

women have equal status. While women have made many strides, gender disparities still exist in many fields. Even though college enrollment of women continues to increase, there continues to be a gender disparity in the fields of science in technology. Women not only earn fewer degrees, but are under represented in advanced secondary math, science and computer science classes. Investment in collegiate athletic programs and athletic scholarship opportunities also continue to favor men.

Perhaps the most distressing aspect of this gender gap is the persistence of sexual harassment on college campuses. Recent studies show that nearly two-thirds of female college students experience sexual harassment at some point during college—causing immeasurable harm to these women's studies and future goals. WEEA programs provide vital resources in order to fight this type activity.

WEEA continues to be an essential component in ensuring that young women are not inhibited by their gender and can choose a career path based on their interests, aspirations, and abilities. I strongly urge my colleagues to support access, equality and opportunity for young women through continued funding of this program.

OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what a pleasure it is to come back to the floor tonight to discuss some issues of vital concern to Members of the House and all Americans.

I could not help but pick up on what the gentlewoman from California was saying just a moment ago about a number of issues. One of them was about Medicare Part D. We are going to talk about a lot of things tonight, but I want to start by talking about Medicare Part D.

I am a physician. I practiced orthopedic surgery for over 20 years in the Atlanta area. She mentioned there was a plan to delay or postpone the deadline for Medicare Part D which is the prescription drug formula for seniors. Nearly 28 million out of 42 million have already signed up. Many of them are finally getting medications for the first time.

She mentioned there was a plan to delay it and they could not get bipartisan support. I guess that is one of the things that brings me to this well almost night after night because what you hear down here just is not so. It is not the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who also believes that there ought to be an extension of that deadline. In fact, we have had a bill on that for over a year and we could not get a soul, not a soul on the other side of the aisle to support that bill. The reason for that is what brought about the Official Truth Squad.

The Official Truth Squad began with a group of freshmen Republicans who

came here after the 2004 election to be Members of Congress and came here with wonderful vision and enthusiasm and positive spirit. And what we were met with oftentimes from the other side was really vitriol, was personal attacks, was a distortion of the truth, misinformation, disinformation.

We had been meeting on a weekly basis as a group and so we got together and we said how can we counter that. Because when I go home, I know that is what concerns many of my constituents. I suspect that is what you hear, Mr. Speaker, back at home. People ask why the level of rancor and why the level of partisanship.

What we thought to do in an effort to try to raise the level of discourse and decrease the kind of partisanship that goes on is to talk about truth, talk about issues in an open and honest manner and in a way that sheds light on issues.

Tonight you have heard an awful lot already about various issues, Mr. Speaker, that frankly have not been treated with the light of the day, if you will.

□ 2145

And so we have adopted, the Official Truth Squad has adopted a saying or a quote from a wonderful former United States Senator, Daniel Patrick Moynihan from New York, and he kind of crystallized what our frustration was, and that is, everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts. And so often around here, what happens is that people's opinion gets mistaken for facts. In fact, it has been said that if somebody says something three times in Washington, they think it is the truth, regardless of whether or not it has any bearing on the truth. And so I want to touch on a couple of things before we get into our other issue tonight, and I want to talk a little about student loans, student aid. We are now dealing this week on the Higher Education Reauthorization bill in the United States House of Representatives. It is a bill that has to be adopted in order to continue the programs that are so vitally important to millions, millions of young people across this country in order to go to college and university and to better themselves and make a better life for both them and their family. And what you always hear from the other side, what you always hear is, oh, they are going to cut this, and they are going to cut that, and they are going to slash this, and they are going to slash that. And that is what we have heard tonight, Mr. Speaker.

But the Official Truth Squad has as a mission to shed the light of day on it and to talk about the truth. And I am fond of charts and posters, because I think that they really describe much more than I am able to do in word. And this chart here, this poster here demonstrates the increases, Mr. Speaker, I said, increases, not cuts, not slashes, I said increases in Federal student aid

over the last 10 years. And anybody can plainly see that the amount of Federal loans, the amount of Federal grants, the amount of education tax benefits, the amount of Federal work study, all of them, all of them, Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years rising year after year after year, and appropriately so, so young people can have an opportunity to realize the American dream. That is the positive issue. That is the real message. That is the truth. These numbers, these numbers don't lie. And so when you hear people talk about cuts or slashes, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that it just is really a fabrication. It is not the truth. It is not what is real. And you will hear them talk about Pell Grants. Pell Grants are the grants that the Federal Government provides for young people in order to go to colleges and universities, those young people who don't necessarily have the means to be able to afford it. It is a wonderful program, works extremely well, allows people to elevate themselves and really raise themselves up by their own boot straps. This is a telling graph, Mr. Speaker. This is a telling chart because it begins way back in 1986. And the yellow portion of this is when the Democrats were in control of the United States House of Representatives. And you will hear all about what they would do if they were able to control again. And I think it is important and instructive for the House of Representatives and for the American people to appreciate, well, don't tell me what you would do. Let us look at what you did. Let us look at the truth. And the truth, in fact, Mr. Speaker, is that Pell Grants provided for by the Federal Government for young individuals who are the most needy in our society in order to go to colleges and universities in fact were flat or decreased in the 10 years prior to 1996. And what has happened since then is an appropriate increase to be able to fund a program that allows young people, without means, to be able to go to colleges and universities. The red portion is what has happened under the Republican control of the United States House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, those are not cuts. Those are not slashes. They are appropriate increases in a program that helps young people who are most in need.

