computers started to come onto the scene. So we added those tools to our arsenal of crime-fighting weapons.

Then we find ourselves in the 1990s, also in the middle of community policing and our efforts to work with the community to solve not only crime in the communities but to improve the quality of life, to interact with leaders of the community, to sit down and listen to their needs and concerns and come to some solutions for their neighborhoods, even as far as painting over graffiti and towing away old cars. That was what police officers did in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

Then came along September 11 and our role changed forever, and as my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) just said, we now live in a different world.

After September 11, the role of the first responder has changed. It still includes those things that I just talked about, the stuff that cops do every day, helping people, arresting crooks, criminals on the streets of our cities across this country, but the added responsibility now of also being a part of the team and protecting our homeland, and they truly are on the front line of that effort.

In our local community in Seattle we have a Joint Analytical Center where police officers from local police departments are assigned to the Federal intelligence task force. We have a regional intelligence task force gathering information within our specific region in the Northwest and sharing with the FBI Joint Analytical Center. That information is analyzed, prioritized, and then assigned to the joint terrorism task force where, again, local police detectives are a part of and member of and participate in investigating and following up those leads that are prioritized by the analytical center. Every day, cops on the streets today are following up leads to find terrorists, people who are in this country to do us harm, and we in the Committee on Homeland Security are here to support that effort.

We would have never thought years ago that police officers on the street would have to respond to calls or train in HazMat uniforms. We would have never thought 5, 10, 15 years ago that we would have had to worry about our police officers and first responders responding to a dirty bomb, a bioterror, or some other weapon of mass destruction, but these are the things today

that our local police officers are trying to deal with, and it is a tough, tough job.

So let us not forget them. Let us support them and we will continue to do our work on the Committee on Homeland Security, and I am proud to be a member of that committee.

I thank the gentleman so much for the time to speak tonight on the role of first responders.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) for sharing his thoughts and perspectives with us, again a 33-year first responder and police officer from the Seattle year.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), another fine individual, member of the committee, from the Third District of Alabama. In addition to working on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Agriculture, he also serves with me on the Committee on Homeland Security where he is assigned to the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology and chairs the Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight. As chairman of this subcommittee, my colleague is very concerned about making sure that the Department of Homeland Security operates in the most efficient and effective and transparent way possible.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for organizing this discussion tonight. It is vital we take the time to talk about these important issues, and I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to highlight some of our accomplishments this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has done many good things to help secure our homeland, some of which we are discussing tonight, but in other areas, we still have a ways to go.

Take, for example, the issue of border surveillance. About 2 weeks ago, the subcommittee I chair held a hearing to discuss the camera system that monitors our Nation's northern and southern borders. Known as the Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System, or ISIS, these cameras are a critical link for helping secure our border.

Unfortunately, this system is not working as planned. What began as a program to monitor the border crossing of illegal immigrants, drug trafficker, and even terrorists has morphed into what one of our witnesses called "a major project gone awry."

According to a 2004 GSA audit, the problems go even further. For example, the initial \$2 million contract was awarded without full competition. Just 1 year later that same contract ballooned to over \$200 million, again without full competition, and the problems do not end there.

The GSA audit also reported significant issues relating to the surveillance system itself: 60-foot poles that were

paid for but never installed; sensitive equipment that failed to meet electrical codes; an operations center where contractors and government employees did little or no work for over a year; and not surprisingly, numerous cost overruns. To top it off, in September 2004, the GSA abruptly ended the maintenance contract. This left approximately 70 border sites without monitoring equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. What we have here, plain and simple, is a case of gross mismanagement of a multimillion-dollar contract. This agreement has violated Federal contracting rules, and it has wasted taxpayers' dollars. Worst of all, it has seriously weakened our Nation's border security.

Before DHS spends another \$2.5 billion on a replacement system known as the America's Shield Initiative, we need to first fix the system we have got. With Federal dollars scarce and budgets tight, it is vital that the American people know what they are getting.

Thanks to the work of this Congress and many of my colleagues here tonight, we are improving the safety of America's homeland, but we still have a ways to go. As we move forward, I hope we can continue to address these issues at DHS.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his comments as well and appreciate his leadership on the Committee on Homeland Security.

I would now like to further this conversation tonight, this Special Order and this discussion with the American people, and I would like to say a few words about the interrelationship between immigration and homeland security.

While so many immigrants who come to this country do so legally and with the sole intention of seeking a better life, there are those who have links to terrorist organizations or who come here to do us harm. To be fully effective, then, the homeland security programs need to contain measures to curb illegal immigration and to prevent those who would seek to propagate acts of violence from crossing international borders.

