



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2007

No. 21

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMPSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.
February 5, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable NICK LAMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Grateful for both the Republican and Democratic congressional retreats which took place these past 2 weeks, Lord God, we pray that the collaboration experienced and the insights gained may not dissipate with time, but permeate all the work of the 110th Congress.

A clearer understanding of the two separate branches of government was achieved, and the importance of bipartisan cooperation to solve large problems was realized in the honored presence and honest dialogue with President George Bush at both retreats. For these deeper perceptions which benefit all Americans, we praise You and bless You, Almighty God.

Time for prayer and reflection revealed a solid relationship with You, Lord God, while both retreats manifested everyone's gratitude and commitment to our Armed Forces and veterans. Precious time with spouses and children renewed the love and appreciation of family members who make daily sacrifices so that Members may serve the Nation and the common interest of others.

May all those who serve and sacrifice their time and talent for the common good of this Nation be rewarded by You both now and forever.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOGGETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 434. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through December 31, 2007, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed without amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be in-

ducted into the National Academy of Sciences.

The message also announced pursuant to section 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group during the 110th Congress:

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

THE PRESERVE HISTORIC AMERICA ACT

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of H.R. 610, the Preserve Historic America Act. This bill would expand and facilitate the use of Federal historic preservation tax credit and create a new historic preservation tax credit for our homeowners. The economic incentives created by the bill will produce historic preservation, economic growth, and spawn jobs.

A study of the Missouri Historic Preservation Tax Credit program, a widely respected program that expands upon the current Federal program, showed State assistance of \$74 million in tax credits contributed to \$267 million in Missouri income, \$381 million in gross State product and 10,278 Missouri jobs.

The State of Missouri has led the way in creating the most utilized historic preservation tax credit in the country, and I am proud to bring my home State's successes to the Federal level. H.R. 610 will provide the economic incentive necessary to save our historic treasures, while simultaneously creating a far-reaching monetary benefit.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1155

RECOGNIZING THE SOUPER BOWL OF CARING

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Bears and the Indianapolis Colts were not the only teams hungry for victory last night. Reverend Brad Smith of the Spring Valley Presbyterian Church in Columbia, South Carolina, founded the Souper Bowl of Caring 16 years ago. This youth-led non-profit collects money on Super Bowl Sunday to feed the hungry in their communities.

Since its beginning, the group has raised \$33 million. Nearly 103,000 youth groups have participated, and more than 18,000 charity organizations nationwide have benefited from its work.

The coordination of the Souper Bowl of Caring with the NFL Super Bowl has not gone unnoticed. Five NFL team owners, including two with South Carolina connections, have made significant financial contributions to fund the organization. Specifically, I would like to recognize USC graduate Bob McNair, and his wife, Columbia College graduate Janice McNair, with the Houston Texans.

The Souper Bowl of Caring is making a positive difference alleviating hunger, and all Americans appreciate its efforts.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

CORVETTE WINNER HAS NO ID

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago, a 22-year-old woman is suing a Spanish language radio station. It seems she won a Corvette in the station's raffle, but the station won't give it to her. Why? Because she would not produce any identification. You see, a valid Social Security number or taxpayer identification number is required by law of the winner to get this type of prize because the winner must pay Federal taxes on the Corvette. The radio station strictly adheres to FCC contest rules. This person did not have either document. Why? Because she is illegally in the United States and because she won't pay the taxes, so the Corvette was withheld.

Never mind the station followed the law and the illegal is breaking the law by being in our country. She is now suing the radio station because she wants the Vette. She is also suing because of emotional distress. What arrogance this illegal has. The lawsuit should be thrown out of court, and when she gets to the courthouse they should put her in the jailhouse and deport her.

And that's just the way it is.

SUPER BOWL COMMERCIAL

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn an unconscionable commercial from last night's Super Bowl. Some ads were good, some ads were bad; but this one was very ugly. For those who missed it, an antiwar political action committee ran an ad claiming, and this is a direct quote: "If you support escalation, you don't support the troops."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that couldn't be farther from the truth. Supporting additional troops in Iraq is supporting one final surge to push the Iraqi people over the threshold of violence and deliver the best shot for a more stable Middle East.

Let me assure you that the veterans in this commercial do not speak for the veterans in my district, nor do they speak for the soldiers that I visited in Iraq or Walter Reed, nor do they speak for our military commanders. But, Mr. Speaker, what disturbs me most about this commercial is that it wasn't just broadcast to those of us watching the game from the comfort of our living rooms and our homes. It was broadcast to the troops watching the game in Iraq.

Our troops should know that the United States military strategy will not be determined by political groups buying air time during the Super Bowl. I support victory in Iraq, and this final surge may be our best last chance to achieve it.

OUR COUNTRY HAS A SPENDING PROBLEM

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, today President Bush presented his budget to the American people, and even though it is bigger and more bloated than I think it should be, I am pleased that it does include a balanced budget without raising taxes.

As stewards of the taxpayers' money, we must be diligent in working to achieve savings and making this government run more efficiently. We have plenty of data from the GAO and from our Inspector General showing that money is wasted throughout the Federal Government, and the President's budget does target 140 programs that could and should be removed.

So whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, there is consensus among the American people that we do have a spending problem in the Federal Government. It is not a revenue problem. Tax reductions have generated record revenues. It is definitely a spending problem, and it is time that we begin to fine-tune our focus and decide what is a priority with this government.

So I hope that my colleagues on either side of this center aisle will join together, will take a good hard look at this budget, and will find a way to balance it without raising taxes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions 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.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

SERGEANT HENRY YBARRA III POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 577) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas, as the "Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 577

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

SECTION 1. SERGEANT HENRY YBARRA III POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 577, legislation naming a postal facility in Austin, Texas, after Staff Sergeant Henry Ybarra III.

On September 11, 2003, Sergeant Ybarra died in Iraq, performing maintenance on a heavy expanded mobility tactical truck when a tire exploded. He was serving in the Army's 6th Squadron, 6th Cavalry Unit when he was killed at the young age of 32.

Born in Austin, Texas, Sergeant Ybarra grew up wanting to be just like

his father and serve in the military. At age 19 he enlisted in the Army and fulfilled his dream.

Sergeant Ybarra served as a technical supply clerk, keeping track of spare parts for the squadron, which was not an easy task since spare parts are often scarce during times of conflict.

Sergeant Ybarra was known for his upbeat attitude, his contagious smile, and strong devotion to the Catholic faith. He is survived by his wife and three children.

Staff Sergeant Ybarra's service to our country should be remembered and celebrated by this small tribute, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sergeant Henry Ybarra was, I am told, a regular guy. On a typical weekend, he could be found relaxing at home with his family, grilling outside with friends or watching his favorite NFL team, the Dallas Cowboys. At other times of the year he would tune into auto racing to watch his favorite NASCAR driver, Dale Earnhardt, Jr.

Born and raised in Austin, Texas, Sergeant Ybarra was a proud family man with everyday American values. At the age of 19, he enlisted in the U.S. Army. His military career took him to Virginia, Kansas, Texas, and on to Germany. It was in Germany, while assigned to Troop D, 6th Squadron, 6th Cavalry that he fought in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

His plans for the future were focused on his family and raising his three children; but as was pointed out, it all ended abruptly on September 11, 2003 in Balad, Iraq, when he was changing a tire on a heavy expanded mobility tactical truck when a tire suddenly exploded and killed him.

As his father back home in the U.S. was attending a memorial honoring those who died on September 11, 2001, he regretfully received word that his own son, who had given so much of himself to his country, had been killed.

Sergeant Ybarra was known by his friends, comrades and family for having a joyful spirit and a constant smile. He liked to kid to make others laugh. A proud father, son, husband and soldier maintained a positive attitude and never said, I am told, a harmful word towards others.

□ 1415

He served his country with distinction. Among his awards and decorations were: the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, three Good Conduct Medals, two National Defense Service Medals, the Armed Forces Service Medal, the NCO Professional Development Ribbon, three Overseas Service Ribbons and the Basic Marks qualification badge.

Mr. Speaker, this was a man who was happy to serve his country, and we are grateful he did. Let us honor his ulti-

mate sacrifice by renaming this post office for him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) as much time as he may consume.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank my colleagues for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor a son of Texas, Sergeant Henry Ybarra III, born and raised in south Austin, and a member of the parish at San Jose Catholic Church. On September 11, 2003, he was killed in Iraq, the first of a number from our State capital in Texas to lose their life there.

I attended his rosary personally, joined by Marine Thomas Cruz, a member of my Congressional staff at that time. Today we honor Henry's sacrifice to our Nation by officially affixing his name to the post office on South Congress in Austin, the road that leads up to our State Capitol.

Henry long knew that he wanted to devote his life to service. His mother, Mary Jane, remembers it as early as age five. His father, a veteran of Vietnam, would find young Henry marching around in his dad's boots and cap. Henry wasted no time making that dream a reality, enlisting in the Army only months after graduating from Johnston High School. That father, Hank, is at this very moment still convalescing from both his own service in Vietnam and the impact of the loss of his son. We wish him continued progress in his recovery, and express our deep gratitude for what he has given personally to our country.

Henry's military career spanned a dozen years, earning numerous honors and awards. He met his wife, Lilian, while stationed at Fort Hood in Killeen, and his career took his family with daughters, Alyssa and Gabrielle, and his son, Henry IV, as far away as Germany. His commanding officer described Henry's easy manner and said, I wish I had a troop full of soldiers with his attitude and outlook on life.

As Pericles once spoke of ancient Athens, so it is with our democracy today: "If it should appear great to you, consider then that her glories were purchased by valiant men, and by men who learned their duty."

With this bill, our Nation pays tribute to a valiant man, Staff Sergeant Henry Ybarra, and to all those valiant men and women who serve and have served under our flag. The veterans groups Tejanos in Action, the Catholic War Veterans Post 1805, the Knights of Columbus Council 10148, the American GI Forum, along with LULAC and other community organizations, have been strong supporters of the effort to memorialize Sergeant Ybarra by naming the South Congress station in his honor.

Tejanos in Action is a unique organization that addresses the needs of our Hispanic veterans, and by providing its

services to our community, provides a meaningful tribute to Henry and others who have served our country. I salute Dan Arellano, the Commander of Tejanos in Action; Moses Saldaña, who works closely with the Knights of Columbus at San Jose Church, and the Catholic War Veterans and all those who continue to serve and inspire our youth with their service.

Last year, I participated in the dedication of the Nicholas Perez Elementary School, as the Austin Independent School District recognized another brave son of south Austin lost in Iraq. Such memorials rightly honor men and women who have given their lives in service. They are daily reminders of both the valor of these young people and of our need to prevent war or its unnecessary escalation. With the death toll now rising towards 4,000 unique human beings tragically lost in Iraq, there may not be enough physical memorials to honor individually the sacrifice of all those who continue to fall.

For Sergeant Henry Ybarra and his friends and family, he will always be in their hearts. With this memorial naming, new generations will learn of Sergeant Ybarra's selfless sacrifice and be inspired by that service.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American and war hero of our country by naming the Post Office at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas in his honor. Born and raised in South Austin, Army SGT Henry Ybarra III was the first soldier from the capitol of my home state—Austin, Texas—to be killed in Iraq. Sergeant Ybarra graduated from Johnson High School and attended San Jose Catholic Church. He is survived by his wife, Lilian, and their three children, Alyssa, 16, Gabrielle, 14, and Henry Ybarra IV, 4.

Army SGT Henry Ybarra III died when he was just 32 years of age on September 11, 2003 in Balad, Iraq. Ironically it was when his father was observing a moment of silence for the September 11th victims that he received a phone call with the grave news that his own son was dead. Readiness, quick thinking, leadership and dedication are some of the traits that America's leaders possess today and traits that Sergeant Ybarra displayed the day that he was killed. Army SGT Henry Ybarra III died under combat conditions when the tire on a 10-ton military cargo truck exploded as he tried to change it. Dedication and excellent service to his country was not new to Army SGT Henry Ybarra and during his military career he earned the Army Achievement Medal, Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, National Defense Medal, NCO Professional Development Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon and Basic Marksmanship Badge.

As Americans will never forget the attack on our Nation on September 11, 2001, so we must never forget those who are fighting the war in Iraq and serving our country. Sergeant Ybarra's memory must live on. He is an example of the thousands of dedicated soldiers who have selflessly given their lives to protect the

freedoms of America and aid those in need. By honoring him, we honor the soldiers before him and the soldiers that are currently deployed in Iraq. Too many times we hear about the ugliness this war brings and as the death toll rises and we continue to stay in Iraq, we must not forget the names and faces of the fallen. I thank Rep. DOGGETT and urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 577, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin, TX, as the "Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building." We must put a face and a name to honor the fallen in Iraq so that his memory will never be forgotten. Help me to honor one of our Nation's finest and bravest by commemorating Sergeant Ybarra and naming a post office in Austin, Texas after him.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 577.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT LEA ROBERT MILLS BROOKSVILLE AVIATION BRANCH POST OFFICE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 514) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16150 Aviation Loop Drive in Brooksville, Florida, as the "Sergeant Lea Robert Mills Brooksville Aviation Branch Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 514

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

SECTION 1. SERGEANT LEA ROBERT MILLS BROOKSVILLE AVIATION BRANCH POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16150 Aviation Loop Drive in Brooksville, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant Lea Robert Mills Brooksville Aviation Branch Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant Lea Robert Mills Brooksville Aviation Branch Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 514, legislation naming a postal facility in Brooksville, Florida, after Sergeant Lea Robert Mills of the United States Marine Corps.

Sergeant Mills was killed April 28, 2006, while conducting combat operations against enemy forces in Al Anbar Province, Iraq. He was 21 years old. A native of Masaryktown, Florida, Sergeant Mills joined the Marines in 2002 after graduating from Hernando High School. After his initial service, he renewed his commitment to the Marines and volunteered to serve his country in Iraq.

He spent only 6 weeks in that country before an improvised explosive device took his life. Sergeant Mills is survived by his wife, Keesha, his parents, Rob and Delores, and his brother, Parker. This young man's death is a tragedy for our Nation and for all those who loved him, but his sacrifice is a triumph of human courage and selflessness. Sergeant Mills is due the gratitude and remembrance of his country and its people.

I urge the swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

From all we know about Sergeant Lea Robert Mills, he was a dedicated and honorable Marine who hoped to make a difference in people's lives. Inspired to volunteer for the military after the September 11 terrorist attacks, Sergeant Mills gave his life fighting for those values we hold dear.

Sergeant Mills of Masaryktown, Florida, joined the Marines after his graduation from Hernando High School in 2002. He wanted to serve on the front lines in the war on terror, and he wanted to make a difference. Always one to do his best, Sergeant Mills advanced quickly in rank and received many honors, becoming a leader to his beloved Marine comrades.

On April 28, 2006, at age 21, he was killed by a terrorist IED explosion while on patrol in Iraq, leaving behind his young wife, Keesha, and a very loving family. Sergeant Mills was proud to serve his Nation and strongly believed that he was doing the right thing for his country.

With gratitude for his bravery and sacrifice to his country, I ask all members to join me in supporting H.R. 514, which will rename the aviation post office in Brooksville, Florida, in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was, I think, submitted by GINNY BROWN-WAITE, who is in transit. I hope that if we get to the next bill and I still control time, I could yield her time to speak on this issue, if it is all right with my colleagues.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill,

H.R. 514, which will rename the aviation post office in Brooksville, FL, after Sergeant Lea Robert Mills.

Lea was a resident of my district in Masaryktown who gave his life for his country while serving in Iraq.

At 21 years old, Lea was proud to serve his fellow citizens, and even requested to be sent to Iraq.

After being inspired to volunteer for the military after the September 11 attacks, he felt it was his duty as a Marine to go where the mission was.

Lea told his father that the marines would give him the best opportunity to make a difference in people's lives.

He joined right after graduating from Hernando High School in 2002, and had just recently re-upped for a second stint with the Marines.

Tragically, he was killed by an IED explosion, leaving behind a young wife and a grieving family.

Sergeant Mills was a true patriot and a brave hero, and our community feels his loss immensely.

His dedication to his country and turning his ideals into actions are truly inspiring.

It is a sad truth that in a cynical world, we are surprised by courageous acts.

Learning about Lea from his family and friends helped me to have faith that not everyone is just trying to get by—some are trying to change the world for the better.

I hope that in renaming this post office, we will memorialize Lea's courage and never forget his sacrifice for this great Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 514.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCIPIO A. JONES POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 433) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1700 Main Street in Little Rock, Arkansas, as the "Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 433

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

SECTION 1. SCIPIO A. JONES POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1700 Main Street in Little Rock, Arkansas, shall be known and designated as the "Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 433, legislation naming a postal facility in Little Rock, Arkansas, after Scipio Africanus Jones.

Mr. Jones was an African American lawyer, judge, professor and humanitarian. Born in 1863 as a slave, he is most noted for his work to appeal the conviction and death sentence of 12 black sharecroppers for their involvement in the Elaine Race Riot. The Elaine Race Riot is one of the bloodiest racial conflicts in American history. Mr. Jones' work brought the case to the United States Supreme Court, and as a result found mob driven trials violated the due process clause of the 14th amendment.

Mr. Jones also made history when he personally purchased \$50,000 worth of Liberty Bonds, which helped support the Allied war efforts in the First World War. Soon thereafter, President Woodrow Wilson appointed him to the Liberty Bond National Advisory Board.

Later in his life, he continued to advocate against racial discrimination. He fought for black voting rights and worked with Thurgood Marshall in a case ensuring fair pay for African American teachers. His contribution impacted society's treatment towards blacks in a powerful way, and for this we all should be proud and remember him dearly.

I urge the swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, February 1 marks the beginning of Black History Month. It is the time when we take time to honor the commitments and struggles of African Americans and try to understand their struggles. It is only fitting that during this month we honor a man whose perseverance and dedication to his community and fellow African Americans broke through and broke down historic barriers.

On August 3, 1863, Scipio Africanus Jones was born in Smith Township, Arkansas. His mother had been a slave. Scipio Jones attended black schools in the area and then moved to Little Rock to attend preparatory courses at

Philander Smith College. From there he earned his Bachelor's Degree from North Little Rock's Bethel University, now known as Shorter College.

But his interest in education did not stop there. He recognized the continuing struggle African Americans face in achieving equal rights, and knew he could contribute through Arkansas' legal system.

Mr. Jones offered to work unpaid as a janitor at the offices of the local U.S. district judge. There he began to read law books and became an apprentice in law under Circuit Judge Robert Lea. He was accepted into the American Bar Association in 1889. From there, he was admitted to practice in the circuit court of Pulaski County in Little Rock.

In 1900, he was admitted to the State Supreme Court, then the United States District Court, the United States Supreme Court, and the United States Court of Appeals.

□ 1430

He was a strong member of his community and joined several local fraternal organizations. He even turned down offers to serve as the ambassador to the Republic of Haiti, as well as the Recorder of Deeds in the District of Columbia so he could support the Little Rock area.

He was treasurer of the National Negro Bar Association, the National Attorney General of the Mosaic Templars of America, a member of the International Order of Twelve, and a member of the Knights and Daughters of Tabor.

Through his work in these fraternal organizations, he became known as the "Gibraltar of Negro fraternal beneficiary societies."

Mr. Jones is famous for his defense in the trial of the Elaine Twelve. In 1919 a group of black sharecroppers met in Elaine, Arkansas, to discuss creating their own unit and whether to bring a class action lawsuit against their landlords for not paying them appropriate shares for their homegrown crops.

When a local sheriff and railroad detective, both white, showed up to the meeting, a fight arose. It quickly spread through the town and lasted for 3 days. It grew so intense that 600 Federal troops came to the area to quiet the fighting.

In the end, 99 black men were arrested. Twelve of the men received a trial that lasted only 20 minutes and sentenced them to death. With Scipio's efforts he pushed their case to the Supreme Court of the United States, which successfully gave all 12 men a new trial.

Beyond his legal work, Mr. Jones was a passionate businessman. He was the founder and owner of People's Ice and Fuel Company. He also founded Arkansas's Negro Business League.

Judge Scipio Jones fought hard his whole life for the rights of his fellow African Americans. He knew a better way of life could be had for his commu-

nity members. He was a prominent leader, lawyer, educator, businessman, and politician. It is so appropriate that we honor a man of such determination, pride and integrity during Black History Month with the naming of this post office.