This is another chart that demonstrates what would happen in the next fiscal year, what would happen with the overall Pell Grant funding. This is 2000, 2006. And with increased budgeting, the next graph, 2000 again, and Fiscal Year 2007 would increase from \$4,050 per individual to \$5,050, a significant remarkable increase. And on the end, the number of Pell Grants recipients, the number of students being helped, 3.9 million in 2000, fiscal year 2007, 5.3 million individuals. This is not a decrease. These are not cuts. These are not slashes. And for anybody to say otherwise is just, it is not true. It is not honest. It doesn't do a credit to the debate. It does a disservice to all

Americans because it means that people aren't able to make appropriate decisions because they are not being given appropriate or accurate information.

And then, one final one on education that I just felt compelled to bring to the House this evening is the annual growth in education, Federal moneys for education over the last 5 years. Total education, remember, Mr. Speaker, what the mantra is out there is that there are being cuts and slashes in education programs all across this Nation. In fact, what has happened over the last 5 years, from 2000 to 2005, total education spending up an average of 9.1 percent. What we have done is required greater accountability. What we have done is said, if you are going to get Federal money, then you need to do a particular job and you need to make certain that you are doing it, and we need to make certain that you are doing that as well and having student accomplishment, that is what we have required. And so I think it is imperative that as we talk about issue after issue after issue here in Washington, and that when the American people listen and they pay attention to what we are doing, that they appreciate and understand and recognize that truth is important to the discussion, and that if we don't start with truth, we can't reach the right conclusion at all.

We hear a lot of talk about what the quote cuts and slashes are going to do to our society. This is a difficult graph to tell the difference because this shows what the projected spending is over the next 5 years in the mandatory or automatic programs that we have which are Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, three programs that the other side likes to talk about a lot because they talk about how the cuts in spending will wreak havoc in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that folks look at this all across this House chamber and appreciate that the difference between the baseline, which is the green line, and the administration proposal, which is full of all these remarkable changes that the other side alleges, is a difference in a 5.3 percent growth that is projected, which is part of the plan that has been adopted or recognized over the past number of years, but when economic situations change, and when it is important to get a handle on the amount of Federal spending and be fiscally responsible, the change that has been recommended

by the President is a 5.1 percent a year growth over the next 5 years. That is right, Mr. Speaker. You heard correctly. All of the demagoguery about these programs, all of the negative comments about these programs, all of the personal attacks about these programs that do a disservice to our entire Nation and are simply untrue are all about the difference between the green line and the red line, a difference between 5.3 percent growth annually over the next 5 years and 5.1 percent growth over the next 5 years. So I would suggest to our friends on the other side of the aisle that it would be much more helpful to be positive, to be open to collegial activity, to bring solutions to the table, to talk about how we can best help individuals to help themselves all across our society, and not be so negative and demagogue every single issue that makes it so it is incredibly difficult to tell exactly what the truth is and where we are going.

You oftentimes hear them talk about the tax cuts for the wealthy and how that will decrease the amount of money coming into the Federal Government and how it will make it so that we can't fund the kinds of programs that we need. Well, President Kennedy knew something very, very brilliant and President Reagan knew the same thing and President Bush learned well, and that is that tax cuts don't decrease revenue to the Federal Government. They increase revenue to the Federal Government. And I know that sounds kind of contradictory, or that it is kind of counterintuitive. But in fact, that is what happens, and this chart shows that extremely well. In 2000, this is the level of revenue coming into the Federal Government under previous administration policies. And what happened, and you see that the line is decreasing because of the recession that we are in, the dotcom bubble burst and 9/11 occurred. And by 2003, we were on a pretty steady slope down.

