

Federal Government. That quickly changed after President Bush came to town, and now congressional Republicans are being disingenuous by attempting to sell their Social Security proposal as a way to prevent the trust fund from being raided in the future.

Republicans are simply misrepresenting their proposal. When asked last week how the government would fund the programs now being funded by the Social Security trust fund money, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCREERY), Social Security Subcommittee chairman, said that the cash can still be used the way it is now. In other words, despite their rhetoric, Republicans would continue to raid the Social Security trust fund.

Americans should not be fooled by this latest privatization proposal. If the President and Republicans are serious about saving Social Security, let us pay back what we owe on Social Security now.

TEN COMMANDMENTS

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, above the Speaker's chair in the people's house are boldly written the words "In God we trust." God. We, the House of Representatives, acknowledge God and have for over 200 years.

Why should it be any other way? Our Declaration of Independence states that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Thomas Jefferson wrote, "Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a belief in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God?"

Now, Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court has ruled that we Texans can gaze upon the Ten Commandments at our statehouse, but the people of Kentucky cannot gaze upon them in their courthouses. This is not helpful. The establishment clause of our Constitution was written to ensure that the State respects all religions, not to declare hostility upon each.

We can and must acknowledge God in public life and in a way that equally respects the Muslim, the Jew, the Christian, the Buddhist, and all people of faith. For when we do, God will continue to bless America.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON IRAQ

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, President Bush has a golden opportunity to level with the American people tonight about Iraq. The question is: Will he?

The President stands at a crossroads. His credibility and the integrity of the

entire administration is on the line. The American people have had enough of administration rhetoric. For a sitting Vice President to dismiss reality and proclaim the insurgency in its "last throes" grossly understates the threat to U.S. soldiers in Iraq and seriously undermines any shred of credibility that the administration has left with the American people. They know that U.S. involvement in Iraq is going badly. Republican Senator CHUCK HAGEL summed it up last week when he said, "The White House is completely disconnected with reality . . . The reality is that we are losing in Iraq."

The American people want the President to deliver a straight story and a realistic plan, something he has been unwilling to do up to now. We will see if we hear it tonight.

WE MUST NOT INDEFINITELY SUBSIDIZE TYRANNY

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, today we will debate whether to keep pouring money into Egypt just to subsidize its military expansion. For the last 25 years we poured billions of dollars into Egypt. Each year we give that country about \$1.3 billion just in military aid in addition to economic aid.

But all the money seems to do is reinforce a regime that refuses change and excuses oppression. It oppresses religious minorities, it obstructs democratic reforms, it censors the media. I think that money can be better spent elsewhere.

□ 1030

Today, I will offer an amendment redirecting some of this military aid to fighting malaria in Africa, a preventable disease that kills as many as 3 million people a year. Poor nations are most at risk, some 40 million in Africa.

While we have a strategic responsibility to support allies, we have a responsibility to help fight disease where we can, and reducing Egypt's military funding will serve as a wake-up call to a country that votes against the United States over 91 percent of the time in the U.N. We will not indefinitely subsidize tyranny.

Congress has the authority to determine what we subsidize. Today we will make that clear.

MISMANAGING NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND THE POLITICS OF IRAQ

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

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, the President had a historic opportunity in 2003. He had the support of the Congress. He had the support of the United Nations. We had inspectors in Iraq. It

was determined that they had no weapons of mass destruction, and yet the President decided to invade.

Just think what would have happened if instead of on that day an invasion began, the President said, Let's keep this international coalition together. Let's move to Iran with the coalition. Let's ensure that they do not have a nuclear weapon.

Now the new President of Iran is stating that the United States and the world will not get in the way of Iran and nuclear weapons. The United States is more in danger, Israel is more in danger, the world is more in danger, because of the bad decision President Bush made on that day in 2003 when he invaded Iraq.

Instead, we are on the brink of a nuclear Iran and North Korea, and we are in a quagmire in Iraq as we referee an insurgency that will breakout into civil war as soon as the United States leaves.

This is a historic mess. The President had a chance for a Nobel Peace Prize. Instead, he is going to go down in history as someone who completely mismanaged nuclear nonproliferation and the politics of Iraq.

TONING DOWN RHETORIC WITH REGARD TO CONFLICT IN IRAQ

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, a year ago today, sovereignty was returned to the country of Iraq and the Coalition Provisional Authority left. But, Madam Speaker, over the past several weeks, the negative press over our progress and polls here at home seem to have undermined a lot of the good activity that has occurred there.

The goal of the attackers, the goal of the insurgents, is to discourage Iraqis from participating in their own government. A second goal, of course, is to weaken our resolve here at home. Ironically, they seem to be failing in the first choice, but succeeding in the second.

Madam Speaker, every time I have traveled to Iraq, I have been struck by the disparity between what I see on my television here at home in the United States and what is actually happening on the ground in Iraq. Our soldiers should not have to look over their shoulders to see if we support them in their mission.

I urge my colleagues in this House on both sides to carefully consider their rhetoric when they use words like "quagmire" and "civil war" in respect to the conflict in Iraq.

THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, last year William F. Buckley, Jr., said if he

had known in 2002 what he had since relearned, he would have opposed the war in Iraq. A few weeks ago, he wrote that it is now time for the U.S. to get out and leave Iraq to the Iraqis. This is a man who has been described as the “godfather of conservatism.”

On June 17, Mr. Buckley wrote that opposition to the war was mounting and summed up his feelings in this way: “A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride. It can't reasonably be disputed that if in the year ahead the situation in Iraq continues about as it has done in the past year, we will have suffered more than another 500 soldiers killed. Where there had been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt.”

We should heed these words of this very respected conservative leader. The American people do not want this war to continue for another 10 or 12 years, or even another 5 or 6 more years.

FIXING SOCIAL SECURITY IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the issue of Social Security. Social Security is an important issue that affects every one of us in this country, yet it has become a partisan issue. It should not have to be a partisan issue. We are hearing comments from the other side that basically say do nothing at all to fix and address Social Security.

What we are proposing today is to try to come up with a consensus plan to at the very least take the surplus Social Security taxes that we are paying and spending on other government programs and apply that surplus to help workers prepare for their Social Security retirement benefit.

At the very least, let us make sure that the surplus taxpayers are paying today and for the next 12 years is dedicated toward preserving their Social Security retirement benefit. That is what we are hoping to accomplish here by trying to have an olive branch of consensus and bipartisanship. That is what we hope to accomplish with this latest plan we have introduced.

But more importantly, Madam Speaker, every year we delay fixing Social Security is another year where we add another \$600 billion of debt to the Social Security problem. That is according to the trustees.

Congress needs to be serious about this. We need to stop being partisan, and we need to fix this very important program.

ALLOW SGT. CARLOS LAZO INTO CUBA

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the case of Carlos Lazo. Sergeant Lazo has served our country honorably in Iraq. There has been a lot of talk about our soldiers in Iraq today. This sergeant returned from Iraq a while ago and wanted to visit his two children in Cuba. Carlos is a Cuban American who escaped that country on a raft several years ago.

He would like to go back, but our government will not let him. You see, he has visited Cuba once in the past 3 years, and that is all you are allowed under current policy. So this soldier, who received a Bronze Star in Iraq for his service and many other accolades, is not trusted by our government to visit his own family in Cuba.

This policy is wrong. The same policy prohibits a child with parents in Cuba from visiting them more than once every 3 years. So if your father dies one year, you go to his funeral. If your mother dies the next year, you cannot go to hers. How is that fair? Why is our government doing this?

We need to change this policy, Madam Speaker, and this week we may have an opportunity to do so. I would encourage my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

JUNK FAX PREVENTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 714) to amend section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) relating to the prohibition on junk fax transmissions.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON FAX TRANSMISSIONS CONTAINING UNSOLICITED ADVERTISEMENTS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 227(b)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(1)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) to use any telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to send, to a telephone facsimile machine, an unsolicited advertisement, unless—

“(i) the unsolicited advertisement is from a sender with an established business relationship with the recipient;

“(ii) the sender obtained the number of the telephone facsimile machine through—

“(I) the voluntary communication of such number, within the context of such established business relationship, from the recipient of the unsolicited advertisement, or

“(II) a directory, advertisement, or site on the Internet to which the recipient voluntarily agreed to make available its facsimile number for public distribution,

except that this clause shall not apply in the case of an unsolicited advertisement that is sent based on an established business relationship with the recipient that was in existence before the date of enactment of the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005 if the sender possessed the facsimile machine number of the recipient before such date of enactment; and

“(iii) the unsolicited advertisement contains a notice meeting the requirements under paragraph (2)(D),

except that the exception under clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply with respect to an unsolicited advertisement sent to a telephone facsimile machine by a sender to whom a request has been made not to send future unsolicited advertisements to such telephone facsimile machine that complies with the requirements under paragraph (2)(E); or”.

(b) DEFINITION OF ESTABLISHED BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP.—Section 227(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) The term ‘established business relationship’, for purposes only of subsection (b)(1)(C)(i), shall have the meaning given the term in section 64.1200 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2003, except that—

“(A) such term shall include a relationship between a person or entity and a business subscriber subject to the same terms applicable under such section to a relationship between a person or entity and a residential subscriber; and

“(B) an established business relationship shall be subject to any time limitation established pursuant to paragraph (2)(G)).”.

(c) REQUIRED NOTICE OF OPT-OUT OPPORTUNITY.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) shall provide that a notice contained in an unsolicited advertisement complies with the requirements under this subparagraph only if—

“(i) the notice is clear and conspicuous and on the first page of the unsolicited advertisement;

“(ii) the notice states that the recipient may make a request to the sender of the unsolicited advertisement not to send any future unsolicited advertisements to a telephone facsimile machine or machines and that failure to comply, within the shortest reasonable time, as determined by the Commission, with such a request meeting the requirements under subparagraph (E) is unlawful;

“(iii) the notice sets forth the requirements for a request under subparagraph (E);

“(iv) the notice includes—

“(I) a domestic contact telephone and facsimile machine number for the recipient to transmit such a request to the sender; and