Frankly, I am in awe of this gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 433.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CONSUMER PROTECTION WEEK

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 94) a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 94

Whereas informed consumers are better equipped to see through frauds and deceptions, whether they take the form of questionable claims in an advertisement, offers that come in the mail or e-mail, or schemes designed to appear to be risk-free;

Whereas the Federal Government provides many educational resources and programs to help people protect themselves against fraud by supplying them with information about their options in the marketplace;

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission and more than 100 other Federal agencies have collaborated on a website, www.consumer.gov, which provides helpful information ranging from how credit ratings work to how to buy a new home;

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission has prepared a collection of easy-to-use materials to enable anyone, regardless of their existing knowledge about identity theft, to learn about and inform others about how to protect themselves against this serious crime;

Whereas consumers can find practical tips from National Consumer Protection Week partner organizations about how to make well-informed purchase decisions, avoid scams, protect their personal information, and file a complaint online at www.consumer.gov/ncpw;

Whereas, by gathering and sharing information, consumers and their friends and families can be more confident, savvy, and safe in the marketplace;

Whereas increasing financial literacy and information about financial services provides consumers with the knowledge to obtain the most appropriate and prudent options for managing their finances and building wealth;

Whereas a 2005 report by the Comptroller General entitled "Credit Reporting Literacy" supports educational efforts to increase consumers' understanding of the credit reporting process and suggests that such efforts target those areas in which consumers' knowledge is weakest, including populations with less education, lower incomes, and less experience obtaining credit; and

Whereas public, community-based, and private sector organizations throughout the United States are working to increase financial literacy rates and consumer protection for people of all ages and walks of life through a range of outreach efforts, including media campaigns, websites, and one-on-one counseling for individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the Ninth Annual National Consumer Protection Week, including raising public awareness about the importance of consumer protection;

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon Government officials, industry leaders, schools, non-profit organizations, and consumer advocates to provide citizens with the information necessary to effectively protect themselves against consumer fraud, and encourage all citizens to take an active role in protecting their personal information; and

(3) encourages people across the Nation to take advantage of the wealth of consumer protection information that can enhance confidence in the marketplace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution that supports the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week. Starting yesterday, Sunday, February 4, through this Saturday, February 10, National Consumer Protection Week has the purpose of highlighting consumer protection and education efforts around the Nation.

This is a worthy goal that Congress should enthusiastically support. An informed consumer is a powerful consumer. Too often, the average citizen is unaware of the litany of scams being perpetrated at any given time.

Many criminals prey on consumers who have fallen on hard financial times, promising them quick fixes to

magically solve all of their economic problems. These scams have real consequences for thousands of Americans, and the effects can be devastating to an individual or to a family.

However, if consumers are well informed and armed with knowledge, they can better navigate the marketplace and avoid these financial pitfalls. National Consumer Protection Week can help in this regard. Sponsored by the Federal Trade Commission, the Better Business Bureau, AARP, the Consumer Federation of America, and many other government and nonprofit organizations, community leaders can access a Web site with an outreach tool kit to help them educate their citizens and spread the word.

Now, this Web site is at www.consumer.gov/ncpw. Let me repeat that: www.consumer.gov/ncpw, which is the acronym for National Consumer Protection Week. On this Web site, consumers can access information about how to protect themselves from fraud.

It also gives tips consumers can use to recognize a ripoff when they see one. Lastly, I would be remiss if I did not quickly mention that as a new member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and specifically on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, it is my hope that this 110th Congress will be the National Consumer Protection Congress.

This week in February is National Consumer Protection Week, but we can do so much more in the coming months ahead. By working with Subcommittee Chairman RUSH and Ranking Member STEARNS, as well as Energy and Commerce Chairman DINGELL and Ranking Member BARTON, I believe that we can instigate many reforms to empower consumers and improve the lives of everyday Americans.

Our committee is prepared to aggressively examine a whole host of basic consumer protection and pocketbook issues. I look forward to working with my Republican friends in the 110th Congress on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 94, recognizing National Consumer Protection Week. The Energy and Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over consumer protection and is a major component of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection.

This subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, has a history of being active and aggressive in the area to address threats to bringing sensible and meaningful changes to help consumers defend themselves against fraud and provide the Federal Trade Commission with the tools necessary for enforcement.

Some of the consumer protection measures we have passed out of the committee include the anti-spyware legislation offered by Mrs. BONO and

Mr. TOWNS, data security legislation to require companies that maintain protection for consumers' sensitive personal information and notify them in the event of a breach; anti-pretexting legislation to prevent unauthorized access to personal phone records; anti-spam legislation to reduce unsolicited and often fraudulent e-mails; and a public law providing for greater authority for the Federal Trade Commission to pursue criminal activity originating in other countries.

Despite all of these improvements and new public laws and our commitment to pass these bills in this Congress, they were not enacted into law in the last Congress. There are unscrupulous people who will continue to try to perpetuate fraud.

Unfortunately, fraud is often not discovered until there are victims and we then become aware. If we want to see the biggest reduction in fraud, we will need to reduce the pool of potential victims. We can only do so with the cooperation of individuals. Consumers need to be educated and able to detect and prevent fraud.

The effects of fraud are often ruinous for individuals and detrimental to society, when we lose trust in our fellow citizens, because those pretending to offer their services are in reality only thieves. In a country as prosperous as the United States, our citizens are too often the target of scams and frauds originating from all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge support of H. Res. 94, because this resolution intends to raise citizens' awareness to the problems of fraud and calls on consumers to take every precaution to secure their personal information.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Representatives HINOJOSA and BIGGERT for bringing this resolution to the floor in conjunction with National Consumer Protection Week.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. I thank my friend and colleague, JIM MATHESON, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 94, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week. I introduced this resolution with my good friend, Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT, a few weeks ago. And I want to thank Majority Leader HOYER for bringing the resolution to the floor in such a timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, in addition I want to take a moment to take this opportunity to thank the leadership on Energy and Commerce for moving this resolution through their committee quickly after a thorough review by committee staff, especially Consuela Washington, Pete Goodloe, and Brian McCullough. I also want to thank legislative counsel, Brady Young, and Harry Savage for facilitating passage of this important resolution.

Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT and I have been collaborating for years on financial literacy, and together we strive to provide consumers with the information they need to make appropriate decisions.

As cofounders and cochairs of the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, we will continue to reach out to the States, the local government, private sector, nonprofits and community-based organizations to improve financial literacy rates across the United States, which has become extremely important in light of the negative savings rate in the United States.

I am pleased that my staff and Zach Cikanek on Congresswoman BIGGERT's staff have jump-started our caucus so early this year, and I look forward to continuing our longstanding partnership. I encourage all of those Members of Congress watching us today to join the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus to help your constituents help protect themselves from fraud and identity theft.

To join, all you need to do is contact my office or the office of Congresswoman BIGGERT. For the past 8 years, local, State and Federal government agencies and national consumer advocacy organizations have worked together to provide as much protection as possible to consumers during what has been deemed National Consumer Protection Week.

They have all recognized the important role public and private organizations play in ensuring that the American consumer is protected from unfair practices. This week we here in Congress will finally join these organizations in supporting the goals and ideals of the ninth annual National Consumer Protection Week, which falls between February 4 and February 10 of this year.

I am pleased to inform my colleagues that this year's theme is "Read up, reach out and be an informed consumer." This week will highlight consumer education efforts in the fight against fraud in communities across our Nation.

By gathering and sharing information, consumers and their friends and families can be more confident, savvy and safe in the marketplace. During this week, consumer protection partner organizations will provide practical and tactical tips so consumers can learn and teach others how to make well-informed purchase decisions, avoid scams, protect their personal information, and file a complaint.

Consumers can research and boost their marketplace IQ by accessing data at the National Consumer Protection Week section of the www.consumer.gov Web site. Some of the organizations that will participate in this week's activities include the Better Business Bureau, the Consumer Federation of America, the FDIC, and of course the Federal Trade Commission.

On Thursday of this week, February 8, 2007, the Federal Trade Commission,

the FDIC and several other consumer-oriented government agencies will host a consumer protection fair for Capitol Hill staff as well as Members of Congress. The fair will be held in room 1302 Longworth beginning at 9 a.m. and running until noon.

Again, the fair will be held in room 1302 Longworth House Office Building, February 8, from 9 a.m. until noon.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this fair, orchestrated by the FTC and Derick Rill, its congressional liaison, will provide the materials our staff needs to teach our constituents how to prevent themselves from becoming victims of fraud and identity theft and will help improve their overall financial literacy.

□ 1445

Again, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this resolution that will benefit consumers across America.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 6 minutes to the coauthor of this legislation, the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for House Resolution 94, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week.

Now in its ninth year, this special week brings together a diverse array of public and private organizations in support of one common goal, ensuring that Americans have the knowledge and financial savvy they need to be responsible consumers and to protect themselves in the marketplace.

There have always been those who would prey on the unwary consumer, be it through misleading claims or fraudulent practices. And as more and more Americans begin conducting transactions on the Internet, or with the use of other rapidly changing technologies, we must actively educate ourselves against new and evolving threats.

Among the most serious risks today consumers face is identity theft. In Illinois alone, we had over 11,000 reports of identity theft in just 1 year. According to the FTC, Illinois ranks among the top 10 States where consumers are most likely to have their personal information compromised. And yet, by following just a few simple tips, consumers are better able to recognize frauds and can significantly reduce the likelihood that their private information will fall into the wrong hands.

In many cases, the wisest and safest consumers are those who simply, with the best understanding, make their choices. Whether it is paying for college, saving for retirement or shopping for a mortgage on a first home, many Americans just don't know where to look to learn about the scores of options that are available to them.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, in February 2005, I joined with my friend and distinguished colleague, Representative HINOJOSA, to establish the Finan-

cial and Economic Literacy Caucus. We began this caucus to ensure that Congress did its part, not just to protect consumers but to empower them. We wanted to make certain that Americans of all ages and all walks of life have access to the tools and the educational resources they need to ensure the economic security of their families.

Today, we have the opportunity to do just that. We can join the Federal Trade Commission, the United States Postal Service, the AARP, Better Business Bureaus of America, and hundreds of other consumer advocates across the country that have collaborated to make National Consumer Protection Week a success.

Together, we can raise the awareness, not just of pitfalls in the marketplace, but the wealth of information and options available to consumers. One such resource, as Representative HINOJOSA said, is consumer.gov, a Federal Web site that provides one-stop shopping for information on everything from avoiding identity theft to finding savings at the gasoline pump.

I would like to also take this opportunity to thank my friend from Texas and cochair of the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, Mr. HINOJOSA, for working so hard on today's resolution, and his tireless effort on financial education issues.

In addition, my thanks go out to Chairman DINGELL and Ranking Member BARTON of the Energy and Commerce Committee for helping to bring this resolution to the floor in such a timely and bipartisan manner.

And finally, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for managing our resolution here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to sponsor House Resolution 94, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to now yield 2 minutes to a fellow member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. TOWNS from New York.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking you for allowing me to speak on this resolution.

Fraud and abuse is very prevalent, and, of course, we need to do something about it. So I would like to say to the committee members that too long have we allowed this fraud and abuse to go without speaking out on it in the fashion that we should.

People are being abused. Family members are being abused as a result of fraud and abuse. So I think that we need to send a message to those that are out there who are doing these kind of things to say that we will not sit back and allow you to do this.

We have people that are taking another person's identity and going out, making bills and creating problems and creating situations where the person's credit is bad, and when they begin to move forward to try to do something on behalf of their family,

they can't do it because somebody else has done some things that they should not have done and make this family have to suffer.

So I would like to just thank the sponsors of this resolution, and to say to you that I think it will draw the attention of those who might not be fully aware of what is going on. I think it will let law enforcement also know that the Members of the United States Congress are very concerned about these issues.

And I would like to salute the sponsors. I would like to salute the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing this resolution forward so quickly because the time is now that we must send a statement, make a statement to let people know that we are not going to sit back and let them do these kind of things to create problems for people.

So I would say to you, on that note, I look forward to working with the committee to see what we can do to further dramatize and to highlight this very serious situation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is pleased to bring to the floor H. Res. 94, supporting the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week. We commend Representatives HINOJOSA and BIGGERT for authoring the resolution.

Under Rule X, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is the authorizing Committee for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). The FTC, which administers over 40 Federal statutes under our purview, is the lead Federal consumer protection agency. The FTC also administers a handful of financial consumer protection laws such as the Fair Credit Reporting Act, the Truth in Lending Act, and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. This has been and remains an effective model.

The Committee that I am honored to lead has a long and proud tradition of consumer protection. It has mandated and overseen major initiatives to rid the markets of unsafe, and in some cases deadly, children's toys and other products.

It has taken legislative action to establish the national Do Not Call List, a giant step forward in lessening annoying telemarketing calls to consumer homes. It also has responsibility for the CAN-SPAM law aimed at curbing the volume of junk e-mail polluting and slowing down Internet commerce.

It is the lead Committee on privacy. Two of our Members, Ranking Member JOE BARTON and Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet Chairman ED MARKEY, are co-founders of the Privacy Caucus. Together, we wrote the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act that protects the most intimate details of American lives. We have begun bipartisan discussions with the Committee on Ways and Means for the design and operation of privacy and security protections for groundbreaking health information technology legislation that we hope to have enacted in this Congress. We authored the privacy provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act that protect financial information.

Later this week, we will be reintroducing four major privacy bills—legislation regarding spyware, pretexting, data security, and Social

Security number protection—that were reported unanimously by the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the 109th Congress (and in the case of spyware, passed the House). We intend to resolve jurisdictional issues with other Committees where they exist. We will also continue to work with consumer groups, technology experts, and industry groups to enact protections that are the most effective possible for both consumers and businesses.

We work hard to live the goals of National Consumer Protection Week. All too often the marketplace takes on the Darwinian tone of "survival of the fittest" with John Q. Public trampled in the process. It is fitting that we reflect on our responsibility to ensure transparency and fair treatment in the marketplace for the people who elect us. We salute the FTC, the Better Business Bureau, and consumer groups for their hard work all year-round on behalf of the American consumer. The Committee on Energy and Commerce intends to continue to live up to its reputation for fair and balanced laws and vigorous oversight on consumer protection issues. In the words of the Beatitudes: "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst for what is right for they shall be satisfied."

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 94, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Ninth Annual National Consumer Protection Week to highlight the importance of consumer protection, and I thank the Gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for introducing it.

This resolution is important because it calls on governmental officials, industry leaders, schools, nonprofit organizations, and consumer advocates to provide citizens with valuable information and because it encourages the American people to utilize consumer protection information that is made available to them.

I hope that this message resonates in my home State of California because our students are in the midst of a consumer crisis. Unless the State acts expeditiously, the consumer protection statute and the agency responsible for protecting postsecondary students from fraudulent institutions whose misrepresentations cause them to default on tens of thousands of dollars in Federal student loans will expire on June 30, 2007. The statute set to expire is called the Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education Act and it authorizes a regulatory and enforcement bureau to scrutinize institutions that receive Federal higher education funds.

In the 1980s and 1990s, numerous abuses by unlawful institutions cost taxpayers billions of dollars in defaulted student loan debt—in fact, there was \$3.2 billion in defaulted student loans in 1992 alone. More recently, in August and October 2006, two San Diego trade schools closed without notice to its students, setting 400 to 800 of them on the path to default on Federal and private student loans—many totaling \$20,000 or more per student—with no education to justify it.

I hope that the State of California sees passage of this important resolution as Congress' call to take whatever measures necessary to uphold the consumer rights of the American people and works quickly to reauthorize the Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education Act. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to acknowledge the leadership of Mr. HINOJOSA and Mrs. BIGGERT on this issue; thank them for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 94, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL BLACK HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 35

Whereas the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the United States has shifted primarily to the African-American community and other communities of color;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has stated that, at the end of 2005, over 188,000 African Americans were living with AIDS, representing 44 percent of all cases in the United States;

Whereas since the beginning of the epidemic, African Americans have accounted for nearly 400,000 or 42 percent of the estimated 953,000 AIDS cases diagnosed, and through December 2005, an estimated 211,559 African Americans with AIDS have died;

Whereas the CDC has further stated that, in 2005, African Americans accounted for nearly 50 percent of all new HIV infections, despite representing only about 12.3 percent of the population (according to the 2000 Census);

Whereas the CDC estimates that, in 2005, African-American women accounted for over 66 percent of all HIV/AIDS cases among women, and were 25 times more likely to be infected than White women;

Whereas the CDC estimates that of the over 18,800 people under the age of 25 whose diagnosis of HIV/AIDS was made during 2001–2004, 61 percent were African-American;

Whereas the CDC estimates that 73 percent of all children born to HIV infected mothers in 2004 were African-American;

Whereas the CDC has determined that the leading cause of HIV infection among African-American men is sexual contact with other men, followed by intravenous drug use and heterosexual contact;

Whereas the CDC has determined that the leading cause of HIV infection among African-American women is heterosexual contact, followed by intravenous drug use;

Whereas in 2002, AIDS was among the top three causes of death for African-American men in the age group 25 through 54, among the top four causes of death for African-American women in the age group 25 through 54, and the number one cause of death for African-American women aged 25 to 34 years;

Whereas the CDC estimates that, since 1996, African Americans have the poorest survival rates of any racial or ethnic group diagnosed with AIDS, with 64 percent surviving after 9 years compared to 65 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives, 72 percent of Hispanics, 74 percent of Whites, and 81 percent of Asian Pacific Islanders;

Whereas African Americans are diagnosed with AIDS later than nonminority counterparts, are confronted with barriers in accessing care and treatment, and face higher morbidity and mortality outcomes;

Whereas in 1998, the Congress and the Clinton Administration created the National Minority AIDS Initiative to help coordinate funding, build capacity, and provide prevention, care, and treatment services within the African-American, Hispanic, Asian Pacific Islander, and Native American communities;

Whereas the Minority AIDS Initiative assists with leadership development of community-based organizations (CBOs), establishes and links provider networks, builds community prevention infrastructure, promotes technical assistance among CBOs, and raises awareness among African-American communities;

Whereas on February 23, 2001, the first annual National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day was organized, with the slogan "Get Educated, Get Involved, Get Tested"; and

Whereas February 7 of each year is now recognized as National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day and recognizes the seventh anniversary of observing such day;

(2) encourages State and local governments, including their public health agencies, to recognize such day, to publicize its importance among their communities, and to encourage individuals to undergo testing for HIV;

(3) encourages national, State, and local media organizations to carry messages in support of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day;

(4) supports full and equitable funding for the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Modernization Act of 2006;

(5) applauds the codification of the Minority AIDS Initiative within the reauthorization of the Ryan White CARE Act;

(6) supports appropriate funding for HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment;

(7) supports the strengthening of stable African-American communities;

(8) supports reducing the impact of incarceration as a driver of new HIV infections within the African-American community;

(9) supports effective and comprehensive HIV prevention education programs to promote the early identification of HIV through voluntary routine testing, and to connect those in need to treatment and care as early as possible;

(10) supports reducing the number of HIV infections in the African-American community resulting from injection drug use; and

(11) supports efforts to link those infected with HIV to accessible care and treatment options.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, this is a healing moment in the long struggle for full and fair recognition for the African American victims of HIV and AIDS. I am proud that the Congress and our Nation continues to recognize the changing face of the HIV and AIDS. And I urge you to unanimously support this resolution.

In the previous Congress, we spent much time and energy on the issue of HIV and AIDS, and rightfully so. I am glad that the Nation and the Congress have come together today to support a House resolution that recognizes the importance of supporting awareness in African American communities across this Nation.

This is a special moment for me, because the HIV/AIDS crisis has hit the national African American community, and my own district in Brooklyn, New York has been hit real hard. So it is critical for Congress today to say to the Nation that this issue at this time is important, just as we did in the last session when we included for the first time the Minority AIDS Initiative in the Ryan White reauthorization.

I am particularly pleased that today's Congress is recognizing the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. The importance of prevention and testing in African American communities is very, very important, the need for full and equitable treatment of the disease in communities of color.

My colleagues will speak to other aspects of the resolution. However, we are united in our support for strengthening the public health infrastructure to assist African American communities in fighting this epidemic.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this critical resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 35. I was proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. This legislation recognizes the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

Wednesday, February 7, 2007 marks the ninth annual National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. This day serves to commemorate the importance of educating African Americans and, indeed, the entire community about the need to get tested, understand the re-

sults of that testing, what it means, and get treatment if they are currently living with HIV or AIDS or are newly diagnosed.