Now, what happened in 2003 with the vertical green dotted line there, what happened is that the tax decreases. The appropriate fair tax decreases of this administration and of the Republican Congress went into effect. And then what you see happen is the tax receipts to the Federal Government increase significantly. In fact, they increase so much that in 2005 they were significantly greater than in 2000. Tax revenue increasing because of tax cuts. And why is that? Well, it is because people have more of their own money

in their pocket. And what do they do with that money? They save it so that it can be invested, or they spend it so that this increases the economy and the economy booms. And that is what has happened. So when you decrease taxes, appropriately, fairly, judiciously, the truth is that what the Federal Government receives is an increase in tax revenue. So when you hear these folks talk about their plan, their plan to save this or their plan to save that, and most often you won't have them tell you exactly what they are going to do. One of them slipped out yesterday. I was listening to him on the floor. And he said, quote, we will have to, quote, raise revenue somewhere else, unquote. Raise revenue somewhere else. Now, what does that mean? What does raising revenue somewhere else mean to folks on the other side? Well, you know what it means, Mr. Speaker. It means raising taxes. It means raising taxes. We have a wonderful opportunity in this Congress to make certain that the tax decreases, the fair tax decreases of this administration and the United States House of Representatives and Senate, that they adopted ought to be made permanent, especially the death tax, the inheritance tax which is so destructive to small businesses and to families all across this Nation. They ought to be made permanent.

And one final poster on revenue and on tax growth, because it projects out to 2011. And that is that as long as the tax decreases, the fair tax decreases are continued, what happens over the next 5 years is that the Federal revenue stream continues to increase. Now, again, I know that seems counterintuitive. That seems like it doesn't make sense. If you decrease fairly the tax liability of individuals all across this Nation, you might think, well, then the revenue coming into the Federal Government is not going to be as much. But in fact what happens is that the revenue to the Federal Government increases significantly. And it increases because when you put more money in the back pockets of men and women across this Nation, what happens is that they save it and they invest it and they spend it when they want to, and what that means is that you get significant economic growth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone a little longer than I had anticipated on the

issue of the economy, but I think it is incredibly important because, as a Member of the Official Truth Squad, what we are interested in doing is bringing truth to issues, all issues, economic issues and an issue of national security that we are going to talk about tonight because when you think about it, the issue of truth and national security, probably nothing could be more important in terms of talking about truth when you are talking about national security.

□ 2200

I mentioned that I am a physician, and if I am taking care of a patient, if I do not have truthful information from that patient, I cannot reach the right diagnosis. I cannot make the right diagnosis. And if I cannot make the right diagnosis, then I cannot treat the right disease. And if I cannot treat the right disease, then the patient does not get well.

And the same is true for our national policy. If we are not talking truthfully about the issue, if we are not openly and honestly discussing the issue, then we cannot make the right diagnosis. We cannot figure out what the right problem is. And if we cannot figure out what the right problem is, then we cannot propose the right solution. And if we cannot propose the right solution, then never on the face of the Earth in this body will the right solution come about. It just does not happen by happenstance. So truth is so incredibly important when you talk about national security because the consequences of not talking about the truth in the area of national security are probably greater than anything else. Our obligation as Members of Congress and Federal representatives is to make certain that we protect our citizens, that we protect our Nation.

And so we would like to talk a little bit this evening, as the Official Truth Squad, about national security. One of those areas of national security is border security. It has gotten a lot of attention the past couple of weeks and certainly coming to a head this week as the Senate addresses the issue of illegal immigration. But I am one of those who join my colleagues in believing that if our border is not secure, then our Nation is not secure. And so I am pleased to be joined tonight by a number of colleagues.

First, I would like to welcome and introduce Congresswoman THELMA DRAKE from the great State of Virginia. Congresswoman DRAKE is a member of the Official Truth Squad and a member of the freshman class and just a great individual who recognizes and appreciates the importance of national security, who has done yeoman's work in the area of assisting our armed services, Armed Forces, and is going to talk a little bit tonight about border security.

So, Congresswoman DRAKE, I thank you so much for coming and look forward to your comments.

Mrs. DRAKE. I would certainly like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to join you this evening to talk about something that is so critical to our Nation.

And before I go into the issue of border security, I just want to comment a moment on what you started out with, and that is Medicare part D. First of all, you and I are freshmen; so we were not in Congress in 2003 when the very largest change to Medicare took place, but I know that both of us have been committed to making sure that citizens in our district understand what this new benefit is for them. And I think it is important just to tell America where we are today, that there are 42 million Americans who qualify for Medicare.

Remember, anyone who is eligible for Medicare and is receiving Medicare is eligible for this new benefit. As of today, 28 million of those have signed up for coverage. The expected figure by May 15 is 30 million people, and there are 6 million people that have been identified that will not need to sign up because they are military retirees, Federal retirees, State retirees, or have other programs. That is going to leave us on May 15 with 6 million Americans that we have not reached. So I think it is important to talk about it so that our seniors understand what a wonderful benefit this is.

What I have learned in my district is when I talk about Medicare part D as being a private sector insurance product with a reduced premium, then all the rest of it makes sense, that they have choices. It is a voluntary program and gives them, as you have already said, the ability to have prescription drug coverage, which many of them have not had in the past.