Legislation recently passed in the House contains these kinds of measures. The Real ID Act is one such provision. It serves to protect the homeland in four distinct ways.

First, it establishes rigorous proof of identity for all driver's license applicants and strong security requirements for all licenses and State-issued identity cards. It further requires that Federal agencies only accept State-issued licenses and ID cards from those States that have confirmed by substantial evidence that the applicant is lawfully present within the jurisdiction. These measures are important because they make it more difficult for would-be ter-

rorists to utilize phony or temporary licenses or secure cover for their nefarious activities here in the U.S. As the 9/11 Commission states: "It is elemental to border security to know who is coming into the country. Today more than 9 million people are in the United States outside the legal immigration system. All but one of the 9/11 hijackers acquired some form of U.S. identification document, some by fraud."

□ 2215

"Acquisition of these forms of identification would have assisted them in boarding commercial flights, renting cars, and other necessary activities." That is from the 9/11 Commission.

The REAL ID Act also makes it easier to deny asylum to and deport would-be terrorists. Prior to REAL ID, individuals who allegedly committed certain terrorist acts could be denied admission to the U.S., but an anomaly within U.S. immigration law provided that once here, individuals who had committed these same acts could not be deported. The REAL ID Act rectifies this situation.

In addition, terrorist organizations have been using front organizations and alleged charities to support and provide cover for their terrorist activities. As President Bush has stated, "International terrorist networks make frequent use of charitable or humanitarian organizations to obtain clandestine, financial and other support for their activities." Money given to terrorist organizations is fungible. Unfortunately, prior to the act, an alien could provide funding or other material support to many terrorist organizations and then escape deportation merely by claiming he did not know the funds would be spent on weapons or explosives.

The REAL ID Act, by contrast, directs that an alien who provides funds or other material support to a terrorist is inadmissible and deportable if he knew or reasonably should have known that he was giving to a terrorist organization.

Finally, the REAL ID Act provides an important component to the physical security of the United States. In 1996, Congress mandated the building of a 14-mile border fence inland from the Mexican border in the San Diego area. The goal was to curb illegal entries into the most heavily trafficked corner of the United States and to guarantee security at the U.S. naval base in San Diego. More than 8 years later, that fence is still not completed, in large part because the construction is tied up in litigation. In order to facilitate the construction of this important security perimeter, the act waives all Federal laws necessary to ensure the expeditious completion of this structure.

Immigration as a security issue was also the subject of portions of the Homeland Security Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006. The act fully funded the hiring and training of some 2,000

border patrol agents. It also clarifies the existing authorities of State and local law enforcement personnel to apprehend, detain, remove, and transport illegal aliens in the routine course of their duty.

Further, it buttresses up that policy determination that local police have the right to help enforce U.S. immigration laws by appropriating \$40 million in training funds for these same municipal authorities. These funds are available to reimburse those communities that choose to send officers to the Department of Homeland Security programs run by ICE, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, designed to train and certify these officers in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws. Having officers trained in this way can only work to the detriment of a would-be terrorist detained as a result of his committing a crime unrelated to national security.

As I have described, the Homeland Security Act has a strong border security component, but so does the homeland appropriation bill. The appropriation bill provides \$19.4 billion for border protection, immigration enforcement, and related activities, an increase of \$1.9 billion over fiscal year 2005 enacted levels and \$285 million over the President's budget request. These funds support a robust revitalization of immigration enforcement efforts, both along our borders and within the interior of the Nation.

Specific funding includes, but is not limited to, \$3.2 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, providing an additional 150 criminal investigators and 200 immigration enforcement agents; \$61 million for border security technology, including surveillance and unmanned aerial vehicles; \$20 million for replacement border patrol aircraft; \$690 million to fund 3,870 beds to house illegal immigrants detained in U.S. facilities; \$119 million to fund fugitive operations teams; and \$211 million for transportation and removal of undocumented aliens.

All these measures I have previously described are designed to enforce immigration laws, but we must also remember that in doing so we are contributing to the preservation of our homeland security as well. By preventing access to this country by undocumented aliens, by removing those who are here illegally, and by training local police officers to help enforce immigration laws, we will increase the odds that a would-be terrorist seeking to enter our country will be stopped before he can wreak any acts of violence against our citizenry.

Another comment I would like to make with respect to this whole issue of homeland security is this. We have heard from a number of speakers tonight about what the United States Congress is doing to make our homeland more safe and more secure. We have heard about the PATRIOT Act, the Homeland Security Authorization Act, the First Responder Bill, and the

appropriations act. But, really, the bottom line is, why are we going through this? The events of 9/11 should have woken up everyone. I believe they did. Many of us lost friends. I had a relative in the first tower on the 91st floor who escaped, luckily. The plane entered that tower in the 93rd floor, and he lived to talk about it.