National Black HIV/AIDS Day is an important reminder that African Americans continue to be impacted by the disease and that local communities should work together to provide avenues to prevent new infections, as well as ensuring that those currently living with the diagnosis have access to available services for their treatment and for their care.

Each year, 20,000 African Americans are newly infected with HIV. African American men and women are among the hardest hit populations in the United States, and in 2004 they accounted for fully half of all of the new HIV diagnoses in this country and more than a third of the AIDS deaths to date.

Department statistics show that racial and ethnic minorities represent the highest number of new AIDS cases. More than 75 percent of the people living with AIDS are racial and ethnic minorities, and HIV has become a leading cause of death for African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in my own district in north Texas, a few facts about the HIV epidemic in Tarrant County. The average HIV rate per 100,000 population for Tarrant County, Texas is 25, but for the African American community it is fully three times that amount at 76.

The average AIDS rate per 100,000 population for Tarrant County, Texas is 13, but for the African American community, again, that number is tripled to 35.

While we saw a spike of AIDS cases in the mid-1990s, and then a decline in the late 1990s, rates have begun again to increase from 1999 to 2003 and continue to climb upwards.

In the State of Texas, almost half of all of the HIV and AIDS diagnoses are African Americans, 42 percent and 40 percent respectively. And in my home county of Tarrant County, there is no bigger advocate and activist for the African Americans who are living with this diagnosis than retired Judge Mary Ellen Hicks, and I thank her for her service in making all of us aware of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution commemorating National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), who has been fighting on this issue from the day that she arrived in the United States Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, Mr. TOWNS, for your leadership, and for managing this bill today, which is very important for not

only my community but for your community and for all our communities throughout the country. And I want to thank Mr. DINGELL, also Mr. BURGESS, for your leadership and for your support for this effort.

Also let me thank our staff for helping us bring this bill to the floor. Especially I want to thank our leadership's staff, Mr. TOWNS's, Mr. BURGESS's, Mr. DINGELL's staff, Mr. BARTON's staff; as well as my staff, Christos Tesentas, for their very competent and their very effective work. This is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. It is a bipartisan issue. And our staffs have really exemplified, I think, the best of what staff can do to work together on something this important.

Two days from now, on February 7, we will commemorate, and it is unfortunate that we have to commemorate this, the seventh National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, a day when we urge African Americans to get educated, to get involved, and to get tested.

The numbers are startling, Mr. Speaker, especially for African American women. According to the CDC, in 2005 African American women accounted for 66 percent of all new HIV/AIDS cases among women, and this is climbing as we speak. It is probably now closer to 70 percent. And we are 25 times more likely to be infected than white women. Today, AIDS is the number one cause of death among African American women between the ages of 25 and 34. Think about that for a minute. The number one cause of death. Young women.

Black gay men are also affected by this disease. A recent CDC study found, and this was in 2005 again, that 46 percent, 46 percent, of black gay men in five U.S. cities were HIV positive.

This is simply outrageous. These statistics are quite staggering.

At the end of last year, we took a positive bipartisan step forward to address the spread of HIV and AIDS among the African American community by ensuring the Minority AIDS Initiative, initiated by a great leader on this issue, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, and DONNA CHRISTENSEN in 1999. We were able to finally formally include this in the Ryan White CARE Act. Now we really do have a responsibility to go even further. We could start by funding the Minority AIDS Initiative at a minimum of \$610 million and by fully funding the Ryan White Treatment Modernization Act.

But we must also go beyond the money and get at the factors that are ultimately driving this epidemic among African American people, African American men and women. Poverty and discrimination, the lack of affordable housing, the unequal impact of the disproportionate rates of incarceration among black men, poor access to care, limited cultural competency for health workers, all of these deserve our attention and deserve action.

Mr. Speaker, the color of our skin really should never determine our

health status or the quality of care we receive. Unfortunately, today to be black is to be at greater risk of HIV and AIDS. And, unfortunately, this disease is really increasing among Latinos and the Asian Pacific American community. So we must do much more for everyone.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to do just that, to change these statistics. It is not an ideological issue, and, Mr. TOWNS, you know this is not an ideological issue. It is a moral and humanitarian call for equality and for justice.

So I urge my colleagues to join us in stopping the spread of this global pandemic, a priority not only throughout the world but also here at home. In Toronto, Canada Congresswomen WATERS, CHRISTENSEN, and myself, we participated in a very effective and very profound international AIDS conference this past year. There were pledges made to make HIV and AIDS a priority with civil rights groups. The NAACP and many of our organizations that have been working for justice and civil rights for many years now understand and are on the front lines in terms of making HIV and AIDS a major, major priority.

So let me just say it is a very important day. This is a very important resolution, and I urge both sides of the House to vote for H. Con. Res. 35.

Again, I want to thank Mr. BURGESS and Mr. TOWNS for your leadership and for yielding the time today.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who has really been involved in this issue, and I have worked very closely with her.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for bringing this resolution before this House. His work is very important on this issue.

And I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 35, supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

The first annual National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day was organized on February 23, 2001, with the message "Get Educated, Get Involved, Get Tested."

Unfortunately, African Americans have been gravely impacted by the AIDS epidemic. Unfortunately, African Americans account for half of the new AIDS cases, although we are only 13 percent of the population. Worse yet is the fact that African American women represent 67 percent of new AIDS cases among women, and black teenagers represent 66 percent of new AIDS cases among teenagers.

That is why back in 1998 I established the Minority AIDS Initiative, with the support of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Clinton administration. At that time we received \$166 million

in funding the new initiative, and this initiative for HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs serving African American and other minority communities was very helpful in helping to build capacity in these communities to deal with the problem.

However, it is not enough. Last year I asked for \$610 million, and I am renewing my call with the support of the Congressional Black Caucus for that amount. But the message "Get Educated, Get Involved, Get Tested" is an important message for all Americans. Over 1 million Americans are living with HIV/AIDS, and 24 to 27 percent of them do not know they are infected.

That is why today I am reintroducing the Routine HIV/AIDS Screening Coverage Act. This bill requires health insurance plans to cover routine HIV/AIDS tests under the same terms and conditions as other routine health screenings.

I also plan to reintroduce the Stop AIDS in Prison Act, a bill to require routine HIV/AIDS screening of all Federal prison inmates upon entering prison and again prior to release from prison, as well as comprehensive treatment for those who test positive. Routine HIV/AIDS screening will allow thousands of African Americans and other infected individuals to find out about their infection, begin life-extending treatment, and avoid spreading the virus to others.

I urge my colleagues to support National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, and I urge all Americans to educate themselves, act responsibly, get involved, and get tested for HIV/AIDS.

I thank Representative TOWNS for the attention that he has given to this issue.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I must admit I don't plan to take it all.

But let me just say I would like to thank the staff members. I would like to thank the leadership of the committees, who, of course, have been very involved in this issue because this is a very serious issue.

People are dying because of the fact that we are not paying enough attention to this disease. So I want to thank people like Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from California, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, and, of course, many others who have been there in the forefront indicating the fact that the time to do something is now.

This resolution sort of highlights how important this issue is and that we must begin to address it. So I am hoping that the Members of the United States Congress will join us in supporting this resolution and not only that but to help us get information out to people.

People need to be tested but not only to be tested. When they are tested, they need to have treatment. It is one

thing to test; it is another thing to have treatment. Just a test to be testing does not make a lot of sense. But when you test and then you have a treatment program and you get education out, then it makes a lot of sense.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNS. I would be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I see that Congresswoman Barbara Lee is at the other microphone. If she, too, may engage in this colloquy.

Mr. TOWNS. I was just wondering, in the work that we have all been doing, we have been trying so hard to educate all of our young people in our communities about HIV and AIDS and how they can take more responsibility. We have been fighting for money.

Do you believe that it would be helpful if we took this resolution and made a comprehensive effort, focused effort, to get to the churches and to some of the other institutions that are so important in our community, disseminate it widely so that we could broaden the individuals and groups who are involved in this whole discussion and fight against HIV and AIDS?

Mr. TOWNS. No doubt about it. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think that we need to involve our churches in this battle. Not only our churches but also our 501(c)(3) organizations. They need to be involved in this as well because we are talking about life and death. And the fact is that if we get involved, I think that we can begin to turn this around.

Right now we are not winning the battle, and I think that we need to win. In order to win, we have to get all the soldiers involved. And I think that the church is crucial. They need to be involved in this issue. So we need to try to get the word out to them and hope that they will respond in a major kind of way because people are dying that really don't have to die if we get this information to them.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNS. I would be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I am delighted that we have a chance to have this colloquy because I would like to highlight the importance of getting tested.

Congresswoman WATERS and I and others last year, actually approximately 16 Members of Congress, were tested publicly. The importance of members of the clergy and Members of Congress and leadership getting tested, showing our communities that it is the correct thing to do, there is a large percentage of individuals living with HIV and AIDS who don't know they have the virus, and in fact, once tested the results are confidential.

There are several tests, but one is a swab test where you get the results

back within 20 to 30 minutes. Again, the results of those tests are very confidential. It is important that ministers and, Mr. TOWNS, you are a great member of the clergy as well as a Member of Congress, and your voice in this entire effort is so important because once people eliminate that fear, then, in fact, they can move forward and get tested and begin to help reduce this pandemic, which is what it is.

So I want to thank you for giving us a chance to talk about this, about getting tested also, because this is one way you actually can have a reduction of the incidences of HIV and AIDS very quickly.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say that I want to salute both of you. Ron Dellums, when he was here in the Congress, Ron, of course, was really in the forefront of the fighting to get additional resources for AIDS patients and AIDS victims, and, of course, now you have picked it up and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS from California. I want to let you know that we really appreciate your voices, and I want to let you know that I look forward to working with you in the days and months ahead to make certain that we get this information out to people that need to have this information because a lot of people don't know, and if they don't know, then they don't do anything about it. So I want to say to you thank you for helping to get the word out to make certain that they do know. I want to thank both of you for your hard work in this effort.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 35 supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness. Established in February 2000, National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness and Information Day, NBHAAD, is an annual observance day that was created to raise awareness among African-Americans about HIV/AIDS and its devastating impact on African-American communities.

There is no question that we must continue to mount a massive campaign to support the mission of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, NBHAAD to build the capacity and increase awareness, participation and support for HIV prevention, care and treatment among African-Americans. February 7, 2007 marks the seventh year of this annual event. The day is part of a national mobilization effort to get African-Americans to learn more about the threat posed by the disease, get tested, get treated and make a commitment to fight HIV/AIDS. For this day and everyday forward we must raise our voices to volumes that can be heard across the globe. Unfortunately, for too long we have settled for surviving our tragic losses in silence. But listen to these screaming statistics:

According to CDC estimates, at the end of 2005, African-Americans accounted for 44 percent of all individuals living with AIDS—188,000.

In 2005, African-Americans accounted for nearly 50 percent of all new HIV infections, despite representing only about 12.3 percent of the population, according to the 2000 Census.

In 2005, African-American women represented 66 percent of all new HIV/AIDS cases among women, and were 25 times more likely to be infected than White women.

CDC estimates that 73 percent of all children born to HIV infected mothers in 2004 were African-American.

With an estimated 38.6 million people worldwide living with HIV at the end of 2005, and more than 25 million people having died of AIDS since 1981, NBHAAD serves to remind everyone that action makes a difference in the fight against HIV/AIDS. Let there be no mistake; we are here to acknowledge that AIDS is a deadly enemy against which we must join all our forces to fight and eliminate.

Though I stand here today in recognition of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, Americans should be reminded that HIV/AIDS does not discriminate. With an estimated 1,039,000 to 1,185,000 HIV-positive individuals living in the U.S., and approximately 40,000 new infections occurring every year, the U.S., like other nations around the world is deeply affected by HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that AIDS is devastating the African-American community. As of February 2006, African-Americans represented only 13 percent of the U.S. population, but accounted for 40 percent of the 944,306 AIDS cases diagnosed since the start of the epidemic and approximately half, 49 percent of the 42,514 cases diagnosed in 2004 alone. African-Americans also account for half of new HIV/AIDS diagnoses in the 35 States/areas with confidential name-based reporting.

The AIDS case rate per 100,000 population among African-American adults/adolescents was nearly 10.2 times that of Whites in 2004. African-Americans accounted for 55 percent of deaths due to HIV in 2002 and their survival time after an AIDS diagnosis is lower on average than it is for other racial/ethnic groups. HIV was the third leading cause of death for African-Americans, ages 25–34, in 2002 compared to the sixth leading cause of death for Whites and Latinos in this age group.

African-American women and children have been disproportionately victimized by this deadly disease. African-American women account for the majority of new AIDS cases among women—67 percent in 2004; White women account for 17 percent and Latinas 15 percent. Among African-Americans, African-American women represent more than a third, 36 percent of AIDS cases diagnosed in 2004. Although African-American teens, ages 13–19, represent only 15 percent of U.S. teenagers, they accounted for 66 percent of new AIDS cases reported among teens in 2003. We must continue to forge a tough fight to reverse all of these costly trends.

Mr. Speaker, combating this crisis will take a team effort. All of us—researchers, legislators, clergy, community organizers and activists and others—must work tirelessly to find solutions and to help so that our work will bring forth a wealth of wisdom that creates a climate of compassionate care and healing.

Let us go forth as warriors, renewed in our commitment to stand in solidarity with everyone who has been affected by HIV and AIDS, and let us be encouraged in our efforts to comfort the afflicted and confront the passiveness of so many who contribute to the spread of this deadly disease; and let us be

emboldened to speak out in our own communities so that silence may no more mask the ringing alarms of rapidly rising infection rates.

I hope that our inner human spirits will move us to a place and time where we no longer turn our heads and close our eyes to those communities who need our help the most. We must find the strength to look past our fears and find compassion to create a world where no man, woman or child is confronted with the perils of this current AIDS crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the goal of NBHAAD to motivate African-Americans to get tested and know their HIV status; get educated about the transmission modes of HIV/AIDS; get involved in their local community; and get treated if they are currently living with HIV or are newly diagnosed.

Let me take this moment to recognize a major inspiration for NBHAAD, Mr. Louis E. Harris, 1947–2003, who passed away in January 2003 due to complications with bladder cancer. Mr. Harris served as the executive director of Concerned Black Men, Inc. of Philadelphia during NBHAAD's conception. His work and dedication will be missed along with his kind and warm words of encouragement. It is hoped that NBHAAD will continue to build the capacity of community based organizations, CBOs, as well as community stake holders to increase awareness, prevent HIV and get those who need treatment into care. I applaud the efforts of NBHAAD advocates to:

1. Increase reporting of accurate up-to-date statistics on the HIV and AIDS epidemic among Blacks by electronic and print media, radio and television stations;
2. Increase collaboration and sharing of resources at the national and local levels;
3. Increase resources and support including capacity building assistance for health departments, community based organizations and stakeholders serving Black communities; and
4. Increase the number of Blacks at high risk for acquiring HIV that receive HIV counseling, testing and other HIV prevention, treatment and care services.

Observance of this day provides an opportunity for governments, national AIDS programs, churches, community organizations and individuals to demonstrate the importance of the fight against HIV/AIDS. Though funding for research is an important key to tackling the tragic devastation of HIV/AIDS in our communities, I realize that providing funding for research alone is simply not sufficient to eradicate the high rates of HIV/AIDS cases within the African-American community. We must also provide funding for prevention and education.

Billions and billions of private and Federal dollars have been poured into drug research and development to treat and “manage” infections, but the complex life cycle and insane mutation rates of HIV strains have made these efforts futile in the fight to remove HIV/AIDS as a global public health threat. Though the drugs we currently have are effective in managing infections and reducing mortality by slowing the progression to AIDS in an individual, they do little to reduce disease prevalence and prevent new infections.

A thousand drugs that “manage” infection will not suffice. We can make and market drugs until we have 42 million individually tailored treatments, but so long as a quarter of those infected remain detached from the importance of testing, we have no chance of

ending or even “managing” the pandemic. Currently, the only cure we have for HIV/AIDS is prevention. While we must continue efforts to develop advanced treatment options, it is crucial that those efforts are accompanied by dramatic increases in public health education and prevention measures.

During my time in office, I have fully and eagerly supported all legislation that has given increased attention to HIV/AIDS, including the Ryan White CARE Act, which is currently slated to receive about \$2.2 billion in funding for FY2007. I have supported legislation to reauthorize funding for community health centers—H.R. 5573, Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006—including the Montrose and Fourth Ward clinics right here in Houston, as well as supported legislation to provide more nurses for the poor urban communities in which many of these centers are located—H.R. 1285, Nursing Relief Act for Disadvantaged Areas. I have also supported and introduced legislation aimed to better educate our children—H.R. 2553, Responsible Education About Life Act in 2006) and eliminate health disparities—H.R. 3561, Healthcare Equality and Accountability Act and the Good Medicine Cultural Competency Act in 2003, H.R. 90. And I will continue to endorse and push for similar legislation.

Twenty-five years from now, I hope that we will not be discussing data on prevalence and mortality, but rather how our sustained efforts at elimination have come into fruition. But if we are ever to have that discussion, there are a number of actions that we must take right now. We must continue research on treatments and antiretroviral therapies, as well as pursue a cure. And we absolutely have to ensure that everyone who needs treatment receives it. In order to do this, we have to increase awareness of testing, access to testing, and the accuracy of testing. How can we stop this pandemic if we are unable to track it?

We must also increase funding for local health departments and community health clinics, as well as fully fund the Ryan White CARE Act. Lastly, but perhaps most importantly, it is imperative that we work to increase funding for HIV prevention and education, so that our children will be equipped with sufficient and appropriate knowledge of this growing threat within our communities, especially within our Black communities and among Black women. If Blacks are 11 times as likely to acquire infection, then we need to make 11 times the effort to educate. And we need to apply similar efforts in every community until HIV/AIDS becomes a memory. If not, our friends and family will be memories instead.

I would like to take a moment to applaud the enormous efforts of community volunteers from churches and other organizations which have done commendable work across our Nation. I think everyone can learn something from their selflessness and their will to serve their communities. We need more people to follow their lead. We do not have time for excuses or hesitation. We have the passion and dedication, and we are securing more and more resources. It is up to us to get the resources where they are needed. I know a lot of people don't want to take things seriously until it hits home; until a brother or a sister or a son or a daughter falls victim to our blithe and ignorance. We cannot afford nor do we want to bear that cost; however, if we continue

to sit by and wait for the next person to act, we may all have brothers and sisters and sons and daughters with HIV/AIDS.

We need to be proactive and act with unprecedented urgency. Now is not the time to get comfortable. If you feel like you're getting comfortable, just remember that there is a face to every number, to every statistic. This is not a hypothetical or theoretical or metaphysical phenomenon. There are no imaginary numbers in this equation; only real people. And I am confident that we can protect and save real people with increased efforts.

I will continue work tirelessly to keep the spotlight on this dark disease that is devastating many people in the African-American community, United States and around the world. My hope is that all of our efforts will lead to the elimination of HIV and AIDS not just from the African-American community but from every community. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 35 supporting the goals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of H. Con. Res. 35, in support of the seventh anniversary of goals and ideals of National Blacks HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

This concurrent resolution will raise awareness about HIV/AIDS within the African American community and will point out the devastating impact this disease has on African American communities.

This day is a part of a national mobilization effort to get African Americans to learn about the threat that HIV/AIDS poses to the African American community.

The National Blacks HIV/AIDS Awareness Day is a day to remember those infected and affected by this epidemic. Since the beginning of this epidemic, 42 percent of all deaths occurred within the African American community.

Dallas accounts for one of the top 26 cities where African Americans are disproportionately impacted by AIDS.

From 2000 to 2005, more than half of new HIV/AIDS diagnoses in 32 states were among African Americans, although African Americans represented only 13 percent of the population of those states.

In 2004, black men had the highest rate of HIV/AIDS diagnoses of any racial/ethnic population, approximately seven times the rate among white men and twice the rate among black women.

Black women are also severely impacted by HIV. During 2000–2004, approximately 69 percent of women who had HIV/AIDS diagnosed were black.

We must take the lead in supporting National Blacks HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. We must continue to educate/prevent and care for our members who have been affected by this atrocious epidemic and continue the fight against HIV/AIDS.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this important resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

HIV/AIDS is one of the worst epidemics we have ever seen in the United States. More than 900,000 cases of AIDS have been reported in the US since 1981. Nearly 1,000,000 people may be infected with HIV, one quarter of them is unaware about their infection.