So I want to thank you for talking about Medicare part D, and I know the work that you have done in your district as well to make sure that our seniors know and they make the best decisions for them.

But what I wanted to talk about tonight is the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act. That is the name of the bill that we passed in December of 2005 in this House.

Unfortunately, at that time there was not any press coverage about that bill. We really were not hearing about it until the Senate took the bill up about a week or so ago.

I know that you and I share the same belief, that the very first step in any debate about immigration reform is the very first debate which has to be secure our borders. We believe that our country must be open for trade, tourism, and legal immigration and closed to terrorists, drug dealers, and criminals. But the bill that passed in December, and I think it is important for America to know, a lot of the components that were in that bill, things such as an employment verification system where employers would be required to check Social Security num-

bers with Social Security and Department of Homeland Security, today that exists, but it is simply a voluntary program, and we all know the stories about fraudulent documents that are out there.

Increased penalties for alien smuggling, mandatory minimum sentences and increased penalties. A crackdown on alien, either legal or illegal, gang members. They would now be inadmissible and deportable, and our Attorney General can designate certain groups as gang members. It also bans benefits for alien gang members, stiffer penalties for aliens who enter after being removed. It bars aliens with aggravated felony convictions from receiving green cards.

There is now cooperation and reimbursement between our border sheriffs and our Federal law enforcement to reimburse them for the work that they are doing for us. Increased authority for the Department of Homeland Security to detain dangerous aliens. Our courts have prohibited this in the past, and the result is that dangerous aliens have been released. It also provides for the removal of these aliens. It bars terrorist aliens from naturalization. There is increased security for our borders with both military support and Department of Defense surveillance. It requires a comprehensive risk assessment of our ports and land and maritime borders and radiation detection devices. Increased inspectors, 1,000 over a 4-year period, and an additional 1,500 K-9 units over the next 5 years.

Physical barriers, state-of-the-art surveillance technology, including cameras, radar, satellites, and unmanned aerial vehicles. It eliminates the release, which is our current catch-and-release program, and requires that they must remain in custody, an illegal alien, until removed. Better communication and sharing of information with our law enforcement community and promotes international policies with Canada and Mexico and requires reports back to Congress.

So I think these are commonsense solutions that America expects Congress to put into place. But as you have mentioned our work is continuing, that the Senate is now having a very, very active debate. That debate will continue in the House. And I think that we all agree that we must revamp this process but starting with the very first component, which is securing our borders. But we also need to end the lottery that exists, get rid of senseless rules and endless litigation, and we must have a policy in our Nation of catch and return and not our current catch and release. And the goal, of course, would be to stop illegal crossings in the first place. And I think the American people deserve that. They deserve to know that that is what is taking place.

But as we continue with these discussions, one of the discussions that will take place, of course, is what about workforce, what about guest workers?

How should that be crafted and what should that look like so we know who are the people who are here? Why are they here? What are they doing here? What is the purpose that they are here? But as a component of that, I also think it is critical that we deal with the issue of health care and that employers who want these workers in our Nation, and we know there is a tremendous need for them, would have to address that issue of health care right up front and not put that burden on the American people as it has done in the past.

So I thank you for the opportunity just to come and tell America what the House of Representatives did do and that as we continue the debate that they will understand that the first goal is secure our borders. We know this is a national security issue. We know the goal of our enemy is to destroy our Nation, to attack us at any possible turn.

I am grateful to our very brave military men and women who we know are taking out their leaders right now, shutting down their money, and keeping them busy over in Iraq and that they have not had the ability to attack our Nation again. And I think that we expect in Congress and the American people expect that we not allow these people to enter because of poor policies that we have in place; that our doors be open for tourism, for travel, for legal immigration, and closed to those who would do us harm.

And I thank you for arranging this meeting tonight and allowing me to join you in it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you, Congresswoman DRAKE, very much. You have just really clarified and crystalized the components of our immigration bill that we passed last December.

And I know that some of us have shared our frustration with the folks at home because there was really little attention paid to what the House did, very responsibly what the House did last December. Recognizing the incredible challenges that we have with immigration reform, working extremely hard to come up with a bill that addressed border security and interior enforcement. I guess if we were to be faulted for anything is that we did it during the Christmas holiday and it kind of got drowned out. But it is an important bill. It is an important bill. And I thank you for talking about the points in it that I think are vital and imperative as we move forward.

As we talk about the issue of border security and national security, the two are really closely linked, very closely linked, and it is a real challenge for America to move forward with immigration reform and border security. And one of the reasons that I believe it is such a challenge is that we essentially have had in our Nation over the last really 20 or 30 years a policy as it relates to illegal immigration of benign neglect. That is what our policy has been, and I am disappointed that

that is the case. But as somebody once said, you play with the cards that you are dealt. And, in fact, the cards that we are dealt right now are a system that has been really neglected for a long, long period of time. So I am so pleased with the work that the House has done and will continue to do in trying to fashion the most responsible border security and immigration reform policy that we can.