So we have all been touched by this in one way or another, and certainly as a freshman Member of Congress I spend a great deal of time going to orientation sessions and being fed a lot of information. I have felt sometimes that being a Member of Congress is sometimes like drinking water out of a fire hose. A lot of information is thrown at you very quickly, and you do your best to absorb it all.

When I was up at Harvard University to be engaged in the orientation program, I met an interesting individual up there, a man name Grahm Allison, who wrote a book called "Nuclear Terrorism," and I highly recommend that people read it because it helps bring focus and clarity to the issue of homeland security and why this government, and not just in the Department of Homeland Security but throughout our Federal Government, State government, our local officials are working so diligently to protect us from unspeakable criminal acts that our enemies would like to commit against us.

I will go to this book, again entitled "Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe," written by Grahm Allison, but he quotes an individual named Suleiman Abu Gheith, who was Osama bin Laden's official press spokesman. Nine months after the 9/11 attacks, Suleiman Abu Gheith made this announcement, and it was put out on al Qaeda Web sites. He says: "We have the right to kill 4 million Americans, 2 million of them children, and to exile twice as many and wound and cripple hundreds of thousands."

What a frightening and extraordinary statement. He says he wants to kill, that al Qaeda wants to kill 4 million Americans. He did not say 1.5 million Americans, he did not say 8 million Americans. He said 4 million, 2 million children. How did he get to that number? He goes on to explain. He itemizes the number. He goes on and he says that for 50 years in Palestine he blames the Jews, and with the blessing and support of the Americans he says the Jews exiled nearly 5 million Palestinians and killed nearly 260,000. They wounded nearly 180,000 and crippled nearly 160,000. And he talks about the American bombings and the siege of Iraq, as he says more than 1.2 million Muslims were killed in the past decade.

So he blames Israel and the United States. He says in the war against the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan, America killed 12,000 Afghan civilians and 350 Arab jihad fighters. In Somalia, America killed 13,000 Somalies. So as he itemizes this number, he somehow gets to 4 million. This is what our enemies are saying about us.

So, then, he asks the rhetorical question as to how should a good Muslim, in his case what he considers a good Muslim, which is not what most of us or most Muslims would consider to be a good Muslim, I am sure, but he said, "Citing the Koran and other Islamic religious texts and traditions," he answers his question by saying, "anyone who peruses these sources reaches a single conclusion: the sages have agreed that the reciprocal punishment to which the verses referred to is not limited to a specific instance. It is a valid rule for punishments for infidels, for licentious Muslims, and for the oppressors."

He concludes: "According to the numbers in the previous section of the lives lost among Muslims because of Americans, directly or indirectly, we are still at the beginning of the way. The Americans have still not tasted from our hands what we have tasted from theirs. We have not reached parity with them." He says, "Parity will require killing 4 million Americans."

This is very frightening. And I would suggest to everyone here today that 4 million Americans is a very big number. On September 11 we lost nearly 3,000 of our own. It would require 1,400 attacks of 3,000 people to get to 4 million.

Al Qaeda is quite clear in their intentions, and it is my belief that they intend to pursue whatever weapons are available to them to maximize the amount of damage they can upon the American people. And that is why our committee is so dedicated, is so committed to making sure that our folks at Homeland Security have what they need to do the job to protect us.

Finally, I want to turn to another man who is a great leader and a friend from my home State of Pennsylvania. I would like to introduce my colleague from the Seventh District of Pennsylvania. In addition to being a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science, he also serves with me on the House Homeland Security Committee, where he is vice chairman.

He is also active on the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology, as well as the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Risk Assessment. He is a former first responder himself, an active student of international relations, and an expert on ballistic missile proliferation.

He, too, is an author of a highly acclaimed book, "Countdown to Terror." I have been talking about books, so I might as well mention this one too. It has been talked about quite a bit in the press, and it highlights his concerns about terrorist failures and the spread of ballistic missile technology in Iran. So without any further discussion from me, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and

of ballistic missile technology in Iran. So without any further discussion from me, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding to me and thank him for this outstanding Special Order. I hope that our colleagues tonight have been listening, because they have seen an outstanding assemblage of excellent young Members of Congress who are picking up the mantle and taking the lead on homeland security issues in our committee.