In my hometown New York City more than 100,000 people are living with HIV. Approximately 1 in 70 New Yorkers is infected with HIV.

Statistics just help us to number the dimension of HIV/AIDS in our country but every single number reflects more, reflects the life and the living with HIV/AIDS of one of our fellow citizen.

While we are far away from curing AIDS, science has made enormous progress.

Today, we can say that early and correct treatment enables people to live longer and to live with HIV/AIDS more as a chronic illness than a definitive death sentence.

Even with these opportunities, we face new challenges.

The African-American community is disproportionately affected by HIV/AIDS.

According to the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, black women are 9 times more likely to die of AIDS than white women; black men in New York City are 6 times more likely to die of AIDS than white men.

This is another sign of the massive health disparities that exist in our nation. We need to work together, all of us in Congress, to address and eliminate the disparities in health and health care between the people of our country.

That is why I strongly support the National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, celebrated on February, 7.

The goal of this day is clear to all of us: We have to fight against both the stigma and the spread of HIV/AIDS in our African-American community, and I would add, in every American community.

Groups like Bronx AIDS Services and the AIDS Center of Queens County do excellent work, but we in Washington need to back them up with the right support.

This includes full funding for Ryan White, ensuring the housing needs of those afflicted are met through the HOPWA program, and eliminating the stigmas attached to the illness.

We also need to allow each community group to speak to and target those at greatest risk of exposure in the most effective ways possible.

But overall, we know that educating about and against HIV/AIDS, engaging in safe sex, and getting tested are the main elements of comprehensive prevention efforts.

Closing, I like to emphasize the importance of the National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day by quoting its goals:

Get tested to know about your HIV status.

Get educated about HIV/AIDS.

Get involved in your local community.

Get treated if you are currently living with HIV.

It is these missions that we must work to achieve.

I thank the gentle lady for her resolution.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reports have been coming out since the HIV/AIDS epidemic first surfaced in the United States more than 25 years ago and every year, they have—and continue to—report the same findings: Since the beginning, this epidemic has had—and continues to have—a disproportionate and detrimental impact on the African American community. In fact, over time, the impact of the epidemic on the Black community has gotten worse, leaving African Americans—more so than any other population group—hardest hit by HIV/AIDS at every stage of life.

Today, African Americans—who are represented in about 13 percent of the U.S. popu-

lation—account for more than 40 percent of all individuals currently living with AIDS and nearly 50 percent of all new HIV infections. More than 7 in 10 children born to women infected with HIV are African American and the AIDS case rate among African Americans is nearly ten times higher than that among whites. Additionally, African Americans account for 40 percent of all AIDS deaths. In fact, African Americans are 7 times more likely than whites to die from an AIDS-related causes.

Particularly affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic are African American women, who are represented in roughly 7 in 10 new AIDS cases among women and who are an estimated 25 times more likely than white women to be infected with HIV. In fact, in 2002, AIDS was the leading cause of death for African-American women, aged 25 to 34 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, this epidemic has and continues to kill African Americans during their most productive life years, robbing them of their opportunity to follow their dreams, pursue their destinies and contribute not only to their communities, but to our society. As a physician who has seen—first hand—what the HIV/AIDS epidemic does not only to the people it afflicts, but to their families, friends, and communities, and given the incidence and prevalence numbers, the unnecessary, often-premature deaths, and the unbelievable toll that this epidemic has in the African American community, I feel strongly that the time has come for us to do more. We can do more, and we must.

I, therefore, rise today in strong and unwavering support of H. Con. Res. 35, which supports the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. Recognized on February 7, National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day—which reaches its 7th anniversary of being observed this year—is a critically important day because it raises awareness about the disastrous impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on the African American community.

We all should support H. Con. Res. 35 and on February 7, 2007, we should observe National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day in a manner that is consistent with its intent. We should publicize the importance of being informed about HIV/AIDS and about ones HIV status, and we should encourage our friends in the media to deliver messages stressing the importance of getting educated, involved and tested. Additionally, I urge all of my colleagues, on February 7 and beyond, to: encourage de-stigmatization of the disease among African Americans; expand voluntary testing because knowledge is power; work to reduce the social determinants of health—such as poverty and lack of education—that put people at greater risk for HIV infection; ensure that incarcerated and ex-offender populations have access to adequate and realistic HIV prevention methods, receive voluntary and confidential HIV testing and, if necessary, are rolled into adequate HIV/AIDS-related care, treatment and services; expand access to culturally appropriate substance abuse prevention programs, as well as to drug treatment and recovery services; and create the necessary political to fully fund the Minority AIDS Initiative in the amount of at least \$610 million in order to target needed funds to build capacity in minority communities to give those who are hardest hit by HIV/AIDS a fighting chance.

Mr. Speaker, our new political climate has brought us a new day. As the Chair of the

CBC Health Braintrust, I am asking all of my colleagues to seize that new day and to support H. Con. Res. 35, to observe National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day on February 7 and to use it as a day to commit to act with cognizance of the impact that this epidemic has on the African American community.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day and to show my support for its goals and ideals.

Domestically, the HIV/AIDS crisis in the United States continues to have a disproportionate impact on African Americans in terms of illness, survival times, and deaths. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, HIV/AIDS is a leading cause of death for African Americans.

Each year, the 7th of February marks National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, a national community-wide effort to build capacity and increase awareness of HIV prevention, testing, education, treatment, and support among African Americans, who are at greater risk of HIV/AIDS infection. National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day reminds us of the uneven effect of HIV/AIDS on African Americans and provides us with an opportunity to renew our commitment to the promise of finding a cure.

We must do more than just bring attention to this epidemic. We must also remain vigilantly committed to prevention programs and to finding a cure for HIV/AIDS.

I invite people throughout the Nation to learn more about HIV/AIDS. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

□ 1515

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 35, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH REGARD TO COTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-11)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed: *To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides

for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire are to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2007.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and attacks against international peacekeeping forces leading to fatalities. This situation poses a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 2007.

REPORT ON MATTERS RELATING TO INTERDICTION OF AIRCRAFT ENGAGED IN ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-12)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with the authorities relating to official immunity in the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking (Public Law 107-108, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2291-4), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, I am providing a report prepared by my Administration. This report includes matters relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 2007.

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-3)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States;

which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

America is a country of opportunity. Throughout our history, we have overcome great challenges by drawing on the strength, creativity, and resolve of the American people. We have adapted to change—while maintaining our commitment to freedom and an open economy.

Our economy is strong and growing. Federal revenues are robust, and we have made significant progress in reducing the deficit. The Budget I am presenting achieves balance by 2012. My formula for a balanced budget reflects the priorities of our country at this moment in its history: protecting the homeland and fighting terrorism, keeping the economy strong with low taxes, and keeping spending under control while making Federal programs more effective.

As Commander in Chief, my highest priority is the security of our Nation. My Budget invests substantial resources to fight the Global War on Terror, and ensure our homeland is protected from those who would do us harm. We will transform our military to meet the new threats of the 21st Century and provide the brave men and women on the front lines with the resources they need to be successful in this decisive ideological struggle. The Budget will support a new strategy in Iraq that demands more from Iraq's elected government, and gives American forces in Iraq the reinforcements they need to complete their mission. And it will continue to provide the tools necessary to keep America safe by detecting, disrupting, and dismantling terrorist plots.

The U.S. economy is strong. Since August 2003, 7.2 million jobs have been created. Unemployment is low. Wages are growing. Productivity is strong. Inflation and interest rates are low. And we have seen tremendous progress despite a series of challenges, including recession, the terrorist attacks of 2001, corporate scandals, the costliest natural disaster in our Nation's history, energy price spikes, and a temporary slowdown in the housing sector. The resilience of our economy is a tribute to America's workers and entrepreneurs. And well-timed, pro-growth tax policies helped create the right climate for innovation and entrepreneurship.

The Federal deficit is declining and on a path to elimination. Last year, we successfully met our goal of cutting the deficit in half, three years ahead of schedule. This occurred because tax relief helped the economy to recover and grow, resulting in record-high revenues while we restrained non-security discretionary spending. With continued strong economic growth and spending discipline, we are now positioned to balance the budget by 2012, while providing for our national security and making tax relief permanent.

My Budget proposes to keep non-security discretionary spending below inflation for the next five years. My Budget also reforms projects and spending that don't get the job done. We need lawmakers' support to help us accomplish this goal—including reforms that will improve the Congressional budget process.

To bolster public confidence in the Government's ability to manage taxpayers' money successfully, Congress should adopt earmark reform. The earmark process should be made more transparent, ending the practice of concealing earmarks in so-called report language never included in legislation. The number and cost of earmarks should be cut by at least half by the end of this session. I have also called on Congress to adopt the legislative line-item veto, which gives the Legislative and Executive Branches a tool to help eliminate wasteful spending. These common-sense reforms will help prevent billions of taxpayers' dollars from being spent on unnecessary and unjustified projects.

To keep this economy strong we must take on the challenge of entitlements. Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are commitments of conscience, and so it is our duty to keep them permanently sound. If we do not address this challenge, we will one day leave our children with three bad options: huge tax increases, huge deficits, or huge and immediate cuts in benefits.

In the short term, my Budget works to slow the rate of growth of these programs, saving \$96 billion over five years. This Administration is also actively working with Congress to comprehensively reform and improve these vital programs so they will be strong for the next generations of Americans.

I am optimistic about the future of our country. We are an entrepreneurial and hard-working Nation. And while we face great challenges, we enjoy great opportunities. This Budget reflects our highest priorities while reducing the deficit and achieving a balanced budget by 2012. I am confident that this approach will help make our country more secure and more prosperous.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
February 5, 2007.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to 2 D.S.C. 88b-3, amended by Section 2 of the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007, I am pleased to appoint the Honorable Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida to the Page Board. Ms. Brown-Waite has expressed her interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill her request.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 94, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 35, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CONSUMER PROTECTION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 94, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 94, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie	Bean	Boswell
Ackerman	Becerra	Boustany
Aderholt	Berkley	Boyd (FL)
Akin	Berman	Brady (PA)
Alexander	Berry	Brady (TX)
Allen	Biggert	Brale (IA)
Altmire	Bilbray	Brown (SC)
Andrews	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Arcuri	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Buchanan
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Bachus	Blackburn	Calvert
Baird	Blumenauer	Camp (MI)
Baker	Blunt	Campbell (CA)
Baldwin	Boehner	Cannon
Barrett (SC)	Bonner	Cantor
Barrow	Bono	Capito
Bartlett (MD)	Boozman	Capps
Barton (TX)	Boren	Capuano

Cardoza	Hill	Millender-
Carnahan	Hinchee	McDonald
Carney	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Carter	Hirono	Miller (MI)
Castle	Hobson	Miller (NC)
Castor	Hodes	Miller, Gary
Chabot	Hoekstra	Mitchell
Chandler	Holden	Mollohan
Clarke	Holt	Moore (KS)
Clay	Honda	Moore (WI)
Cleaver	Hooley	Moran (KS)
Clyburn	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Cohen	Hulshof	Murphy (CT)
Cole (OK)	Hunter	Murphy, Patrick
Conyers	Inglis (SC)	Murphy, Tim
Cooper	Inslee	Musgrave
Costa	Israel	Nadler
Costello	Issa	Napolitano
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Neugebauer
Cramer	Jackson-Lee	Nunes
Crenshaw	(TX)	Oberstar
Crowley	Jefferson	Obey
Cuellar	Jindal	Olver
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Davis (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Paul
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Pearce
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Pence
Davis, David	Kagen	Perlmutter
Davis, Lincoln	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Davis, Tom	Kaptur	Petri
Deal (GA)	Keller	Pickering
DeFazio	Kildee	Pitts
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Platts
Delahunt	Kind	Poe
DeLauro	King (IA)	Pomeroy
Dent	King (NY)	Porter
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Putnam
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Radanovich
Dingell	Kline (MN)	Rahall
Doggett	Knollenberg	Ramstad
Donnelly	Kucinich	Rangel
Doyle	Kuhl (NY)	Regula
Drake	LaHood	Rehberg
Dreier	Lamborn	Reichert
Duncan	Lampson	Renzi
Edwards	Langevin	Reyes
Ehlers	Lantos	Reynolds
Ellison	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Ellsworth	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Emanuel	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Emerson	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Engel	Lee	Rohrabacher
Eshoo	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Roskam
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Ross
Fallin	Linder	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Fattah	LoBiondo	Rush
Feeney	Loebsack	Ryan (OH)
Ferguson	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (WI)
Filner	Lowe	Salazar
Flake	Lucas	Sali
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Sanchez, Linda
Fossella	E.	T.
Fox	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Frank (MA)	Mack	Sarbanes
Franks (AZ)	Mahoney (FL)	Saxton
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Gallely	Manzullo	Schiff
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Schmidt
Gerlach	Markey	Schwartz
Giffords	Marshall	Scott (GA)
Gilchrest	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Gillibrand	Matsui	Sensenbrenner
Gillmor	McCarthy (CA)	Serrano
Gingrey	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions
Gohmert	McCaul (TX)	Sestak
Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)	Shadegg
Goodlatte	McCotter	Shays
Gordon	McCrary	Shea-Porter
Granger	McDermott	Sherman
Graves	McGovern	Shuler
Green, Al	McHenry	Shuster
Gutierrez	McHugh	Simpson
Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Sires
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Skelton
Hare	McMorris	Slaughter
Harman	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Hayes	Meehan	Smith (WA)
Heller	Heller	Snyder
Hensarling	Meeke (FL)	Solis
Herger	Meeke (NY)	Souder
Herse	Melancon	Space
Herseth	Mica	Spratt
Higgins	Michaud	

Stark	Turner	Weiner
Stearns	Udall (NM)	Welch (VT)
Stupak	Upton	Weldon (FL)
Sullivan	Van Hollen	Weller
Sutton	Velazquez	Westmoreland
Tancredo	Visclosky	Whitfield
Tanner	Walberg	Wicker
Tauscher	Walden (OR)	Wilson (NM)
Taylor	Walsh (NY)	Wilson (OH)
Terry	Walz (MN)	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (CA)	Wamp	Wolf
Thompson (MS)	Wasserman	Woolsey
Thornberry	Schultz	Wu
Tiahrt	Waters	Wynn
Tiberi	Watson	Yarmuth
Tierney	Watt	Young (AK)
Towns	Waxman	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Boucher	English (PA)	Neal (MA)
Boyda (KS)	Fortenberry	Norwood
Brown, Corrine	Goode	Ortiz
Burton (IN)	Green, Gene	Payne
Butterfield	Grijalva	Peterson (PA)
Buyer	Hastert	Price (NC)
Carson	Johnson (IL)	Pryce (OH)
Coble	Kennedy	Rothman
Conaway	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Cubin	Miller, George	Shimkus
Davis, Jo Ann	Murtha	Udall (CO)
Doolittle	Myrick	Wexler

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL BLACK HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 35, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 35, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—396

Abercrombie	Biggert	Burgess
Ackerman	Bilbray	Calvert
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Camp (MI)
Akin	Bishop (GA)	Campbell (CA)
Alexander	Bishop (NY)	Cantor
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Capito
Altmire	Blackburn	Capps
Andrews	Blumenauer	Capuano
Arcuri	Blunt	Cardoza
Baca	Boehner	Carnahan
Bachmann	Bonner	Carney
Bachus	Bono	Carter
Baird	Boozman	Castle
Baker	Boren	Castor
Baldwin	Boswell	Chabot
Barrett (SC)	Boustany	Chandler
Barrow	Boyd (FL)	Clarke
Bartlett (MD)	Brady (PA)	Clay
Barton (TX)	Brady (TX)	Cleaver
Bean	Brale (IA)	Clyburn
Becerra	Brown (SC)	Cohen
Berkley	Brown-Waite,	Cole (OK)
Berman	Ginny	Conyers
Berry	Buchanan	Cooper

Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummins
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hersth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel

Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
Hill
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Nadler

Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns

Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield

Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—38

Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Cannon
Carson
Coble
Conaway
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Doolittle

English (PA)
Fortenberry
Goode
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastert
Hunter
Johnson (IL)
Kennedy
Lewis (GA)
Miller, George
Murtha
Myrick

Neal (MA)
Norwood
Ortiz
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rothman
Royce
Shimkus
Udall (CO)
Wexler

□ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and not able to record my rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 74 and 75.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, unfortunately today, February 5, 2007, due to major delays in my airline options, I was unable to make it into Washington, DC in time to cast my votes on H. Res. 94 and H. Con. Res. 35.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 74 on final passage of H. Res. 94, as amended, Supporting the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week, I would have voted "yea."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 75 on final passage of H. Con. Res. 35, as amended, Supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, I would have voted "yea."

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the budget the President unveiled today fails to restore fiscal responsibility and meet the budget priorities of a majority of Americans. Critical to my district is county and rural school funding. We have a half-hearted proposal, the same one rejected out of hand by the Senate last year. Not only half-hearted, but half-funded. It would be only half the money needed to meet the obligations of the Federal Government over the next 5 years.

In addition, it is speculatively funded with controversial land sales, while he diverts a stable force of funding from oil and gas revenues to pet projects and tax cuts for rich people.

Despite all that, he fails to deliver on his promise of a balanced budget, and he borrows \$1.5 trillion from Social Security and Medicare, jeopardizing those programs. His budget is full of holes like Swiss cheese, but it smells like Limburger.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES WASCO COUNTY ROADS, SCHOOLS, AND POLICE PROTECTION

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act amounts to a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across our country. For Wasco County, Oregon, this means cutting core school programs, removing the one detective from the drug enforcement task force, and losing 40 percent of the road department employees.

In their own words, Sheriff Rick Eisland says, "Losing these funds will leave a huge void in our fight against illegal drug activity and we would also be forced to cut our contract with the Forest Service to patrol in the Federal lands."

School Superintendent Candy Armstrong says, "Rural schools have nowhere else to cut except core services. Lost funding represents the entire high school math program."

And Judge Dan Ericksen says, "Roads are the lifeblood of rural America, and losing this funding is the equivalent of applying tourniquets to our arms and legs. We will no longer be able to function."

My colleagues, Congress must keep the Federal Government's word to timber communities and pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

NATIONAL BLACK HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Dr. CHRISTENSEN, Congresswoman WATERS, Congressman TOWNS, Congresswoman KILPATRICK, and many of my other colleagues in support of the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

It is unbelievable, Madam Speaker, to hear the numbers that are escalating now with HIV/AIDS in the African American community, which accounted for nearly 50 percent of all new

HIV infections despite representing only about 12.3 percent of the population.

The CDC estimates that in 2005, African American women accounted for over 66 percent of all HIV/AIDS cases among women and were 25 times more likely to be infected than white women.

Drastic, drastic decisions have to be made. We may be able to address this question by educating, but I do believe we must confront the question of testing. In our high schools today we are finding that there are those who are proving to be HIV positive as early as ninth grade and as early as middle school. We have to address this question. I ask my colleagues to wake up and confront this crisis in America.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF THE THIRD GRADE CLASS AT BROOK FOREST ELEMENTARY

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, this past Friday I had the privilege of visiting the third grade classes at Brook Forest Elementary School in Oak Brook, Illinois. They gave me a wonderful and informative presentation on current efforts to protect the Mexican Grey Wolf and save it from extinction. I was impressed by their thorough research and their dedication to protecting this endangered species. They felt so strongly about it that they held a bake sale and raised \$448 to donate to Chicago's Brookfield Zoo for its wolf breeding program.

I commend their teachers for their creativity in planning such a comprehensive and engaging curriculum. They combined lessons in science, social studies, public speaking, and environmental and civic responsibility into one challenging and complete unit.

I want to offer a big "thank you" to my new friends at Brook Forest for teaching me so much. I join them in their noble cause, and will continue to work in Congress to protect endangered species like the Mexican Grey Wolf.

HEROIC ACT OF SPC GURLEY

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

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to another great American hero. On July 15, 2006, Specialist Nathan Gurley of Fayetteville, North Carolina, though wounded, fiercely pulled Specialist Josh Eckley of Little York, Illinois and another crew member from a military vehicle that had been hit by an IED while on combat logistics control in Al Anbar Province in Iraq. For his heroism, Specialist Gurley was awarded a Bronze Star with Valor and the Purple Heart.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the 17th District of Illinois, I thank Specialist Gurley for saving the life of one of our beloved sons. Specialist Gurley and Specialist Eckley represent the best the United States military has to offer in Iraq. These two brave soldiers risked their lives to fight an unrelenting insurgency in one of our country's most dangerous areas. For their service, the American people will be forever indebted.