Again, I think it is important that you make certain that we talk about truth. What is the truth? Where are we now that has put us in this challenging situation and in literally this crisis? And the issue is that we have between 12 and 20 million people here who are here illegally. And Congresswoman BLACKBURN has so often mentioned that she believes that it is not appropriate to call it illegal immigration, that it is illegal entry. She uses the wonderful analogy of if somebody were to enter your home illegally, you would not open your arms to welcome them. What you would do is take care of it. You would call on the authorities and ask them for help. And what has happened over the last 20 or 30 years is that when the States and localities have called on the authorities, the Federal Government, to come help, they have been left wanting. And that really is a shame. That is the benign neglect that I talk about. But comprehensive immigration reform has to, it must, begin with securing our borders. If you do anything else without securing the borders, it does not make any difference.

□ 2215

The porosity of our borders makes it so that is imperative, and the national security, as I mentioned, depends on border security. We need to know who is coming into the country. We need to know where they are from, and we need to know what they are doing here.

No immigration, no reform of the immigration system will be successful unless Congress makes the definitive commitment, has the willpower to make the commitment to ensure that the agencies that are responsible for stopping illegal immigrants have the resources that they need to get the job done. That just makes sense.

Without properly securing our borders, we remain vulnerable. I don't think anybody would deny that we remain vulnerable to those who may want to enter our country undetected and do us harm. We must ensure that our Border Patrol agents have the resources and the manpower and the technology to do their jobs.

I understand, and all of us understand, that America is a nation of immigrants. We are all here by virtue of somebody coming here from somewhere else at some point that allowed us the wonder and the glory and the good fortune and the blessing of being born or allowed to be a citizen of the United States of America.

We are also a nation of laws. We are a nation of laws, and I think it is ex-

tremely important that we appreciate that indeed America has been built on the hard work and the innovation of immigrants, without a doubt, and our country thrives on new ideas, and fresh energy that so many of our legal immigrant groups continue to bring. It is part of what makes our country great without a doubt.

We will remain a nation of immigrants, regardless of what we do in this legislation, because the number of legal immigrants that we welcome to our shores every year is significant. We invited over 1 million new permanent immigrants last year, much more than any other nation on the face of the earth. We accept over 6 million applications, 6 million applications, Mr. Speaker, for immigration and immigration benefits each year.

But America, again, has been founded on the principle and the respect for the rule of law. Those who enter our country illegally disrespect those laws, and they take advantage of a very generous immigration system and a very generous society.

We have got to find a comprehensive solution, a comprehensive solution that acknowledges the important contributions of legal immigrants and what they do to make our country great without rewarding illegal behavior. It is imperative that we remove that magnet of illegal employment and enable employers to be able to determine whether their workers are legal or illegal.

I think it is important when we talk about the employer verification aspect of the bill that we passed, and of any reform mechanism, that we make certain that we communicate to our employer community that we are not asking them to be policemen; and that the Federal Government's responsibility is to make certain that they are able to access real information in real time to be able to determine whether an employee that is coming to their place of work and asking to be hired, whether or not that individual is here legally. They need to be able to determine that then and now so that they can go ahead with the plan to either hire them or not based upon their qualifications, and not have to delay things because the Federal Government doesn't have accurate information.

I am pleased with the work that the House has done. This is a work in progress. The Senate is acting and will act, and then we will move forward with a conference committee, a group of the House and Members of the House and Members of the Senate to come up with a final product that hopefully we all can stand and be proud of and that will address a true crisis and a true challenge that we have in this Nation and end this policy of benign neglect that we have had for so many years.

Again, the issue we are talking about this evening on the Official Truth Squad is national security. I am pleased to be joined again tonight by Congresswoman VIRGINIA FOXX. Congresswoman FOXX is from the grand

State of North Carolina, a dear friend and fellow member of the freshman class who is committed, committed, to making certain that truthful comments are made from the well, and that those things that are made, those comments that are made in the House that are not truthful are corrected.

I am pleased to have Congresswoman FOXX join me this evening to discuss the issue of national security. I welcome you, and I look forward to your comments this evening.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you so much, Congressman PRICE. It is very good to be on the Official Truth Squad with you and to bring facts out that need to be brought out. I heard your comments about illegal immigration, and I share those concerns with you. As we talked about homeland security, national security begins with border security. That is very important.

I think what we have to make sure that people understand all the time, the Federal Government was formed to provide for the defense of this Nation. It began by the States joining together to get our freedom from England, but we stay together for the defense of this Nation. Local government, State governments, cannot provide for the defense of this Nation.

We are the most free country in the world. We are, in my opinion, the greatest country in the world. We are not perfect. None of us who serve in Congress, none of us in the executive branch, are perfect people.