This is the first year for the full operation of the authorization committee for homeland security funding and oversight, and it is extremely important that we get off to a good start. I just want to say, as a Member who was very aggressively behind this committee, I am overwhelmingly pleased and positive with the type of membership we have on this committee. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), is an example of an outstanding leader who is committed; and he has brought together an assemblage of Members tonight who have articulated the various parameters of the concerns we face, from first responders, to our borders, to protecting our ports and our airports, and for all of the significant work that has been accomplished under Secretary Ridge, now being accomplished under our current new Secretary and under the able leadership of the chairman of our House Homeland Security Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), and our appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, later on this evening I will be offering another Special Order that will reveal some absolutely amazing information for the American people. I will divulge tonight the information that prior to 9/11, not only did we know about the Mohammed Atta cell, but that the Special Forces Command in our military actually wanted to take action against that cell, and we did not take that action.

I will be discussing our intelligence in detail, and by following through on a special project that was initiated under the leadership of General Shelton focusing on al Qaeda. But at this point in time, I wanted to stop by and thank our distinguished Members, thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for his leadership, and say to those who participated in this Special Order, if we are going to win the battle and protect the homeland, all Members must play the critical role that you have played tonight and pick a specialty area that you have a focus on so we as a team can make sure that our country is properly protected.

### THIRTY-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for half the time until midnight, 44 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to address the House, and the 30-Something Working Group would like to send our appreciation to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for allowing us to have the time to come to the floor once again to talk about issues that are facing everyday Americans.

The 30-Something Working Group was created in the 108th Congress, some 3 years ago, to start talking about issues that focus on young people, children and grandchildren, about their future and the direction this country is going in. Every 30-Something Working Group hour, we talk about issues that we feel that young Americans and Americans in general should know about, but we also talk about what Democrats are doing that is different than the majority side.

I celebrate the fact that in this democracy we have an opportunity to give our views and opinions as it relates to what is happening and what is not happening. I think both are very, very important. For us to continue to move in the direction that we moved in since we became the United States of America, it is important that we have not only factual information to share with the Members and the American people, but to make sure that we are consistent.

Tonight I am joined by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). We will talk about issues that are at the forefront of the debate here in Washington, D.C. One is Social Security. Two, we want to continue not necessarily in this order to talk about the issues that are facing veterans. We have men and women that are in the forward area in Iraq and Afghanistan, and many other parts of the world where they are fighting terrorism, but at the same time we have to understand the responsibility of making sure that we keep our end of the deal as it relates to their veterans affairs once they get back.

We have individuals that have served in past conflicts on behalf of this country, that allow us to celebrate the very freedom that we live under today. We cannot leave them behind. We cannot forget them, or turn our back on them. In many places we will point out where there are those in Congress fighting on behalf of veterans, and those in Congress who say they are fighting on behalf of veterans, but it is not coming out on the other end.

I want to talk about the Social Security proposal that has been put forward by not only the President and some Republican leaders, not only in the House but in the other body. I think it is important that the American people understand that in Washington, D.C., all

you may see and hear may not be true. It is also important that we point out those inequities because anything that goes toward private accounts, I think that the American people need to continue to be very wary of. You can dress a private account up and put a fake mustache on it and a wig, but it is still privatization of Social Security.

The bottom line is across the board with both of these proposals, Americans will lose benefits if we go into private accounts. Will private accounts deal with the Social Security solvency issue? I must add that is 47 years away; 100 percent of benefits will still be provided to 48 million Americans, those 33 million in retirement, the rest who are receiving disability and survivor benefits. It will be here. What we are asking for on this side as it relates to the Democratic leadership, not only the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) but also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), our chairman, and our vice chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), we have not only an ongoing, but are working toward a bipartisan approach.

Mr. Speaker, I must also add there is a discussion going on now, there was a press conference last week talking about we have a bill and private accounts. It is not as bad as the President's bill, but it is starting us off on private accounts. In this same press conference it was admitted by the sponsors of the bill this will not deal with the solvency of Social Security. I do not know why we are trying to fool the American people. I do not know why we are going through this dance that we call here in Washington the Potomac two-step, trying to fake out the American people.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and I are going to attempt to share not only with the Members that we know exactly what they are doing, and we are here, elected by the people from our districts, and also representing the people of the United States of America, to make sure that they know exactly what is going on.

Tonight is not about the 30-Something Working Group and what we want to talk about. It is factual. It is not the Tim Ryan report or the Kendrick Meek report, it is what is happening right now, third-party validators. And we will continue to come to the floor to point out factual inequities in what the majority side is talking about. We want to make sure that the American people understand the difference, the difference between the leadership of veterans, or not; and the difference between leadership on behalf of Social Security and making sure that we do not leave the present generation and future generations behind.

We talked last week about the issue of the ever-growing deficit. Guess what, we are going to have to pay it off, and I do mean all of us, some