Madam Speaker, brave men such as Specialist Gurley and Specialist Eckley are hard to come by, so for their sake and for all those continuing to fight, it is my sincere hope that at the conclusion of this war their sacrifice will not be in vain.

□ 1915

BENEFITS OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal ran an editorial on the benefits of trade agreements. It is clear that additional trade agreements are an essential part of our economic future if we want high-quality, high-paying jobs for ourselves and our children.

Several years ago, I formed the Economic Competitive Caucus to reveal the barriers, created by Congress, that keep us from bringing jobs back to America.

Lack of free trade agreements is one of those barriers, and it is clear that from the information from the U.S. Trade Representative's office that our trade has increased 26 percent with 10 of the countries that we signed trade agreements with since 2001, compared with the rest of the world, which has only grown by 13 percent. This success has meant more union jobs at U.S. manufacturers like Caterpillar, Boeing, and Cessna.

Madam Speaker, I believe America would have a stronger economy and more high-quality, high-paying jobs, including more union jobs, if Congress had approved 40 trade pacts like the Chilean Government has over the past 15 years.

Madam Speaker, let us tear down the trade barriers for American working families.

END THE RHETORIC

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, in the Senate right now, there is a piece of nonbinding legislation that disapproves of the troop surge or the Bush Doctrine. Now, it is nonbinding.

What I find offensive, when we have troops on the ground in combat, is you

have a bunch of self-proclaimed moralist Senators saying that we should not do this, and so what they want is a nonbinding legislation.

Well, if they really feel like this idea is a bad idea and it imperils Americans, then they should follow their conviction and introduce real legislation. After all, they do carry the impact of changing the law since they are the U.S. Senate.

I think it is silly to have an extra-curricular, intramural exercise. They should bring real legislation to the floor. I am hoping that Members of the House will do that.

There are a lot of critics of the war in the House. Well, it is time to tone down the rhetoric and beef up the legislation, whether you want immediate withdrawal, phased-down withdrawal, a surge, maybe a bigger surge than the President.

We should be having real conversations in Washington. The election is over.

MEMBERS NOT ABOVE THE LAW

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, over the last 2 years Americans have heard story after story about what my constituents very frequently call, "Members Gone Wild."

Duke Cunningham, James Traficant, Bob Ney, Frank Ballance have all been convicted of crimes and are serving time in prison. These are all former Members of Congress and hail from both sides of the partisan divide.

Madam Speaker, constituents are fed up with this behavior. They expect their elected representatives to be held to a higher standard.

When the FBI gets an authorized search warrant and enters the office of a sitting Member accused of taking bribes, it just makes sense to constituents and to me that Congress should not interfere.

Last week, I reintroduced my legislation, H. Res. 88, a resolution that declares to our constituents that we agree with them: Members of Congress should not be above the law.

Listen up, America. Turning a blind eye to alleged indiscretions by elected Members of Congress will no longer pass muster.

I urge my colleagues to join with others who are cosponsoring this resolution.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHARACTER COUNTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend and highlight the wonderful education framework called Character Counts.

I am very proud of the Santa Barbara YMCA and the Santa Barbara county education programs in my district that support this important framework which promotes civil responsibility through the following six pillars.

The first pillar is called "trustworthiness." This program teaches children and young adults the value of reliability, honesty, loyalty and the courage to do the right thing. It is followed in sequence by a pillar named "respect."

Respect encourages students to treat others with the same kind of tolerance of differences and consideration that they would wish to be treated themselves. It is never too early to begin to teach that framework that is centered around respect for one's self and respect for others.

The third pillar in the framework called Character Counts is titled "responsibility," which teaches young people to consider the consequences of their actions and to be accountable for the choices that they make. Again, the earlier we can begin to both model and teach ways to make choices which lead to good consequences for a young person's life, the better the results can be for them and for those with whom they associate.

Then we have the pillar of Character Counts that is labeled "fairness," and that is easy to see but it is hard to teach. It is taught by repetition on a playground, in a classroom, by following rules and understanding why rules are established, to be open-minded and not to take advantage of others, to learn to wait for one's turn.

Then we come to the pillar of responsibility called "caring." Caring can be described in so many ways, but again, we learn to be caring individuals by seeing how others care for us and we begin to experience compassion, gratitude, forgiveness. These are behaviors that we want to repeat with young people over and over again until they become second-hand.

Finally, we come to the sixth pillar in this framework called Character Counts which is labeled "citizenship." Here we teach students the merits of getting involved in making a community an environment, a place where they would want to live and be themselves and where they can see the benefits for those they care about.

Madam Speaker, last October I had a chance to see Character Counts firsthand in my district on two separate occasions. I attended the Fifth Annual Civic Mission of Schools Forum sponsored by the county schools office. I also was part of the Santa Barbara YMCA Character Counts event where

each of these promoted these six pillars.

So I want to particularly thank Art Fisher for his dedication and his tireless work toward civic education at the Santa Barbara County Education Office. I know that the work he is doing to teach our children the value of responsibility, respect, honesty and compassion is remarkable.

I want also to highlight the work of Aaron Martinez at the Santa Barbara YMCA in promoting the very same program for children as young as 2 and 3 years old, stretching all the way through every age of life, which is what the YMCA is all about.

By promoting these six pillars of Character Counts, the YMCA gives our children, our young people, lifelong tools for success, and of course, our children will be the leaders of tomorrow.

So these lessons are invaluable, not just for them and for their day-to-day life but also for the future of our community and our society.

I told these young people as I listened to them describe these pillars that from what I have seen in Washington, D.C., and in the House of Representatives in the Congress, these principles of trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship are absolutely necessary for making decisions affecting their lives and should be important for us to model here in the United States Congress ourselves.

I told them that I could envision these six pillars here on the floor of the House of Representatives, that we would say to ourselves every day that just as we want to teach these values to our young people we want to model them here.

We need to set the example in our own House to remind our children that character does count.

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

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

HONORING DEL REEVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to a proud son of Sparta, North Carolina, country singer and Grand Ole Opry legend, Del Reeves. Del Reeves passed away after a long and painful battle with emphysema on New Year's Day 2007.

Del Reeves was born in 1933 and was named Franklin Delano Reeves after Franklin Delano Roosevelt who was nominated to be the Democratic Presi-

dential candidate just a few days before his birth. Del was a driven individual who knew at a very young age that he wanted to be a performer.

As a young child, Del spoke of music on the radio and said, "I listened on the radio on Saturday nights and it was the ultimate," referring to the Grand Ole Opry. "As a child, I told my daddy I was going to sing on the Opry one day. He said, 'Yeah, sure you are.' I kept my goal in mind and in '66 we achieved it." He was one of the select members of the Grand Ole Opry for 40 years.

Del achieved that goal and many others. From a very young age, Del would borrow his brothers' instruments, and by the time Del had turned 12 years old, he had become a local radio star on WPAQ in Mount Airy on the "Merry Go Round Show," a program which is still aired today.

□ 1930

But this was just a start for Del Reeves. He went on for years performing and recording numerous hits, including 55 charted hits, two of them in the top 10.

Del was just more than a performer. He attended what is now Appalachian State University and served in the Air Force at Travis Air Force Base, where he wrote a number of his songs.

Del was very dedicated to his hometown and the advancement of others. He started the Del Reeves Scholarship Fund, and for 10 years came back to Alleghany for the "Del Reeves Homecoming," where he held concerts to benefit the scholarship fund he set up.

I am so proud that Del, a Sparta native, was successful in his performing career, yet never lost touch with his roots and never let go of his dedication to helping others. Del had a wonderful career that spanned over 40 years. Beyond being a member of the elite group of the Grand Ole Opry, Del also wrote and performed a number of hit songs and appeared in eight movies, including "Sam Whiskey," starring Bert Reynolds and Clint Walker. Del also worked in television, hosting a TV program called the "Del Reeves' Country Carnival."

Some of Del's greatest hits were "The Belles of the Southern Belle," his first hit in 1963; "The Girl on the Billboard," his number one billboard hit; "Sing a Little Song of Heartache," which he wrote with his wife; and "Looking Through the Windshield," his trucker anthem released in 1965.

Other notable hits that charmed and thrilled country music fans were hits such as "Women Do Funny Things to Me," "Good Time Charlie's," "Be Glad" and the "Philadelphia Fillies." In addition, Del wrote many songs for country legends such as Carl Smith, Roy Drusky, Rose Maddox and Sheb Wooley. Del enjoyed performing lighter material as well as singing ballads, and he reflected on that saying, "Under this clown's face, there's a serious guy . . . I've been clowning as long as I can

remember.” That is what made Del Reeves unique, he was such a multifaceted and talented person.

When asked how he would like to be remembered, he said, “I want to be remembered as a great showman and a nice guy . . . that’s all I could hope for.” That is exactly what Del got, as he certainly is remembered as a nice guy and a great showman.

One of his closest friends, J.D. Higgins, appropriately commented that on New Year’s Day country music lost a tremendous entertainer, and I will miss him greatly. He will be missed by country music fans all over the world. I know he will be missed by family, friends and his numerous admirers. Del was a true inspiration who made his hometown friends and North Carolina proud.

Del Reeves showed his large heart and love for his hometown community by creating a scholarship fund and always coming home to perform in Alleghany. Del’s contributions will serve as a lasting testimony of his tremendous talent, kindness, motivation and delightful personality. We will all miss Del Reeves but know that his timeless music will never be forgotten. He leaves quite a legacy for fans and future generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PAKISTAN REFUSING TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST TALIBAN

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. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to once again call upon Pakistani President Musharraf to take action against Taliban fighters in the western region of his country. President Musharraf continues to deny that Taliban leaders are hiding in Pakistan and that the Taliban are regrouping there, despite numerous international press accounts describing otherwise.

President Musharraf claims that securing the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan is not the sole responsibility of his country. He has admitted that border guards at the tactical level often, quote, turn a blind eye when insurgents cross the border into Pakistan. Yet he still shirks the responsibility his country must take in dealing with the situation.

In Musa Qala, a town in southern Afghanistan where a peace deal last year was signed by NATO-led troops and local elders, government officials confirmed that Taliban forces had taken

partial control of the town in the last few days. The Taliban’s movement into Musa Qala completely disregards the peace agreement and goes against the wishes of the Afghani citizens living in the town.

A similar deal was developed last year in North Waziristan, a region in western Pakistan. As was the case in Musa Qala, Taliban fighters disregarded this deal and have taken partial control of the region. Yet President Musharraf continues to defend this peace deal, despite the fact that the Taliban seemed to have created a stronghold in the region where they can likely plan future offensives against U.S. forces and the citizens of Afghanistan.

If the Pakistani President truly wishes to defend this peace deal, he must take the necessary steps towards eliminating Taliban forces, not only in North Waziristan, but throughout his country. President Musharraf has also scaled back plans to enforce and patrol the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. If Musharraf actually wishes to eliminate Taliban forces in Pakistan, he must work to control this border in a safe and diplomatic manner.

Madam Speaker, last week I came to the floor to highlight H.R. 1, a bill that implements the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission. This is part of our first 100 hours. Included in H.R. 1 is language that would end U.S. military assistance and armed sales licensing to Pakistan unless it is certified that the Islamabad government is, I quote, making all possible efforts to end Taliban activities on Pakistani soil.

It is my hope that once this law is passed, the bill will finally force President Musharraf to crack down on Taliban training camps and leaders within his country. The Bush administration, however, has already signaled its opposition to this language in H.R. 1. Last week, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State John Gastright assured Musharraf’s government that the administration opposed any end to military assistance to Pakistan.

I believe it is absolutely unacceptable for President Bush to oppose these actions against the Pakistani government. The language in H.R. 1 places appropriate pressure on President Musharraf to finally take suitable action against the Taliban forces currently plotting within his country’s borders.

The Bush administration claims that it deals with President Musharraf regardless of his actions, because it believes the Pakistani President is better than the Islamic extremist and anti-Western alternatives in Pakistan.

However, there are Democratic alternatives in Pakistan. According to a recent poll by the International Republican Institute, the second most popular leader in Pakistan is former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. Now, Mrs. Bhutto’s party, the Pakistani People’s Party, has joined with the Muslim

League Party to form the Alliance for Restoration of Democracy and hopes to restore democratic government to Pakistan in the near future.

Madam Speaker, it is essential for the United States to increase pressure on President Musharraf to step up his commitment to eliminate Taliban fighters in training hubs in his country. A significant step towards applying this pressure came with the language in H.R. 1, which we passed in the first 100 hours, ending military aid to Pakistan unless the Pakistani President takes steps towards this goal of routing out Taliban forces. It is imperative for President Bush to realize the importance of the language in this bill and support the provisions outlined in H.R. 1.

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

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

HONORING SARKIS ACOPIAN

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

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a national treasure, Sarkis Acopian. Mr. Acopian died on January 18, 2007, at his home in Palmer Township, Pennsylvania, which is located in my Congressional district near the City of Easton. He was 80 years old.

To say that Mr. Acopian lived a full life does not do justice to the legacy of this extraordinary man. His is, in part, the classic immigrant success story. He was born on December 8, 1926, in Tabriz, Iran, to Armenian parents. He came to this country in 1945 to study engineering at Lafayette College in Easton, Pennsylvania. While here, Mr. Acopian was drafted into the United States Army. After completing his military service, Mr. Acopian returned to Lafayette, where he graduated with a Bachelor of Science Degree in mechanical engineering in 1951.

Mr. Acopian used his prodigious intellectual gifts and business acumen to design and build things that helped to make people’s lives better. While working for the Weller Electric Corporation, he designed a power sander which became one of the company’s main products. After forming the Acopian Technical Company in 1957, he designed and manufactured the first ever solar radio. Mr. Acopian subsequently led his company into the power supply business, and the company, which is still operating today, became and remains quite successful in that enterprise.

But Sarkis Acopian was much, much more than just an outstanding entrepreneur. In that regard, he loved outdoor venture and throughout his life he

was an avid pilot, scuba diver and sky-diving enthusiast who made more than 200 jumps during the 1960s. But where he really made his presence known was in his philanthropic work.

Mr. Acopian was a self-effacing man who believed passionately in supporting the community quietly but with unmatched generosity. He was passionate about education. He made significant donations to Columbia University, to the Acopian Engineering Center at Lafayette College and to the Acopian Center for Ornithology at Muhlenberg College located in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

He was passionate about his faith, building the Saint Sarkis Armenian Apostolic Church in Charlotte, North Carolina, and giving generously to the Diocese of the Armenian Church of America and the Armenian Apostolic Church of America, as well as to local churches in Armenia.

He was passionate about nature, creating the Acopian Center for Conservation Learning at Hawk Mountain Sanctuary and the Acopian Bog Turtle Preserve, as well as endowing the environmental education program at the American University of Armenia and the Florida Institute of Technology.

He was passionate about the locality in which he lived, Easton, Easton, Pennsylvania. He gave generously to the Children's Home of Easton, a sanctuary for underprivileged youth. The State Theater of Easton and the Easton National Canal Museum. His contributions made children's lives better, raised appreciation for the arts in his community, and helped to preserve important local history.

As an immigrant to this country, Mr. Acopian was eternally grateful for the opportunities that had been afforded to him here. He showed that gratitude, in part, by providing \$1 million towards the construction of the World War II Memorial in Washington D.C., that is right, \$1 million to the World War II Memorial in Washington D.C. His generous donation was the single largest contribution to that fundraising effort.

I must tell a story, former Senator Bob Dole came to the Easton area several years ago and said that one day in front of a few hundred people he received a check for \$1 million for the World War II Memorial. He picked up the phone and called this man, Mr. Acopian. He said, Mr. Acopian, this is very generous. Is there anything you would like because of this very generous gift? Mr. Acopian wanted anonymity. He said no, there is really nothing I want, Senator. After a few moments, he thought about it and said, Senator, there is actually one thing, Senator, I do want. He said, I would like to have a seat at the dedication. Bob Dole said, well, heck, yes, he can have mine. That is the way Sarkis Acopian was. He sought anonymity, but Bob Dole blew his cover.

His greatest passion, however, was for his lovely wife of 59 years, Mrs. Bobbye Seitze Mixon Acopian. To-

gether the couple had two sons, Gregory, who is married to Karen; and Jeffrey, who is married to Helen, both of whom still reside in Easton. He is survived also by six grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

IRAQ AND THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the devastating blast in the Baghdad market over the weekend was the worst suicide bombing since the American occupation began nearly 4 years ago, 121 killed and 226 wounded. The Iraqi Interior Ministry says approximately 1,000 people have been killed over the last week alone.

This so-called "surge" that the President is force feeding us is getting off to quite a start, isn't it? Indeed, The New York Times reported on Sunday that Iraqis are saying that the security situation has gotten worse, not better, with the escalation of American troops.

The National Intelligence Estimate released last week offers little hope that sectarian violence will abate or that Iraq can repair its political rifts between Sunni and Shi'a. Under these circumstances, with American soldiers thrown into this unwinnable occupation with no hope of turning the situation around, there is only one solution, bring our troops home.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 508, with Congresswoman LEE and Congresswoman WATERS and 30 others, which will do just that. H.R. 508 will end the occupation within 6 months of enactment. H.R. 508 will prohibit the construction of permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq. It will restore the sovereignty of the Iraqi people, even as we continue to provide nonmilitary assistance and to support a short-term international stabilization force will be available, if requested by the Iraqi government.

What a difference from the White House approach. Staring at the colossal, tragic failure of his Iraq policy, what did the President do today? He submitted a budget that asked Congress to sign off on \$145 billion to continue waging war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Meanwhile, he wants us to make his tax cuts permanent, and he says the budget will be balanced by 2012. So where is the money going to come from? Why, of course, it is going to come from the most vulnerable members of society, that is where.

Actually, over time, the very troops and their families, who are sacrificing life and limb in Iraq today, will be paying for this debt.

□ 1945

The President's budget seeks deep Medicare and Medicaid cuts at just the moment when we need to be expanding

access to affordable health care. Actually, it is simple, Madam Speaker. The money is there for the folly of occupying Iraq. The money is there for wealthy people to get tax breaks; but when old and when poor people need nursing home care, or kids need immunizations, suddenly it is time to tighten the belt.

It is a disgrace, Madam Speaker, this ongoing occupation of Iraq. It is not only morally indefensible; it is fiscally irresponsible. So many of our own communities need investment. So many of our own poor and middle-class families are taking on more and more risk, struggling to get by, getting squeezed economically. But we are spending our grandchildren's money on a fantasy that is getting young soldiers killed, igniting a civil war, inciting jihadists, inspiring hatred of the United States around the world, harming national security and making Americans less safe.

There is a solution: One, end the occupation; two, return Iraq to the Iraqis; three, spend our foreign affairs budget on humanitarian endeavors, not on war and conquest. Spend it on economic development, on democracy promotion, on building schools and hospitals.

In addition, bring our troops home. Bring our soldiers home. Bring our tax dollars home where they can be put to work meeting the needs of Americans, strengthening American communities.

GLOBALIZATION

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, when we look at the issue of globalization, inevitably the question of wealth and equity comes up. We see reports of massive payouts for executives, and the natural inclination is to question the fairness of this.

But the acquisition of wealth, we need to remember, is not a zero-sum game. If one worker brings in a big new client and gets a bonus as a result of that, that does not mean that someone somewhere else has to take a pay cut. The question we must ask ourselves is not are some individuals getting wealthier at a faster rate than others. The question is whether everyone is becoming more prosperous; is everyone's standard of living going up. If all individuals who wish to climb the economic ladder have the opportunity to do so, we are then on the right track. And the economic data show that that is exactly, absolutely the case in America today. With a workforce of 146 million, there are more Americans working today than ever before.

Unemployment is at an incredibly low 4.6 percent. Two million new jobs were created in the last year alone. Average weekly earnings grew by 4.8 percent over the same time period. And as we had reported last week, gross domestic product growth grew at an

annualized rate of 3.5 percent last quarter, propelled by a dramatic rise in what? Exports. We have been exporting goods and services from the United States, and that has played a big role in the GDP growth.

These are excellent numbers, Madam Speaker, and they demonstrate the strength and vitality of the U.S. economy. But to really understand what they mean for individuals and working families, we have to delve in a little deeper. We have to look at the broader context and the bigger picture. Let's focus on the issue of wages.