But the Republican party is focused on the issue of national security. We, as Republicans, understand that if we don't maintain our freedom, then nothing else matters. The way we maintain our freedom is to make sure that we have strong borders and that we protect against attacks like the ones that hit us on September 11, 2001. We are focused on that, and I think that the administration has done a great job of keeping us from being attacked again.

What are the Democrats doing in that respect? Today, they managed to release their so-called "national security agenda." We have been waiting for this plan that they say they are going to roll out where they say they can do things better.

One of the things their agenda calls for is improving border security. Now it is really curious that is what they say. They think they can tell the American people something that the American people will believe, and that we will ignore what they have done. Let me talk about what Republicans have done and what the Democrat reaction has been to that.

Last year, House Republicans passed the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act, as well as the REAL ID Act. How do these bills protect our border?

The Border Security Act increases penalties for illegal immigration and holds violators accountable to restore the integrity of our Nation's borders, reestablish respect for our laws, and

help ensure that terrorists cannot enter the United States.

The REAL ID Act federally standardizes the requirements for applying and issuing State identification cards, because the 19 hijackers responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks carried between them 13 valid driver's licenses and 21 State-issued ID cards.

How do the Democrats vote on these issues? They are telling you now that they want to protect the border, and that is a part of their national security agenda. Well, 164 of the Democrats opposed the Border Security Act, and 152 opposed the REAL ID Act. So the Democrats now want to improve border security?

Here is a tip for them, Mr. Speaker. They need to start voting for legislation that does exactly that. They need to quit talking and start doing.

Today, when I was listening to them doing 1 minutes, something occurred to me, the motto of the State of North Carolina is *Esse Quam Videri*, To Be Rather Than to Seem. I kept thinking that the Democrats never want to admit what they are, but rather they want people to think that they are something else. I think that they are the antithesis of the motto for North Carolina, To Be Rather Than to Seem, because they just want to seem to be something that they are not at all.

Earlier tonight, I heard somebody say, the Democrats will never agree to what their real agenda is, because it is so much opposed to the values of average Americans that if they admit to their real agenda, admit to their real values, they can't ever get elected again.

I think that it is very important that we continue to talk about border security and other things as it relates to national security.

The Democrats also voted against the creation of the Department of Homeland Security. The Department of Homeland Security helps prevent domestic terrorist attacks and assists the recovery and response efforts in the event of a terrorist attack. It passed the House 261-161. One hundred twenty Democrats opposed.

Last night we mentioned the PATRIOT Act conference report that strengthens our national security by giving law enforcement the tools they need to wage the war on terror and includes new oversight measures so that security and liberty remain balanced. It passed the House 251-174 with 157 Democrats opposing. The Democratic leader in the Senate bragged that they had killed the PATRIOT Act, and then when the PATRIOT Act came back, they short of sheepishly voted for it, wanting everybody to think that it was all okay and to forget about their bragging that they had killed the PATRIOT Act.

What about intelligence votes that weakened our national security before September 11? We might not have had September 11 if we had had an even stronger national security and if the

Democrats had gotten on board with making sure that we could do all that we needed to do. In 1998, Representative PELOSI was one of only 31 Representatives who voted against authorizing appropriations for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government for the CIA and related agencies. Several bills are outlined there.

In 1996, she and 153 House Democrats voted to reduce the total amount authorized by the fiscal year 1997 intelligence authorization by 4.9 percent. Even when PELOSI and the Democrats were in charge of the House of Representatives, they voted to cut intelligence authorization by \$500 million.

We are going to present every chance we get the facts about what the Democrats have done. We are going to present the facts through the Official Truth Squad. We are not going to let them get by with seeming rather than being. And I think that that is very, very important.

I want to quote our Majority Leader BOEHNER today in a statement that he made:

"While Democrats have openly advocated cutting and running from our efforts to support democracy in Iraq, Republicans continue to build upon our strong record on national security by funding our troops fighting terror around the world and supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

"While Democrats seem more interested in protecting the rights of terrorists than the American people, Republicans passed the PATRIOT Act to give law enforcement the tools necessary to combat terrorism, protect our citizens and secure our communities.

"While Democrats focus more on protecting the rights of illegal immigrants than enforcing our immigration laws, Republicans have voted to secure our borders, give law enforcement new tools to enforce our immigration laws and help prevent terrorist and criminal aliens from moving freely throughout our society. When it comes to national security, their answer is the same as it is for everything else, 'no.' A media stunt will not eclipse their record of obfuscation and neglect on national and border security."

Those are the comments from Majority Leader BOEHNER today. I endorse what he has said. I think he has hit the nail right on the head. Someone else said that the Democrats say, "Do as we say, not as we do, on national security." That is another, I think, thing that we need to point out to the American people every chance that we get.

