

tomorrow or the next day, and they had some fairly dramatic recommendations to reform the U.N., and I think that is really the way to go.

Thirdly, while it is true the U.N. has failed in Srebrenica, they failed in Sarajevo, they failed in Rwanda, and they are failing in Darfur, the recommendations of the Gingrich-Mitchell can make a large difference.

Lastly, the peacekeepers that we have in some places, for instance, the peacekeepers in Sudan, keep American men and women, military, from being on the ground. So I would urge Members, where we are going to accept the amendment, to look at the Gingrich-Mitchell recommendations which will be coming out this week which will be dramatically reforming the U.N. on a bipartisan basis.

So having said that, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have amendment at the desk, and I will offer it and withdraw it.

My amendment designates \$1.2 million out of the overall census budget for research on migration to improve demographic analysis and population estimates.

When the 2000 census count was announced, there was a great deal of confusion at Census Bureau. Demographic analysis, which has been the gold standard for measuring error in the census, and which had showed a substantial net undercount in the census for 50 years, showed an overcount. The population estimates, which had been used to distribute funds throughout the decade, missed almost 8 million people. There was a simple explanation for this. The Census Bureau assumptions on net migration into the country were wrong. The Census Bureau is now asking Congress for additional funds to do the research necessary to correct these estimates.

Measuring error in the census and providing population estimates for the distribution of funds are part of the core mission of the Bureau. Improvements in those activities should be funded before anything else. I am disappointed that this research has not been funded. I will, however, withdraw this amendment, and I hope that the chairman and ranking member will work to see that the necessary research gets done before the 2010 census.

The Census Bureau has at times wasted money on gadgets and promotional items instead of basic research. We need to direct their efforts back to basic research, such as the demographic analysis.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which would increase the

funding for investigation and prosecution of consumer identity fraud.

Approximately 10 million people a year are being victimized by identity theft. Last year's business and financial institutions lost about \$52 billion, and consumers lost about \$5 billion due to identity theft.

Too little is being done to effectively address consumer identity theft and credit card fraud. Presently what happens is the credit card companies just simply wipe out the debt, but the fees are not never appropriately pursued. The problem is that the laws we have on the books are not being adequately enforced due to insufficient investigative and prosecutorial resources. While the Department of Justice devotes some resources towards identity theft, it is not a high priority due to inadequate resources, and so the thieves practice their wares with impunity.

Mr. Chairman, last year we passed legislation which authorized money for consumer identity theft enforcement. We have not properly funded that, and this amendment would go a long way into properly funding it. I understand, however, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) has expressed some concerns about the offsets and the funding level in the bill already, and I would ask the chairman if he would work with us to make sure that the funding of identity theft is properly done under the bill between now, over in the Senate, and in conference.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, he has my commitment to that. This is a very important issue, and we can work together.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his commitment.

And with that, I will not offer the amendment, but will be working to make sure that consumer identity theft investigation and prosecution is properly funded under the bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1730

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2862 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 314, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

amendments printed in the RECORD and numbered 1, 4, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19 and 21;

amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 2, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. WOLF, regarding funding levels;

an amendment by Mr. HINCHEY, regarding implementation of laws on medical marijuana, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. MARKEY, regarding limitation on funds for torture, which will be debatable for 15 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. NADLER, regarding health insurance records under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SANDERS, regarding FISA applications under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF, regarding protection of the Federal judiciary;

an amendment by Mr. CARDIN, regarding WTO action against China for currency manipulation;

an amendment by Mr. MICA, regarding U.S. and Commercial Service Funding;

an amendment by Mr. SHIMKUS or Ms. ESHOO, regarding NTIA funding;

an amendment by Mr. INSLEE, regarding NOAA Coastal Zone Management Program;

an amendment by Mr. FOSSELLA or Mr. KING of New York, regarding U.S. fugitives residing in Cuba;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, regarding educational cultural exchanges;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, regarding goods to Cuba, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, regarding data on racial distribution of convictions;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, regarding affirmances by immigration judges;

an amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia, regarding export licenses for firearms;

an amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE, regarding NASA Hollywood liaison;

an amendment by Mr. OTTER, regarding delaying notice on search warrants; an amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa, regarding implementation of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996;

an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF, regarding DNA collection from convicted felons;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding safety requirements for the Space Shuttle and the International Space Station;

an amendment by Mrs. JONES of Ohio, regarding EEOC;

an amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, regarding SBA funding;

an amendment by Mr. WEINER, regarding State and local law enforcement funding;

an amendment by Mr. HAYWORTH, regarding U.N. funding;

an amendment by Mr. MCDERMOTT, regarding travel to Cuba;

an amendment by Mr. REYES, regarding torture of human rights activists.

Each amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee or the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD or a designee; shall be considered as read; shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to the demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but under my reservation I want to simply take note of the fact that as I see the situation, counting the votes we have had today, if every amendment is offered tomorrow, there would have been 22 amendments offered and voted upon that originated from the minority side and 21 that originated from the majority side.

If you count the debate time just for the amendments that are going to be offered tomorrow, it appears that you have at least 7½ hours of debate time; and if you account for slippage and the time consumed in voting, I assume that that means it will take at least 10 hours to finish the bill. I think that makes it very difficult to finish tomorrow, if the schedule holds for tomorrow.

So I would simply note that to me that indicates that there is apparently

as much discontent on the majority side with the consequences of the budget resolution on programs in this bill, including especially the squeeze on local law enforcement assistance, there is as much discontent on that side of the aisle as there is on this side of the aisle.

I would note that the membership on both sides of the aisle has been extremely cooperative in reaching time agreements, and yet we have a bill that could very possibly take fully 2 days and perhaps even a portion of the third day to finish. I think that ought to send a message with respect to the inadequacy of funding on the part of a number of these programs because of the budget resolution priorities.

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

Mr. OBEY. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I was told the leadership does plan on finishing the bill tomorrow. But the gentleman's points are well taken.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would point out if that is the case, we are probably going to be here until 8 or 9 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to associate myself with the ranking member's comments and express appreciation for the majority side in working hard on this. The number of amendments we have agreed to reflects the interest in the bill. It is an important bill, and we are certainly going to thoroughly consider it. I just want to express my appreciation for working out this unanimous consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2863, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-127) on the resolution (H. Res. 315) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2863) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ADMINISTRATION MUST LEVEL WITH AMERICAN PEOPLE ABOUT WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, either the Bush administration refuses to see the reality on the ground in Iraq or they are deceiving the American people as to the continued war in Iraq. During a Memorial Day interview on CNN's Larry King, Vice President CHENEY said he believed the insurgency was in its "last throes."

Where exactly is the Vice President getting his information? It certainly is not coming from the generals on the ground. According to a report from Knight-Ridder, a growing number of senior American military officers in Iraq have concluded there is no longer a military solution to the insurgency in Iraq, an insurgency that military leaders on the ground say is not running out of recruits. In the news report, Lt. Colonel Frederick Wellman said, "We can't kill them all. When I kill one I create three."

That certainly does not sound like we have the insurgency under control, and, as the Vice President suggests, that they are in their "last throes."

Things are really getting so bad in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, that we are beginning finally to hear Republican Congressmen step forward and question some of the outrageous claims made by the Bush administration in regard to their policy in Iraq. This past weekend, my Republican friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), came forward and said that the Bush administration needs to have a deadline for its war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and I have been next-door neighbors in the Cannon House Office Building for years. As visitors to our wing of the fourth floor walk down the hallway, they see the faces of the fallen. Since the beginning of the war, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) has been hanging up the pictures of the brave American soldiers who have died in Iraq. It started right outside his door and spread so quickly that the faces are outside each of the Members' doors of our wing of the Cannon Building.

Another one of our Republican colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), criticized the