As I have stated, earnings are on the rise. This is obviously extremely important to working families trying to make ends meet. But even more important than growing wages is growing purchasing power. A bigger paycheck is meaningless if the government increases taxes and takes a bigger portion of that paycheck. That is why Republicans have focused so heavily on the issue of tax relief.

Because of the tax cuts we have passed in 2001 and 2003, after-tax income is up nearly 10 percent. That is extra disposable income that Americans have to pay college tuition, get their car fixed, or take a family vacation.

It is extra income, Madam Speaker, that Americans would not have without the tax relief that Republicans provided. Now, the cost of consumer goods also plays a major role in a family's purchasing power. That is why keeping our economy open to imports is so important.

A tariff on inexpensive clothes from Bangladesh, for example, is a tax on the American family. A tariff is a tax. A tariff on affordable furniture from China is a tax on the American family. What is more, tariffs and other protectionist barriers constitute a regressive tax because they hit and hurt working families the hardest.

It is not Italian leather bags or antique Belgian furniture that gets slapped with tariffs. It is the low-cost everyday items that families need to buy. The more we open up our economy, the more we increase the purchasing power of Americans who need it most.

Wages are rising, and that is essential. But we must remember that increased wages cannot be accompanied by a reduction in the purchasing power of those wages through greater protectionism and higher taxes.

Republicans have pursued an agenda of economic liberalization and embrace the great benefits of globalization. As a result, we can look at the question of whether everyone is growing in prosperity. And we can answer the question with a definitive and decisive, yes, they are.

Madam Speaker, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue on this path. I call on them to reject any calls to reverse the course to saddle Americans with greater taxes and cut off their access to the goods

they need at prices that they can afford; to reject any efforts to impose the regressive taxes of protectionism. Our economy cannot afford it, Madam Speaker, and we must recognize that those who are struggling most can afford it least.

SUPPORT FOR INCREASED SCHIP FUNDING

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I rise to call upon this Congress to assist States facing overwhelming shortfalls in funding their State health insurance programs.

In 1997, Congress created the SCHIP programs to help States provide health care coverage to the growing number of uninsured children throughout the United States. Ten years later, more than 6 million children have been enrolled in this program. They are going for annual check-ups to the doctor, and they are getting their prescription medications that they need. And they are also receiving care when they are extremely sick.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, this program's success is threatened by inadequate funding, and hundreds of thousands of these children stand to lose this health care coverage they have grown to rely upon.

Federal funding has failed to keep up with the program's expanding enrollment. An inefficient allocation of these funds means some States are sitting on more than \$1 billion of SCHIP funding, while 14 States, including my own State of Georgia, face severe shortfalls on the order of hundreds of millions of dollars.

This inadequate funding has forced some States to consider stopping all SCHIP medical services. Without help from the Congress, Congress will be unable to continue to provide health care for the 300,000 children enrolled in its Peachcare SCHIP program. Without increased Federal funding, these children will no longer receive their immunizations. They will no longer get their teeth cleaned, or their eyesight checked. And worse still, they will not be able to afford emergency room care in the event of a tragedy.

Madam Speaker, terminating coverage for these children would lead this country further away from decreasing the number of uninsured children in the United States. Congress must act expeditiously to allocate Federal funding to those States facing SCHIP shortfalls. It must reauthorize the program to ensure that all six million enrolled children continue to receive health care.

It must increase Federal funding so that more uninsured children can be enrolled in this program and get the health care that they deserve. I look forward to working with my colleagues from Georgia and other affected States

to rectify this increasingly dire situation.

CHIEF ERNIE MENDOZA

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, peace officers are a noble breed, daily risking their lives to protect and serve the rest of us. They are what separate the evil of the lawless from us.

Two weeks ago on a dark, cool misty Texas night, Needville, Texas, Independent School District Chief of Police Ernie Mendoza, was coming home from his job. He had been supervising a basketball game at one of the local schools. As chief of police of Needville Independent School District, it was his job to protect students during school and during events.

However, on the same road was 29-year-old construction worker Guillermo Paniagua. Guillermo was drunk and driving his pickup truck. He was headed toward the chief's car. And within moments Guillermo's truck crossed the center stripe of the road, slammed head first into the chief of police's vehicle. The crash instantly killed this dedicated police chief.

The chief had devoted 25 years of his life as one of Texas's lawmen. It was something that meant a lot to him. He was proud to serve his country as a peace officer. He was a 1983 graduate of the Waco Police Department where he worked in this small central Texas town.

Then he moved on to the big city of Houston, Texas, where he worked with the Houston Independent School District Police Department, one of the Nation's largest school districts. And then in 1996 he accepted the position with the Needville ISD Police Department where he became chief of police.

ISD police officers have the responsibility to protect children and teachers while they are in school. They maintain law and order and discipline. They keep the kids safe from day to day. And Chief Mendoza was one of the best. He strived to be a positive role model for the kids he protected, and he made peace officers look good.

He took the time to talk to kids and was well liked throughout the school. But it all ended a mile from his own home and the indifference of a drunk driver. Like most drunk drivers, Guillermo had only minor cuts and bruises. He was not injured. But those bruises did not keep him, the coward, the killer, from running from the scene in the darkness of the night.

He was quickly captured by the Wharton County, Texas Sheriff's Department, and now he faces first-degree felony murder charges, and failure to stop and render aid.

You see, when you drink and drive and kill somebody, that is a felony, as it ought to be. Chief Mendoza's wife and four children are now deprived of

their husband, and father for the rest of their lives. The kids of the Needville school system have lost a good protector.

But, Madam Speaker, this was not Guillermo's first rodeo. You see, he has a total of four intoxication convictions in the United States, two in Texas and two in Georgia. In Texas he was given probation for a DWI, but that was revoked when he was rearrested. And then when he got that second DWI, he only spent 3 days in jail and got 18 months probation and his license was suspended.

This drunk should never have been given his driver's license back at all. His four DWI convictions proved that the system is not holding him accountable for being a drunk driver.

But the most disturbing thing about Guillermo Paniagua is he is illegally in this country. So why is he still here? How did he get a driver's license in the first place? Why was his immigration status not checked by the police officers each and every time he was picked up for drunk driving? He should have been deported the first time he was arrested.

Police Chief Ernie Mendoza was killed at the hands of an illegal, a drunk driver. And this could have all been prevented. He and his family have become more victims of the U.S.'s inability to secure the border and protect its citizens.

Madam Speaker, Chief Mendoza was a real person. This is a photograph of him taken shortly before he was killed. The Needville ISD and the great State of Texas have lost a fine lawman. And the casualty list continues to mount in the U.S. by those lawless insurgents who are illegally occupying our land.

This government should be as concerned about the homeland casualties as it is about those casualties killed in lands far, far away, or there will be more Chief Mendozas killed.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 2000

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 514, SGT. LEA MILLS POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today about my bill, H.R. 514, which passed the House earlier today. The bill will rename the Aviation Post Office in Brooksville, Florida, after Sergeant Lea Robert Mills. This is the Post Office that Lea used because it is close to his parents' home in Masaryktown, Florida.

Lea was a resident of my district who gave his life for his country while serving in Iraq. At 21 years old, Lea was proud to serve his fellow citizens, and he actually requested to be sent to Iraq.

After being inspired to volunteer for the military after the September 11 attacks, he felt it was his duty, as a Marine, to go where the mission was. Lea told his father that the Marines would give him the best opportunity to make a difference in people's lives.

He joined right after graduating from Hernando High School in 2002, and he had just recently "re-upped" for a second stint with the Marines. Tragically, he was killed by an IED explosion, leaving behind a young wife and a grieving family.

Sergeant Mills was a true patriot and brave hero, and our community feels his loss immensely. His dedication to his country and turning his ideals into action are truly inspiring. It is a sad truth that in a cynical world, we are sometimes surprised by such courageous acts.

Learning about Lea from his family and friends helped me to have faith that not everyone is just trying to get by. Some are trying to change the world for the better.

Dee Mills, who is Lea's mother, was so brave and so patriotic at the funeral. I don't think I will ever, ever forget that. While others who have lost loved ones grieve in very different ways, Dee Mills, like her son, decided to help change the world. Dee has put together a 501(c)(3), and it is called Lea's Prayers and Postage. And the purpose of this organization is to raise money to send packages to our young men and women currently serving in Iraq. What a wonderful cause, what a wonderful way to work out one's grief at losing her son.

I can only hope that in renaming this Post Office we will memorialize Lea's courage and never, ever forget his sacrifice for this great Nation.

Both Lea Robert Mills and Dee Mills, his mom, have given so much to the community and so much to America that I am very proud to represent the Masaryktown area and certainly the Mills family.

HONORING SCIPIO A. JONES

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

Mr. SNYDER. People throughout America, Madam Speaker, celebrate our heroes of the Civil Rights Movement. Every American knows of the great contributions of Martin Luther King. No Arkansan celebrates these heroes without celebrating the Little Rock Nine. No Arkansan remembers these heroes without remember Daisy Bates.

I recently introduced a bill to remember another noteworthy Arkansan who is not as well known as he deserves to be, Scipio A. Jones. Scipio A. Jones contributed to moving Arkansas and our Nation forward, and I am pleased that earlier today the House adopted this measure, H.R. 433, to designate the facility at 1700 Main Street

in Little Rock as the Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building.

His is the life of which movies should be made, Madam Speaker. Scipio Africanus Jones was born a slave in Dallas County, Arkansas in 1863. He moved to Little Rock, Arkansas in the 1880s, took preparatory courses at Philander Smith College and graduated from North Little Rock's Bethel University, now Shorter College, with a Bachelor's Degree in 1887.

Jones apprenticed to practicing attorneys and was accepted into the Arkansas Bar in 1889. He was admitted to the Supreme Court of Arkansas in 1900, to the U.S. District Court for the Western Division of the Eastern District of Arkansas and the U.S. Circuit Court for Arkansas in 1901, the U.S. Supreme Court in 1905 and the U.S. Court of Appeals in 1914.

In 1915 and 1924, Jones was appointed as a special judge to preside over cases when the regular judge had been incapacitated.

He was the National Attorney General for the Mosaic Templars of America, an international fraternal organization headquartered in Little Rock, Arkansas which provided services to African Americans in an era when discrimination resulted in few basic services being readily available. The location of the Post Office we will designate is less than a mile away from the Mosaic Templars headquarters.

On a visit to Little Rock, Arkansas by Treasury Secretary W.G. McAdoo during World War I, Scipio A. Jones personally wrote a check to purchase \$50,000 worth of Liberty bonds to support the Allied cause in World War I, and soon thereafter raised another \$50,000 for this effort.

He was honored by President Woodrow Wilson, who appointed him to the National Advisory Board to the Liberty Bond effort.

He opposed and helped defeat grandfather clause legislation that some southerners were seeking to add to the Arkansas Constitution to disenfranchise and prevent African American voter participation.

In the aftermath of the Elaine Massacre of 1919, which resulted in the deaths of five Caucasians and an estimated 856 African Americans, Scipio A. Jones garnered national attention with the successful defense of 12 sharecroppers who had been condemned to death and by securing the release of nearly 100 other Elaine defendants who had been sent to prison.

The legal work of Jones ultimately resulted in the case of Moore v. Dempsey being argued before the United States Supreme Court, which found that mob-dominated trials were a violation of the due process clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

He was widely respected by people of all races in the central Arkansas community. He died on March 28, 1943 and is buried at Haven of Rest Cemetery in Little Rock.

□ 2015

I am pleased that this designation will acknowledge the lifelong service of Scipio A. Jones as a civic leader, talented lawyer, skillful jurist and civil rights leader and for his remarkable courage and notable contributions to the advancement of social justice.

I would like to thank Chairman WAXMAN of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for bringing H.R. 433 to the floor, and Denise Wilson of that committee for assistance in moving it forward. I also thank Representative LYNCH and Representative SHAYS for the kind words they offered during debate on the bill today, as well as James Savage, of my staff, for his work on this legislation.

A RESPONSIBLE EXIT STRATEGY IN IRAQ

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, our country faces great challenges: energy independence, global warming, economic competitiveness, health care, and widening income inequality. But when I visit with people in Maine, the first issue they bring up is Iraq.

We cannot address our other pressing issues unless we solve our most urgent problem: Iraq. We cannot make many needed investments in our future until we put our involvement in Iraq in the past. The war in Iraq is straining our military and compromising our ability to address vital priorities like global terrorism and nuclear proliferation. It is diverting attention from dealing with Iran, North Korea, and Afghanistan. Since the President will not, Congress must lead to force Iraqis to take responsibility for their own security by directing an orderly redeployment of troops and promoting a political solution in Iraq with a focus on transition to Iraqi control.

Recent experience shows that the U.S. must impose deadlines with consequences so that Iraqi leaders will be compelled to take responsibility. An unending U.S. military presence in Iraq creates a climate of dependency that undermines the goal of having the Iraqi Government control internal security.

There is a growing consensus that only a political solution, not a military one, will address the sectarian conflict in Iraq. Yet President Bush has rejected the wisdom of military commanders, the Iraq Study Group, and the voters by choosing to send more troops into the crossfire of a sectarian civil war. If the President won't provide an exit strategy, Congress must take the lead in ending the war.

To achieve this goal, I have cosponsored H.R. 645, a bill introduced by Representatives DAVID PRICE and BRAD MILLER. The bill would, by December 31, 2007, terminate the authorization for military operations in Iraq that passed, over my objection, in 2002.

The original mission Congress authorized, eliminating weapons of mass destruction and ousting Saddam Hussein, is no longer operative. If the President wants U.S. troops in Iraq beyond the end of this year, he should justify his plans and seek new approval from Congress. I am confident that the new Congress will not give the President a blank check, as the congressional majority wrongly did in 2002.

H.R. 645 also requires the President to submit a plan and timetable for phasing out troop deployments by December 31, 2007. It declares that U.S. policy is to withdraw forces in order to transfer responsibility to Iraqis; prohibits funding for permanent U.S. bases; authorizes employment, democracy, and governance programs; and creates a special envoy for Iraq regional security.

America's servicemen and -women in Iraq have served with skill, determination, and courage. We owe them and their families our gratitude and our unwavering support. Our legislation does not cut off funds for armor and protective equipment still needed by our troops in the war zone.

No exit strategy will succeed unless it has broad public support. I support H.R. 645 as a responsible approach to ending the war by focusing on U.S. policy and on the now outdated congressional authorization for the use of force. Citizens deserve to know where their elected officials stand on the war and not just on the escalation. I have let my constituents in Maine know where I stand and how I believe Congress should take a long overdue leadership role in ending this war.

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

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

SUPPORT NATIONAL BLACK HIV/ AIDS AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Honorable BARBARA LEE for introducing the National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day resolution. I also thank the 396 Members who voted in support of this resolution in a true spirit of bipartisanship.

And I ask the question, why is it important to support National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness? Why? Because as of 2005, 188,000 African Americans were living with AIDS. Why? Because African Americans are 12 percent of the population and over 50 percent of the new cases diagnosed. Why is it important? Because for African Americans, HIV/AIDS is a leading cause of death.

Why is it important, Madam Speaker? Because AIDS is the number one cause of death for African American women 25 to 34.

However, Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the impending crisis, I am hopeful. I am hopeful that we will allocate more funds, more funds for medication, because this disease can be treated. More funds for counseling because this disease can be prevented. More funds for research because this disease can be cured. And, Madam Speaker, I believe that we must end AIDS because it has the potential to be our end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CEDAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, it is time that the U.S. ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, or CEDAW.

The treaty has been in force since 1981 and has been ratified by 185 countries; 185 countries cannot be wrong, and they include such countries as Saudi Arabia, Rwanda, Nigeria, and Pakistan. The U.S. stands out as the only Western country that has not ratified the treaty and, in doing so, keeps company with Iran, Sudan, and Somalia.

Women continue to be subjected to severe human rights violations simply because of their gender. Women in many parts of the world are unable to receive a basic education, earn a living, own or inherit property, or protect themselves against HIV/AIDS. Violence against women continues to be a terrible problem in all corners of the globe.

In the Mexican cities of Juarez and Chihuahua, over 400 women have been killed since 1993. In Guatemala over 2,500 women and girls have been murdered since 2001.

Women are still stoned to death and killed by members of their family in the name of honor. In 2002 at least 270 women were murdered in "honor killings" in the Punjab Province of Pakistan alone.

Domestic violence continues to hurt and kill women at alarming rates. In Russia 70 percent of married women have been hurt in one form or another of violence from their husbands.

CEDAW is an important tool in combating discrimination and human rights abuses against women around the world. It seeks to ensure that

women have equal access to education, public health, credit, property rights, as well as prevent violence against women. There have been numerous positive changes because of the convention, such as the implementation of equality legislation, the eradication of harmful practices such as sex slavery, and changes in inheritance laws. But there is clearly a great deal more to do.

As one of the most powerful nations in the world, the U.S. must be the leader in the fight against these violations of women's human rights. Our refusal to ratify the treaty sends the message that CEDAW is not important and does not need to be enforced. There is no valid reason why the U.S. should not ratify CEDAW.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has voted twice to send the convention to the full Senate for ratification, first in 1994 and then again in 2002; but it has never been voted on by that body.

The U.S. is already substantially in compliance with the treaty and agrees with its fundamental principles of non-discrimination and equality for women. We cannot claim to be a defender of human rights without including over half of the world's population.

Ratifying CEDAW is something the U.S. can do that can make a difference in the lives of thousands of women around the globe. So what are we waiting for? We should move forward and ratify it.

RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT BUSH'S HEALTH CARE PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to discuss the need to make access to health insurance for everyone a priority in our country.

As you know, 46 million Americans are uninsured, including more than 9 million children in the U.S. One in three people in the San Gabriel Valley, which I represent, is uninsured; and across the State of California, 6.5 million adults and 750,000 children lack health care insurance. Nationwide, 83 percent of the uninsured are from working families. Of uninsured Californians, more than two-thirds of those families have full-time jobs. Fourteen million uninsured are Latinos, including one in five children.

In the past 5 years, the number of Latinos without health insurance, as you know, has increased. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, uninsured children are five times less likely to have visited a doctor or dentist in the past 2 years compared to those children who are insured. Fewer doctor visits can lead to serious illness and health problems, as well as avoidable costly emergency room visits. The Institute of Medicine estimates that each year at least 18,000 people die prematurely due to lack of health insurance.

But President Bush's proposal will not help the 46 million uninsured men, women, and children in our country. Instead of finding real solutions, President Bush wants to provide tax deductions to wealthy Americans who can already afford their health care insurance. Tax deductions, as you know, will not solve the real problem of skyrocketing health care costs. Tax deductions will not make it easier for low-income families and middle-class working families to purchase health care insurance. In fact, as you know, our families may be better off without the President's so-called help.

According to Families USA, President Bush's plan is "like throwing a 50-foot rope to someone in a 40-foot hole." And for the majority of uninsured people, his plan is like throwing them nothing at all.

People without employer-sponsored coverage, such as people who work in small businesses, who make up the majority of those individuals in some of our districts, will not benefit from Bush's tax breaks. Even White House officials admit that only 3 to 5 million uninsured people would actually become insured under Bush's proposal. The President's plan, as you know, fails to relieve the problems that most uninsured adults and children face.

We have to do better for the American people. And we must ensure that everyone has access to affordable and quality health care insurance and that programs are easily accessible by all. Programs such as the State Children's Health Insurance Programs, as you know, are very important. We call them the SCHIP program, and in the State of California they are known as the Healthy Families Program. Across the Nation, Medicaid and SCHIP provide coverage for more than 34 million children. These programs must be adequately funded and include needed tools to reach all eligible populations.

However, as you know, millions more children are eligible for these programs but are not enrolled. In fact, 74 percent of the uninsured children are eligible but are not somehow showing up on these enrollment applications. Many are low income. They come from families that are poor and unaware of the fact that they are eligible even for these services. And recent research shows that the SCHIP program may be failing to reach the hardest to reach subpopulations of the uninsured children like Latinos. And according to Families USA, distrust of the health care system, language, culture, these are all barriers that are confusing to our families, and those eligibility rules are high obstacles for families to enroll.

Community health care workers, such as the promotoras, play key roles in overcoming these barriers to enrollment for public programs. Promotoras, as you know, exist in the State of California and along the frontera, along the border on the U.S. side. They are qualified people who could help pa-

tients access and navigate the complex and confusing health care system. They can reach racial and ethnic minorities that would otherwise remain locked out of our system.