Again, we have to protect the freedom of this country. That is what allows us to do all the other great things that we do. Without national security, without freedom, we can't do any of the other good things. We are trying to bring freedom to other countries just as we have it here. It may take a little bit longer than it did in this country because of the very different cultural

basis that we came from, but it is going to happen. We are going to help export freedom all over this world and that is going to help keep Americans free because that is what we have to do.

□ 2230

Representative PRICE, again, I want to thank you for the work that you are doing on helping us get out the facts and making sure that the Truth Squad presents the truth every night, and I would like to now turn my time back over to you.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you so much, Representative FOXX. You are always so cogent and accurate in what you say. And you do the Official Truth Squad proud by bringing forward the information that is so important for citizens all across this country in order for them to be able to make appropriate decisions and realize what kind of work is being done here in Washington, positive work, positive work on behalf of the American people.

That is what the Official Truth Squad is all about. It is all about making certain that the accurate information, honest information for the entire Nation is being presented at some point on the floor of the House because oftentimes what we hear is not that kind of information. So I cannot thank you enough for coming and joining me this evening really, again, in a discussion about national security that is so extremely important; and it is important because nothing is more basic to our ability as a Nation and each of our ability as individuals to realize our own dream.

If we are not secure, if we cannot maintain our liberty and our freedom, then nothing else matters. Then what kind of job you have, where you work, what you want to do with your family, where you want to live, all those kind of wonderful things that all of us as Americans think about, dream about and work so hard for won't make any difference if we do not have the kind of security that we need.

I appreciate also you taking it in a little bit of a different direction because I think it is important that we talk about what the other side has proposed because it is important that they have stated they have given the talk, it is important to look at how they are walking and how they have walked. I also think it is important to shed light on the truth of where we stand as a Nation in this world and how grave and significant the enemy is because some people will tell you, well, there really is not an enemy out there. That if we just gather round and kind of huddle down that there will not be any problem with anybody else on the face of the Earth, that the people will just leave us alone.

Well, in fact, I think that if we truly and honestly look at the situation and if we reflect over the last 25 or so years we will appreciate that we have been in this war on terror for a much longer

period of time than any of us might have admitted just a few short years ago. And in order to bring light to that, in order to provide some truth to that, I thought I would repeat something that I mentioned last evening. It is a very sobering list. It is a list of events that I think are extremely important to reflect upon because I think they put in perspective how we as a Nation are being challenged and that allows us to respond in a much more appropriate way.

So as a matter of truth I proposed, Mr. Speaker, to just kind of outline and list a number of events that have occurred over the last 25 years beginning as many of us will remember in November of 1979 when the embassy, our embassy in Tehran was seized and there began that 444-day long hostage crisis that I think was kind of the beginning of this litany of events that occurred.

In April 1983 there was the bombing of our embassy in Beirut, 63 Americans killed. In October of 1983, the bombing of our U.S. Marine Corps Headquarters in Beirut, 241 killed. In December 1983, a truck loaded with explosives driven into our embassy in Kuwait. In September 1984 another violation of our embassy in Beirut. In August 1985 the bombing of the United States Air Force Base in Rhein-Main, 22 killed. In October 1985, the *Achille Lauro* was hijacked and an American invalid in a wheelchair was killed. April 1986, Madrid bombing of a restaurant frequented by U.S. soldiers. April 1988, TWA flight 840 was bombed killing four. Again, in 1988 Pan Am flight 103 bombed over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 259.

January 1993, two CIA agents shot and killed as they entered CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia. February 1993, the first World Trade Center bombing killing six and injuring over a thousand. November 1995, car bomb explodes at a U.S. military complex in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia killing seven servicemen and women. June 1996, a truck bomb in Dhahran destroys the Khobar Towers, a United States Air Force barracks, killing 19 and injuring over 500. And then two coordinated attacks on U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania killing 224. October 2000 the USS Cole was attacked in Yemen. And then on September 11, 2001 the second World Trade Center attack killing 3,000 of our fellow citizens, innocent all.

I think it is important to talk about that because that is the truth. That is the truth of where we sit as a Nation right now. And some will say, well, that was the end of it September 11, 2001. Well, the truth is that that was not the end and is not the end. And I cannot think of anything better to crystallize that and to explain that and to bring it to light than to quote an avowed enemy of the United States, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who said in January 2005, "We have declared a fierce war on this evil principal of democracy and those who follow this wrong ideology."

That is not anything we made up, Mr. Speaker. That is our enemy. That is an individual who designs day in and day out to do us harm, to hurt America and to hurt Americans. And so when we talk about things as grave and as important as that, I think it is incredibly important that we talk about what the plan is for each party, who is in charge, who is making the policy and what is the plan.

So as our friends on the other side on the aisle today unfolded their national security policy that they would propose, and it is an appropriate policy, the problem is that it reminds me of that wonderful country and western song that is out there right now, what we need is "A little less talk and a lot more action." And the talk that they have brought to the table is mostly appropriate; but the action that we have seen from our friends on the other side of the aisle just does not ring true. It does not ring true.

They call for eliminating terrorist breeding grounds, but in fact what they ignore is that Iraq is the central front in the war or terror and a breeding ground for terrorists. What do they say? Their security agenda supports our troops in Afghanistan. What do they do? When given the opportunity a majority of House Democrats voted against funding the troops in combat in Iraq and in Afghanistan. Their security agenda says they will stop the spread of terrorists. But what do they do? They oppose the terrorists surveillance program.

Another thing that they talk about is proposing an anti-terrorism plan that increases human intelligence capability, eliminates terrorist breeding grounds, secures loose nuclear materials and stops nuclear weapons development in Iran and North Korea. What do they do when given the opportunity? They voted repeatedly to slash funding for intelligence activities and they vote no on expressing support for those who work in the intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, this is the truth. This is the truth. This is what happened. When given the opportunity to say we as a sense of Congress support the men and women who are risking their lives and working in the intelligence community to make sure that you and I are safe what do they do? They vote no. If anybody is interested in looking it up it is Roll Call number 293. The vote was on June 23, 2004.

That is what the Official Truth Squad is about to call people to task, to say this is what the truth is. You can say anything you like on the floor of the House of Representatives. We have certainly recognized that. But it is important that you are held to account that you are held responsible for your actions. You what do they say? They say it calls for a stronger homeland security by implementing all recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. What do they do? They vote against the REAL ID Act which makes it difficult for terrorists to travel freely

throughout the United States, and they vote no on additional funds to respond to the attacks of September 11 and to bolster the homeland security efforts. Roll Call vote number 31 in February of last year. Roll Call vote number 206 in May of 2002.

Mr. Speaker, that is the truth. That is the truth. So you can talk the talk but you have got to be able to walk the walk. You can say one thing but you have got to be able to do it. And I think it is important for the House of Representatives to understand and appreciate and for the American people to understand and appreciate that there is a track record. There is a track record of a group of individuals who are in the leadership and forming the policy in the United States House of Representatives now that supports our intelligence community. It is vital work, incredibly important work.

Then there is a group of individuals who say that they support the intelligence community but when given the opportunity to provide the resources for them to work and when given the opportunity just to say we thank you and support what you are doing as a matter of principle they could not even do that.

What do they say? Again, they say they will support the recommendations and work for implementing the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, a bipartisan commission. What do they do when they get the opportunity? They vote no on establishing the Department of Homeland Security. Roll Call number 367, July, 2002. They vote no on \$21 billion in funding for strengthening the border protections. Roll Call number 373, July 2004.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an incredible privilege and an honor to serve in the United States House of Representatives. I am humbled every time I walk in this building. I get goose bumps looking up at the dome.

The men and women who have preceded us in this chamber and in this body have been many incredible men and women who have donated the better part of their lives toward making certain that we as a society and we as a Nation will survive. They did so by talking about real things, by talking about honest things, by talking about truthful things, by working together with other individuals all across this body. And I challenge Members on both sides on the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, to work together, to come together as a body and work for our national security and work positively.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (AT THE REQUEST OF Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 12:30 p.m. on account of a family commitment.

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCHENRY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, March 30.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, March 30.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2116. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain real property to the Supreme Court.

S. 2120. An act to ensure regulatory equity between and among all dairy farmers and handlers for sales of packaged fluid milk in federally regulated milk marketing areas and into certain non-federally regulated milk marketing areas from federally regulated areas, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 30, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6768. A letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Definition of "Client" of a Commodity Trading Advisor (RIN: 3038-AC20) received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6769. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Ag-

riculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Emerald Ash Borer; Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 05-067-2] received March 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6770. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV06-932-IFR] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6771. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Update and Clarify a Shell Egg Grading Definition [Docket No. PY-05-003] (RIN: 0581-AC47) received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6772. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to the Potato Research and Promotion Plan [Doc. No. FV-05-702-IFR] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6773. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Avocados Grown in South Florida; Florida Avocado Maturity Requirements; Correction [Docket No. FV06-915-1 C] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6774. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—International Banking Operations [Regulation K; Docket No. R-1147] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6775. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Market Risk Measure; Securities Borrowing Transactions (RIN: 3064-AC46) received March 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6776. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Certification of Assumption of Deposits and Notification of Changes of Insured Status (RIN: 3064-AC93) received March 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6777. A letter from the Acting Director, OSHA Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Occupational Exposure to Hexavalent Chromium [Docket No. H054A] (RIN: 1218-AB45) received March 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6778. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits—received March 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6779. A letter from the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protections for Subjects in Human Research [EPA-HQ-OPP-2003-0132; FRL-7759-8] (RIN: 2070-AD57) received March 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.