A recent report by the Journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics compared the effectiveness of community workers with traditional Medicaid and SCHIP outreach enrollment. The report found that families who interacted with community health workers such as the promotoras were eight times more likely to obtain health insurance.

□ 2030

Almost 96 percent of children who work with promotoras in the study obtained health insurance. Seventy-eight percent were insured continuously. The study provides that community health workers can reduce the number of uninsured children, and we should move forward asking for the SCHIP program to also provide for assistance through the promotoras program.

I know that the gentleman from California understands what I am talking about, because those promotoras also exist in her district as well.

We need to make sure that President Bush plans for a significant funds for those children that are uninsured, and I would ask that our colleagues please continue to provide funding for the SCHIP program and to expand that in those needed areas.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, 110TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs adopted these Rules by voice vote, with a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on January 30, 2007.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FOR THE 110TH CONGRESS (ADOPTED JANUARY 30, 2007)

RULE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Applicability of House Rules—The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in Committees and subcommittees.

(b) Subcommittees—Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) Incorporation of House Rule on Committee Procedure—Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made part of the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable. Pursuant to clause 2(a)(3) of

Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the full Committee is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(d) Vice Chairman—Pursuant to clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the full Committee shall designate the Vice Chairman of the Committee and a Vice Chairman of each subcommittee established under Rule 5(a)(1).

RULE 2—REGULAR AND ADDITIONAL MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meetings—The regular meeting day for the Committee shall be at 10 a.m. on the second Wednesday of each month in such place as the Chairman may designate. However, the Chairman may dispense with a regular Wednesday meeting of the Committee.

(b) Additional Meetings—The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(c) Notice—The Chairman shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular and additional meeting of the Committee at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting, except under circumstances the Chairman determines to be of an emergency nature. Under such circumstances, the Chairman shall make an effort to consult the ranking minority member, or in such member's absence, the next ranking minority party member of the Committee.

RULE 3—MEETINGS AND HEARINGS GENERALLY

(a) Open Meetings and Hearings—Meetings and hearings of the Committee and each of its subcommittees shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(b) Announcement of Hearing—The Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by the Committee, and the subcommittee Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee or the subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman or the subcommittee Chairman, as the case may be, shall consult with the ranking minority member and make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Clerk of the Congressional Record and the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(c) Wireless Telephone Use Prohibited—No person may use a wireless telephone during a Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing.

(d) Media Coverage—Any meeting of the Committee or its subcommittees that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by radio, television, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of House rule XI.

(e) Requirements for Testimony—

(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, also provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the Chairman. Each witness shall limit any oral presentation to a summary of the written statement.

(2) Pursuant to clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, in the case of a witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(f) Calling and Questioning Witnesses

(1) Committee and subcommittee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member may be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. Except as otherwise announced by the Chairman at the beginning of a hearing, members who are present at the start of the hearing will be recognized before other members who arrive after the hearing has begun. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) regarding the 5-minute rule, the Chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member may designate an equal number of members of the Committee or subcommittee majority and minority party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes. In no event shall the Chairman allow a member to question a witness for an extended period under this rule until all members present have had the opportunity to ask questions under the 5-minute rule. The Chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member may permit Committee staff for its majority and minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods of time.

(3) When a hearing is conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee on any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman of a majority of those minority members before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of the hearing thereon.

(g) Subpoenas—Pursuant to clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

RULE 4—QUORUM AND RECORD VOTES; POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

(a) Working Quorum—A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for business and a majority of the members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(b) Quorum for Reporting—No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the

House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(c) Record Votes—A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to any record vote on any motion to amend or report, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the report of the Committee on the bill or resolution.

(d) Prohibition Against Proxy Voting—No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(e) Postponing Proceedings—Committee and subcommittee chairmen may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment, and may resume proceedings within two legislative days on a postponed question after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 5—SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Establishment and Jurisdiction—

(1) There shall be four subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over compensation; general and special pensions of all the wars of the United States; life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces; cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior; burial benefits; the Board of Veterans' Appeals; and the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans' Claims.

(B) Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over education of veterans, employment and training of veterans, vocational rehabilitation, veterans' housing programs, readjustment of servicemembers to civilian life, and servicemembers civil relief.

(C) Subcommittee on Health, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

(D) Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which shall have oversight and investigative jurisdiction over veterans' matters generally, and over such matters as may be referred to the subcommittee by the Chairman of the full Committee for its oversight or investigation and for its appropriate recommendations. The subcommittee shall only have legislative jurisdiction over such bills or resolutions as may be referred to it by the Chairman of the full Committee.

(2) Each subcommittee shall have responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chairman refers to it.

(b) Vacancies—Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of that subcommittee.

(c) Ratios—On each subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee.

(d) Referral to Subcommittees—The Chairman of the Committee may refer a measure or matter, which is within the general responsibility of more than one of the subcommittees of the Committee, as the Chairman deems appropriate. In referring any

measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chairman of the Committee may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(e) Powers and Duties—

(1) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(2) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the Chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full Committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so shall notify the Chairman and the ranking minority party member of the Committee of the Subcommittee's action.

(3) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee during any of its meetings and hearings, but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the meeting or hearing.

(4) Each subcommittee shall provide the Committee with copies of such record votes taken in subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chairman of the Committee deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6—GENERAL OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITY

(a) Purpose—Pursuant to clause 2 of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall carry out oversight responsibilities. In order to assist the House in—

(1) Its analysis, appraisal, evaluation of—

(A) The application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or

(B) Conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) Its formulation, consideration and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, the Committee and its various subcommittees, consistent with their jurisdiction as set forth in Rule 5, shall have oversight responsibilities as provided in subsection (b).

(b) Review of Laws and Programs—The Committee and its subcommittees shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the applications, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Committee and its subcommittees shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee.

(c) Oversight Plan—Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House.

(d) Oversight by Subcommittees—The existence and activities of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall in no way limit the responsibility of the other subcommittees of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for carrying out oversight duties.

RULE 7—BUDGET ACT RESPONSIBILITIES

(a) Budget Act Responsibilities—Pursuant to clause 4(f)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget not later than six weeks after the President submits his budget, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request—

(1) Its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(2) An estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

RULE 8—RECORDS AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) Transcripts—There shall be a transcript made of each regular and additional meeting and hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees. Any such transcript shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

(b) Records—

(1) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and each of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(I) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(2) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the Committee and each of its subcommittees, including a record of the votes on any question on which a recorded vote is demanded. The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(c) Availability of Archived Records—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3 or clause 4 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

(d) Availability of Publications—Pursuant to clause 2(e)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible.

EULOGY HONORING FATHER
ROBERT DRINAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, a little over a week ago our country suffered a great loss with the passing of Father Robert Drinan. He was a great man. He was a great humanitarian. He was a priest and he was a Member of Congress.

When asked to talk about Father Drinan, it is impossible not to speak in the superlative in every case. And also the words that I would like to use are to quote a great man, Father Drinan himself.

At his funeral, which I had the privilege to eulogize Father Drinan, I said that when Saint Francis of Assisi, who is the patron saint of my City of San Francisco, when St. Francis of Assisi was asked what a person had to do to lead a good and virtual life, he said, Saint Francis did, "Preach the gospel. Sometimes use words."

Father Robert Drinan preached the gospel, sometimes from the pulpit, sometimes from the floor of this House for 10 years as a Member of Congress, and sometimes from the classroom at the Georgetown University School of Law. But he always preached the gospel through the power of his example.

Father Drinan lived and legislated according to an expansive view of the gospel, believing that it had something to teach us about the whole range of public policy, from war and peace to poverty and justice, to how we treat our children and our parents. It was because of his faith that he was one of our great champions for human rights. He believed that there was a spark of divinity in every person, and he acted upon that belief. But he did so selflessly.

When the Soviet dissident Anatoly Sharansky was freed after 8 years in a Siberian labor camp, it was because of years of advocacy by many. Yet, at a reception welcoming him to the United States that was held in this Capitol, Sharansky, surrounded by supporters and admirers, looked to the back so he could find and thank the man who was his major champion, Father Drinan. That was Father Drinan, eager to help, slow to accept credit.

I was particularly honored that earlier, it was the beginning of January actually, Father Drinan celebrated a mass at my alma matter, Trinity College, before I was sworn in as Speaker. He said that mass in honor of the children of Darfur and Katrina. And he prayed there that "the needs of every child are the needs of Jesus Christ himself." Those were Father Drinan's words.

He challenged us by saying, "Imagine what the world would think of the United States if the health and welfare of children everywhere became the top objective of America's foreign policy! It could happen, and it could happen soon, he said, if enough people cared."

He continued, "Let us reexamine our convictions, our commitments and our courage." He emphasized courage. "Our convictions and our commitments are clear and certain to us. But do we have the courage to carry them out," he asked? "God has great hopes for what this great Nation will do in the near future. We are here to ask for the courage to carry out God's hopes and aspirations."

He inspired us with those words, and as he led us in prayer that day, Father Drinan said, "We learn things in prayer that we otherwise would never know."

That day in church at his funeral, and since then, we are praying for the courage of Father Drinan. That may have been Father Drinan's last sermon from the pulpit, but afterwards, he sent me a letter asking that I place that sermon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And I commend to all of you his call for "peaceful revolution" to all who read our RECORD. He quoted John F. Kennedy, who said that we could make that possible with our actions.

These words join the many courageous words Father Drinan said on this House floor. He came to Congress to oppose the war in Vietnam. They join his powerful words on the day, last May, when Congress had the privilege of honoring him with the Congressional Distinguished Service Award. He received that award, along with our former Ambassador to the Vatican and our former colleague in this House, Ambassador and Congresswoman Lindy Boggs.

In his service, it was repeated during the communion service, "Where there is charity there is Christ. Where there is charity there is God." Ubi caritas Deus ibi est. And on that day, in the Capitol, when we honored the two of them, charity was present and so was God's goodwill.

They also, Father Drinan's words that we have submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, join the words he shared with his students. He was a priest, he was a politician, he was an American patriot who loved our Constitution and fought for our civil liberties, and he loved his students as a teacher.

When he left here because Pope John Paul II, when he became Pope said he had to choose between being a priest and being a Member of Congress, he said, "I am a priest forever," and he left the Congress.

His successor, I know, is a source of great hope to the people in his district. Congressman BARNEY FRANK will be leading the special order in honor of Father Drinan shortly.

But as a teacher, as I say, he loved his students, his law students. And just before graduation of one class, Bob Hickmont told me this, who was one of his students, Father Drinan offered advice to a group of Georgetown law students. He said, "As I look out at all of you, with your new and expensive law school educations, I would urge you to go forth into society not as mere legal

tradesmen, but as moral architects. Design, create and build a better and more equitable society and use your skills to help those who are otherwise not being served."

Father Drinan, this statement and others of your statement are entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Again, those words, with those of your 10 years in Congress, will serve as an inspiration for all who follow the proceedings of Congress and all who ever knew you.

Again, to his family, the Drinan family, to Helen and all of the family, his sister-in-law, Helen, I hope it is a comfort to them that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time. And I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER ROBERT F. DRINAN, SJ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise with a sad duty, although also a proud one. It is a chance for our colleagues to mourn the death and celebrate the life of one of the ablest and most principled people ever to serve as a Member of this body, the late Father Robert Drinan.

Madam Speaker, I will include for the RECORD of these proceedings the eulogies that were given at his funeral mass last Thursday by two of his fellow Jesuits, the Reverend John Langan and Professor Ladislav Orsy; by John DeGioia, the President of Georgetown University, where he taught for so many years; by our colleague Senator EDWARD KENNEDY; and by former Ambassador Max Kampelman. The Speaker also gave a eulogy, which she herself inserted in the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, Bob Drinan was an extraordinary man. He had several careers, any one of which would have been extremely impressive. He was a Member of this body for only 10 years. By Congressional standards, that is not a long career, and many people are surprised to learn it was only 10 years, because his impact on this body and through this body, this country and this world was so significant. He was a man of such force of intellect and

strength of character and energy and determination that he made 10 years here do more than many do in 30 or more years.

He was a prolific author of serious and thoughtful books. As I said in Massachusetts on Saturday, Father Drinan wrote more books than some high officials in this town have ever read.

He was a very distinguished educator. Had he been nothing but the Dean of Boston College Law School, and two of our colleagues who attended that law school during his deanship, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, will be addressing us soon, had he simply been that dean for 16 years when he helped make that into the first rate educational institution it is today, that would have been a significant career.

Then on leaving this place, he spent 26 years teaching at Georgetown. At 86, Bob Drinan was a vigorous and engaging teacher who was widely sought after by students interested in the intellectual stimulation that they got from him.

Now, with all of this, he was, of course, a Jesuit priest, and it was striking to me last Thursday here in Washington, Saturday at Boston College, to see the justifiable pride that his fellow Jesuits had in this man. And not just their pride in him, but their pride and gratitude that he remained first and foremost a member of that Jesuit community, an extra community of people who have made such contributions to education and other important causes in this country.

But what was particularly striking was the gap between the immensity of his accomplishments, the dignity of his intellect and his person. No one was ever less inclined to stand on ceremony. He was a down-to-earth individual. People who met him, and simply met him without knowing who he was, although that became increasingly harder as his fame grew, would be surprised to learn that he was a man of such accomplishments.

He was a delight to be with. He was one of the most irreverent reverends you will ever meet, and did not need ceremony, did not need any kind of false dignity. He had the talents.

What I want to talk about now is the common theme in that multiplicity of careers, of teacher and law school dean and Member of Congress and priest and author.

We have a lot of debate in our society and American politics about morality in politics, what is the role of morality in politics, and there are some who style themselves as very religious, who believe that they are the exemplars of morality in politics and who have been critical of people like Father Drinan and said that he failed in that task.

Absolutely the contrary is true. Father Drinan's life was dedicated to public morality. Few people worked as consistently and effectively to bring a moral tone to the relationships we have with each other.

Now, people have said, "well, what about on some of these individual matters?" Let's be very clear. This is a man who lived by an extraordinary exacting moral code personally. He was a priest. He was a priest for over 60 years and a member of the Jesuit community. As a Member of Congress, he served the Jesuit community in Georgetown. When he went back to his district, it was the Jesuit community at Boston College. He voluntarily subjected himself to the very stringent discipline that the Jesuit community and priests in general follow.

In 1980, when he was ordered by Pope John Paul II not to run again for Congress, that was a decision that caused him great anguish. It denied him the chance to do something that he thought was terribly important to his very being, and he wished that he could reverse the decision. But when it became clear that that decision could not be reversed, there was no hesitation.

People who want to talk about living by a moral code should look at the example of this very important Member of Congress with great accomplishments behind him who voluntarily left this body because the moral code of the priesthood to which he had committed himself required him to do that.

So in his personal life, he lived by the code of celibacy and of obedience and of poverty. And it was a voluntary decision, and anyone who knew him knew that he had talents which would have allowed him to break those bonds, but he didn't see them as bonds, he saw them as an essential part of his being.

So for those who wonder about his dedication and personal morality, look at his life. Look at this man, who at 86 awoke 10 days ago feeling ill, feeling very sick, and ignored the advice of others to stay home and went to class to teach at 86 and collapsed in class, because he had a sense of duty and an insistence on living by that personal code that no one could deny.

On the other hand, he did not believe, and I do not claim that this is something he told me, he was a man who taught in his life by example as well as articulately. As the Speaker said in her eulogy, he quoted Saint Francis of Assisi, who said, "Preach the gospel, and sometimes use words," and Bob Drinan preached the gospel by his life and his life's work very effectively.

I believe that his view was that, yes, he was happy to follow a stringent moral code personally that few human beings would be able to do with the dedication and discipline that he did for as long as he did, but he also felt that that was his personal choice. It was a choice that he would urge on others. He was a member of that important religious community, and through that religious community, yes, he would convey that message.

But he did not believe, and this is what is critical, that it was legitimate to use the coercive mechanism of government to impose his personal choices on others, and that is the distinction

that Father Drinan stands for. In those matters of life where we affect each other, where human beings come together and impact each other, than morality must guide our actions.

I would caution many of my liberal friends who say, well, we don't want to have morality in politics, because they are reacting against people who would use the government to impose personal choices on others. That is not morality, and the problem there is not that they are imposing morality in politics, but that they are intruding politics into personal lives.

What Father Drinan stood for in his writings, as a Member of Congress, as an activist, as an advocate, as a teacher, was that in those areas of life where we come together and affect each other, we are obligated to follow a moral code, and that is a moral code which focused on the dignity of human beings and the right of every human being to be treated decently, because that was the common core of Bob Drinan.

What issues did he care about? He cared most about those issues where there was a danger that some people would be mistreated. In the fifties and sixties, he was the leader in the fight against racism and for racial justice, one of the great examples of wrongdoing in American history, of people of African descent being mistreated. Bob was a leader in the civil rights movement.

He was a great civil libertarian, opposing efforts to oppress people who spoke in terms that other people did not like.

He was a great defender of the Jewish community, against anti-Semitism.

He then became the founder, more than any other individual, of the doctrine of international human rights. Before the seventies, there were people on the left who criticized governments on the right for not respecting human rights. There were people on the right who criticized left governments for not following human rights.

Bob Drinan was one of those who forged the doctrine that we could demand respect by any government of any political stripe, that they respect the rights of individuals, and he was a leader in his writings and his work here in the Congress. That was the central core, whether it was racism or anti-Semitism, whether it was governments denying people basic rights, whether it was our own government denying the rights of our own citizens in the name of security.

He was a very good lawyer. In fact, in the seventies, he was working hard on rewriting a criminal code which some of the people on the left thought was too tough, because he understood that people had a right to be protected against those who would violate their rights and property. But he also believed deeply from his experience that there was no need for the government to disregard basic human rights in protecting all of us, and there were no

more articulate defenders of that principle.

When he stood up against Richard Nixon, it was because of his conviction that the Nixon administration was defying fundamental human rights, a conviction which, of course, proved to be absolutely true.

That is the common thread. And Bob Drinan believed, and this is very important I think to note, that it was as a priest that he wrote, as a priest that he served here, as a priest that he advocated for human rights, because he genuinely believed that in his insistence that we treat each other with the dignity that human beings are entitled to, he was following the word of his God as he understood it, a God that created in his mind human beings with this inherent dignity.

So this is a man whose life had many parts, but they had a common theme. They had a common theme, whether it was in his religion or his politics or his writing or his teaching. It was that we owe each other the duty of respect and dignity. And, yes, morality belongs in politics, and Bob Drinan's life, both as a Member of Congress, as a political activist afterwards, yes, it was dedicated to morality in politics.

He was a man who understood that there is no greater political immorality than an unjust war; that nothing more greatly degrades human beings than wars which violate the doctrine of the just war. And he came to this Congress as a leading opponent of the Vietnam War at a time when it was not the most popular thing, and up until his last days he was a leader in agitation against another unjust war as he saw it.

So I am very proud to be the inheritor of that tradition. I do not claim to exemplify all aspects of it. But I do share with him this commitment, that people have a right to make personal choices; that your personal choices ought to be guided by a moral code; and that we ought to urge on each other that we bring out the best. But that when it comes to using the coercive mechanisms of the government, the central point is to make sure that people are treated fairly by each other, that the role of morality in politics is to enforce the fundamental right of each person to be treated with dignity and respect.

□ 2045

Bob Drinan was an exemplar of what is appropriately morality in politics. We will miss him terribly, but we have, enduring, his example to drive us forward.

Now, Madam Speaker, I want to yield to one of my colleagues, who is the only member of the Massachusetts delegation who was able to serve with Bob Drinan, one of the few Members who served with him and who has the dual distinction of both serving with him and being his student at Boston Law School and is a man who very much carried out the ethic of respect for

human rights that Bob exemplified. The gentleman from Massachusetts, I yield him such time as he may consume.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman very much, and I thank him for his eloquent statement. I thank him for the eulogy which he delivered on behalf of Father Drinan at St. Ignatius Church in Massachusetts on this past Saturday. You captured the essence of Father Drinan in that eulogy, and I thank you for doing that on behalf of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives mourns the passing of Father Robert Drinan, Society of Jesus, Member of Congress. His death is a blow to those of us who revered his wit and wisdom, and a great loss for those who continue to struggle for human rights and life's basic necessities. Yet, tonight we also celebrate Father Drinan's life and know well that the life he brought to the issues of our time will continue to shine on in the efforts of those he touched and those whom he exhorted to do more.

I had the privilege of having Father Drinan as my dean at Boston College Law School. I met him in August of 1968 as the school year at Boston College Law School was about to commence. But the truth is that I had set my goal to attend Boston College Law School 6 years before when I was a sophomore in high school because it became my goal to go to Boston College Law School so that I could have Father Drinan as my dean; and, to be honest with you, I didn't even know if you had to go to college in order to go to law school, such was my desire to go and to be in this school that was training lawyers to help humanity.

At Boston College Law School in the late 1960s, Father Drinan used his power as the dean of that school to actively recruit minorities, to actively recruit women to come to Boston College Law School. He did so using the greatest power that a dean of a law school has, and that is admissions and full scholarships. He wanted Boston College Law School to be at the cutting edge of the change which was taking place in our society, and he wanted to ensure that those who had been excluded from our society would be given access to the law school education that they would need in order to effect the laws in our society. And today, all of those who were exposed to him during the years that he was dean at Boston College Law School continue to have a debt to him, not only those to whom he brought in, in order to ensure that they were not excluded, but all of the rest of us who were then exposed to these injustices and the remedies to them that Father Drinan ensured that that law school embodied.

Just a few years after graduating from Boston College Law School, only 4 years later, I had the great honor of coming here as Father Drinan's colleague. I felt that there was no greater honor in fact in being elected to Con-

gress than in knowing that I would be his colleague. It seemed somewhat asymmetrical that I would have the same vote that he had here on the House floor. And when he would consult me on which choice he should make, should he become the chairman of the criminal law subcommittee or the immigration subcommittee, it was an honor for me to be consulted by Father Drinan as a young man now, but his colleague in Congress, as to what was the best place. And his criteria of course was what was the best place where he could do the most good for those most in need in our society. And of course, the way he saw our society was not just the United States of America but the whole planet.

So I had that unique opportunity to see him in both of those settings, both in law school and here on the House floor. And I saw him play the role of the catalyst, of the idealist, of the man who continued to push others when they say they can go no further in trying to strive for excellence and to stand up for an ideal. And that is the role that Father Drinan played not just in law school and not just here in Congress, but for the last 26 years since he left this Chamber.

When we stand in this Chamber of Congress, when Members of Congress are coming here to cast their vote, all of our names are flashed up on a board over the head of the Speaker to vote "aye" or "nay" on the key issues of our time. During the years that Father Drinan was a Congressman, as the Members would look up to see how other Members of Congress voted, when they looked up at Father Drinan's name, they knew he was not casting a vote looking at the next election, but rather he was looking at the next generation on every vote. And that led to almost every one of his elections being as close as an election can be, because he was not factoring in his own electoral life but rather the life of every person in our society. His vote was true north, every vote that he cast here in Congress.

As a Jesuit, he clearly lived up to the Jesuitical ideal of being a contemplative in action. He worked tirelessly for both tolerance and for social justice. He took on each task in this institution, large and small, as he did others in life, and offered them *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*, To the Greater Glory of God, which was a favorite phrase of St. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order.

He was unambiguous in his convictions that America could do better, could aspire to greater things for its people and the world. The direct and candid quality of Father Drinan's personality added to the moral force that Father Drinan brought to the quality of the debate in this Chamber. His personality animated these discussions in hearings and debates here on the floor. His eloquent, passionate, heartfelt speeches are greatly missed.

Madam Speaker, I think that one of the real ironies of Father Drinan's ca-

reer is that at its very end here in Congress, in his very last term here that he served in this body, that he was unopposed. In other words, just at the point at which he had convinced those who lived in his district that in fact not only was he not outside the main stream, but his views were those that should be embraced by everyone who lived within that district, he was unopposed. He had fought Richard Nixon on Vietnam; he had called for Richard Nixon's impeachment because of the illegal bombing on Cambodia. He was someone who, by the time he had reached 1980, people looked up to with admiration that he had been unafraid during those fights during the early 1970s, one that had been able to now command the admiration of everyone in this body.

His defense of human rights was tireless, from the plight of Soviet Jewry to the victims of apartheid to the dislocated and the powerless in Central America. He risked his own life in going down to Central America after the assassination of Archbishop Romero. He was the first. His voice was the most powerful. He brought a moral dimension to the crimes that were being committed in Central America. He elevated that to a point where Congress had to deal with it. He mobilized the Jesuit community, the moral community not only here but around the world to focus on what was happening in Central America. It was Father Drinan. And he was literally risking his life when he went down there in those early years. There was no protection for him. That was the unwavering commitment of his life, that he would use it in order to advance the cause of those who were most powerless.

And at Trinity College, as Speaker PELOSI said, on the day before she was sworn in he delivered a sermon to each of us who was there on our responsibilities to help the children of Darfur, the children of Katrina, and every child in need of help around the planet. And he told us that it was our job here to make sure that those children were taken care of, that God's work was truly our own here in this great body.

Now, when Father Drinan was forced to choose between political life and his priestly life, it really wasn't a choice. On that day, I went up into his office and sat with him and I asked him how he felt. And he said, "EDDIE, it really isn't a difficult choice. I am a priest for life, not a politician. I will find other ways to serve God, and I will be able to accept this, although it is difficult." And that is just how he was. And for the next 26 years, it can be argued that he had the most productive part of his life, because during those 26 years he, then at Georgetown Law School, trained thousands of young lawyers to go out across this country and across this world in order to advocate on behalf of human rights.

So he showed us how we could pursue justice, seek continued incremental progress towards peace, towards a more

just distribution of society's assets, and towards a Nation which celebrated diversity and fostered tolerance.

In the final analysis, Father Robert Drinan was a gift to all of us. Here in the House of Representatives, the memory of this iconic and comprehensively decent man of our friend and our colleague will be long remembered and venerated. He will be sorely missed not just here in Washington and in Massachusetts, but all around the world.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank my colleague. And I would now recognize another colleague who is carrying on very much that work. The gentleman from Massachusetts who just spoke alluded to Father Drinan's role in Central America, and our next speaker is a man who along with our late colleague Joe Moakley played a very important role in carrying forward that work of bringing people to justice which had begun with Father Drinan.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts, BARNEY FRANK, for organizing this Special Order, and I want to thank him for his beautiful words paying tribute to Father Drinan as well as my other colleague from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY, for his very beautiful words honoring a truly great man.

I feel truly privileged to have known Father Drinan. As was made clear by the previous speakers, he was a remarkable man, remarkable in his incredible faith and remarkable in his strong political beliefs.

I think all of us who knew Bob Drinan will miss him; however, I believe that even those who didn't know Father Drinan personally will feel a great sense of loss, because we have lost a man who was truly dedicated to good. He was a man of unbelievable intellect, of unbelievable conviction and compassion. He also was a man with a great sense of humor.

You know, the day after his passing, I delivered a tribute to him on this House floor, and I recalled his early and steadfast opposition to the war in Vietnam and his most recent opposition to the war in Iraq.

□ 2100

He thought both wars were senseless and moral blunders. Father Drinan was someone who spoke his mind, regardless of the political polls or political consequences. Indeed, many of his closest allies would caution him to be careful in some of his pronouncements on some of the more controversial issues that he took on.

But even when his words were controversial, he had this kind of uncanny knack of usually being proven right; and whether it was the war in Vietnam or whether it was his call for the impeachment of Richard Nixon, he turned

out to be right, on those issues and so many other issues.

I admired his commitment to peace and human rights. Whether it was speaking out on behalf of Jews who were being persecuted by the former Soviet Union or, as mentioned, whether it was his advocacy on behalf of so many people in Central America who were victimized by the wars that engulfed that region of the world in the late 1970s and early 1980s, nobody was more dedicated to human rights than Bob Drinan.

When raising his voice in Congress and trying to change U.S. policy was not enough, he would travel to the countries where people were being oppressed to speak out. Those of us who were involved in El Salvador during the 1980s recall with great admiration his visit to that country in the midst of a civil war where he said mass alongside of Archbishop Oscar Romero. Only a few months after that visit, Archbishop Romeo was murdered by Salvadoran death squads.

We also remember in 1989 when six Jesuit priests were murdered by the Salvadoran military. I was working for Congressman Joe Moakley at the time, who was investigating those killings. Father Drinan spoke up forcefully, demanding justice in that case.

It is also important to note that his service to people did not end when he left the House of Representatives. He continued to advocate for what was right and just in his teachings, his lectures, his numerous TV appearances and his writings.

Many of us would get calls from him. Did you see my piece in the National Catholic Reporter, he would ask, or we would get letters citing specific passages in a book that he wrote or a book that he read or some article that he thought was worth mentioning. He would sometimes suggest we use the material in a speech or perhaps insert something in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He never stopped making a difference.

I have also had the privilege over the years of attending many dinners with Father Drinan. He always kind of held court. All the attention focused on Father Drinan because he was brilliant, and he had well-thought-out answers to every single policy question that ever existed.

Over the last several days, I have attended his calling hours at Georgetown University and his funeral mass at St. Aloysius Church here in Washington. I was struck by how many people whose lives he had touched. So many of them had dedicated their lives and their careers to public service and education. He inspired people, and the only thing that he scorned was indifference.

Mark Gearan, who was a former staffer of Father Drinan and who actually met his wife Mary Hurley working on Father Drinan's campaign, is now the President of Hobart and William Smith Colleges in New York, and he recently wrote an article that appeared

in the Boston Globe entitled, "Father Drinan was our unfailing champion." I would just like to read a passage here:

"But for me and countless others, it was his role as a mentor that distinguished Father Drinan. Amid the pressures of tough campaigns and congressional duties, he always reached out to young staff and encouraged their interest in politics and policy. He took time to ask your opinion on issues and was genuinely interested in knowing why you felt that way. 'Tell me something I don't know,' he would bark out in an elevator ride or driving to the airport. A tough assignment to respond to the author of 12 books with such a keen and inquisitive mind."

I recall one time attending a speech that Father Drinan gave before the Americas for Democratic Action here in Washington, D.C. When his speech was over with, he asked me what did you think. I said it was a great speech. He said what specifically did you like about the speech. I had to think for a minute.

But the bottom line was Bob Drinan was not interested in just empty plaudits. He wanted to know what moved people, what worked, how to get things done, how to move an audience.

This country is better off, not just because of Father Drinan. This country is better off because of the countless people he brought into the political process, people who love this country, people who want to make a difference, people who want to change it for the better.

Several years ago, I attended a graduation commencement ceremony, and the late John Kenneth Galbraith was the speaker, and he said to the audience of students, I would ask you to go out and comfort the afflicted, but given the current political climate that might be considered eccentric. So instead I will ask you to go out and afflict the comfortable.

That is what Father Drinan did, and that is what we are going to miss, a truly great man who did some extraordinary things not only for this country but for people all over the world.

Let me close as I began by saying I feel it a great privilege I had the opportunity to get to know this wonderful man, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. Let me call on another of Father Drinan's former students who now serves on the committee where Father Drinan did such good work, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for organizing this Special Order so that we could pay appropriate tribute to Father Drinan.

I rise today to honor the memory of our former colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Father Robert Drinan. Father Drinan was elected to this body in 1970 on a platform that advocated progressive ideals, basic human rights for all, and ending our involvement in Vietnam.

During his tenure in the House, Father Drinan was a powerful voice for the poor and disadvantaged; and as a man of faith, he clearly understood morality in its true sense. Just 2 years ago on NBC's "Meet the Press," Father Drinan eloquently stated:

There's a common core of moral and religious beliefs, and frankly, we are in total violation of that. We are supposed to be good to the poor; we have more poor children in America than any other industrialized nation. We're supposed to love prisoners and help them; we have 2.1 million people in prison, the largest of any country on the Earth. We also allow 11 children to be killed every day. All of the religions are opposed to that. That's violence. Why don't we organize on that?

Father Drinan spent his life advocating to change these realities. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Father Drinan strived to reform our still broken criminal justice system; and as the new chairman of that subcommittee, I hope to carry on Father Drinan's legacy in that regard.

Father Drinan's compassion for the disadvantaged did not end with his tenure in Congress. After leaving Congress, Father Drinan continued to advocate for basic rights with his service with the International League of Human Rights, the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, the International Labor Rights Fund, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. He also spent the last 26 years as a law professor at Georgetown University.

I did not have the personal privilege of serving alongside Father Drinan in this Chamber, but I first encountered Father Drinan's commitment to equality during my senior year in college. At that time, Father Drinan was dean of the Boston College Law School, and he went out of his way to open opportunities for minorities at the law school. This motivated me to apply to Boston College Law School, and today, I am a proud graduate of the class of 1973.

Mr. Speaker, this evening we pay final tribute to one who dedicated his life to improving the lives of others and making the American Dream accessible to all. A Jesuit priest who, even as a Member of Congress, lived in a small room in the Jesuit community at Georgetown, Father Drinan helped make better the lives of countless millions of Americans of all religious, racial and ethnic backgrounds. Our great Nation will certainly feel the loss of this courageous and compassionate humanitarian.

I thank you for yielding to me and thank you for the opportunity to pay tribute to Father Drinan.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and now let me call on another member of the Massachusetts delegation who did not serve with Father Drinan here, but has provided very important service to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the State legislature as a leader during the time

that Father Drinan was here and another one who carries on in that tradition, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for organizing this tribute, and I am grateful for the opportunity to add a few thoughts to the eloquent comments of my colleagues in celebration of the life of Father Robert Drinan.

Priest, lawyer, teacher, author, law school dean, Congressman and international statesman, Father Robert Frederick Drinan was an amazing individual who touched the lives of thousands.

More than 100,000 of my current constituents in the northern part of Worcester County, Massachusetts, were fortunate enough to have been represented by Father Drinan during his time in Congress, and they were served extremely well by his unique brand of politics and conscience.

Father Drinan was elected to this House by what was essentially an anti-Vietnam War platform. He was the first to call for the impeachment of President Nixon but not on Watergate grounds. Father Drinan's cause was the President's illegal bombing of Cambodia.

He was a passionate supporter of international human rights. Father Drinan spoke out against injustice wherever he saw it. He even privately funded several humanitarian missions to Chile, El Salvador, Vietnam, the Philippines, and other developing countries torn apart by violence and oppression. He repeatedly urged the President and Congress to do more to restore religious and social freedom to the people of Russia, Bolivia, and Iran.

While he served in the Congress, he uniquely balanced matters of faith with matters of state. Although he opposed abortion on moral grounds, he held that particular religious belief as separate from the issue of the legality of reproductive rights and thus was a fervent supporter of those constitutionally protected rights.

In his district, Father Drinan worked to increase affordable housing in older cities like Fitchburg and Gardner, both of which are in my current district. He was also instrumental in securing funding to begin the cleanup of the Nashua River in north Worcester County. Twenty-five years later, his efforts are the foundation on which we build today.

Later in his life, Father Drinan continued his crusade for international human rights by teaching that subject at Georgetown University and by lending his expertise to numerous international justice organizations here in Washington. For his distinguished career in public service, the American Bar Association and later this House of Representatives awarded him official honors.

Father Drinan's life's work is an enduring example of public and humanitarian service that few will ever equal,

but we should all aspire to follow his example. He led with superior conviction, and he lived his life with universal compassion. He will be remembered for many, many years to come.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman, and finally, very appropriately, a colleague of Father Drinan's in the fight against racism on the central, moral fights then and now in this country, the delegate from the District of Columbia, a woman who prior to coming here was a leader, as she still is, in the movement against racism and for civil rights, and in that capacity, worked very closely then and later with Father Drinan who paid her the ultimate political tribute I think of becoming her constituent. Although I think he was still voting absentee up in my district, I will tell the gentlewoman, but you had his body. I had his vote. It was a good trade. I recognize now the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and he will understand that Bob Drinan was also a politician; and by voting for you in Massachusetts, he at least had a vote. Whereas living in the District, I appreciate that you provided him with a way for him to express his views.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I think the gentlewoman would agree that he was confident there would not have been much daylight between our voting records. So he could do either one.

Ms. NORTON. The gentleman knows well that he would have expected you to lead this Special Order and he would have wanted you to lead this Special Order, and he would have been right. He would have been right not only because you had the good fortune to inherit his district, but as he would have known, that the gentleman who inherited his district, the new chairman of the Financial Services Committee, would bring it all together for us.

I appreciate the way you have capsulized Bob Drinan's life, and I appreciate the words of his several colleagues, because each has, in his own way, told us something we did not know about this remarkable man.

Now, I have listened in patience to my Massachusetts colleagues who, with some reason, can claim Father Robert Drinan, son of Massachusetts after all, a man who represented the State, a man who after all was born and spent much of his life in the State; but you will forgive me if I come forward to speak for the residents of the District of Columbia and especially for my colleagues at Georgetown University where he lived and worked as a priest and scholar who also this evening and forever will lay claim on Father Bob Drinan.

For me this is a very sad occasion because I was and remain a tenured professor of law at Georgetown University and go every other week to teach a course there. How else could I retain

my tenure which is harder to get than to be selected, and he and I joked about that.

□ 2115

But the fact is that there has been an outpouring on the Web site of students, of faculty, because Bob died so suddenly. We got a faculty notice just last week saying Professor Drinan is ill, he is in the hospital, we fully expect his recovery, and telling us that we should leave notes for Bob in a faculty box, and they will see that they got there. This is a man who died on his feet, remarkably vital to the very end. He died the way we all want to die, just like that. No long illness, going to his last class, he died as he lived.

I must say, to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I can only imagine what the experience must have been when Bob Drinan was on this floor, because I did not know him as a Member of the House. He was gone for a long time by the time I got there.

He was 86 when he died, that is living a long life. I was tickled to read a quote of his in the *Legal Times* when he was asked about whether he thought about retiring from the faculty? And Bob Drinan said, "Jesuits don't necessarily retire," they just did what you do, and he did keep doing what he did, and he did it through a fare thee well. Dean Aleinikoff said, well, when writing for the faculty and students, he said, "his life was fully devoted to the service of others—in the church, in the classroom, and in Congress."

Of course, Bob does not need more recognition. I am not sure there was a more recognized man. He loved being recognized. Not out of hubris, but out of the delight and joy that was just a part of his life. He was joyful every time you saw him. He was a man of ideas who always wanted to stop you to pluck one of those ideas out of his brain and see where it would go in yours.

Among the honors that are most delighted him was the faculty, the vote of the faculty at the law school to establish the Robert F. Drinan Chair in Human Rights. I suppose the only thing that might have delighted Father Drinan as much as what we did in just last year, an award, that is, seldom given to past Members of Congress. After all, all of them merit our love for their service, and he was one of three you heard Speaker PELOSI speak about how rare is that honor.

In 2004, the ABA awarded him its highest award, calling him a man of the stuff of which legends are made and legendary, and he was, even in his lifetime. He is really, and we have to face it, the first and the only priest to serve in the Congress. He will be the last probably.

I note that there was a nonvoting delegate who served before him, but you see it doesn't count in the Congress. That is why D.C. is trying to get the vote. So Rob Drinan is the only priest who served. When he first ran, he was asked by one of the Boston papers, well, why are you a priest running for Congress, and he answered, "Why? Why

not? Jesuit priests always have been avant-garde. Right?" Right, Bob, but have no doubt about it. Bob was a priest first.

When he wore the collar on the floor, he was not trying to impress anybody. He was, I think, being entirely candid when he said it is the only suit I own. Of course, it startled those who have never seen a priest on this floor, much less as a Member.

When he was running for Congress in Boston, there were some who irreverently said "Our father, who art in Congress," as an unofficial campaign slogan. Yet, when he bowed to the discipline of his church and was asked whether he had pain and regret, he answered it is just unthinkable that he would renounce the priesthood to hold office. Here I am quoting him, "I am proud and honored to be a priest and a Jesuit. As a person of faith, I must believe that there is work for me to do which somehow will be more important than the work I am required to leave." I hope Members of Congress will hear those words, this man who had a life after Congress understood, that honor though it be to be elected to the House and the Senate, that may well not be the greatest honor you will ever receive.

For Bob Drinan, it was not what, of course, you, Mr. Chairman, have spoken of, what his colleagues from Massachusetts have spoken of, is the extent to which his deep religious beliefs did not stop at the altar, did not stop at the church door.

I think that Father Drinan would have been very much at home with the bishops, the bishops who are first to stand up against war, the bishops who are the first to speak out for the minimum wage, the bishops who are the first to decry the inattention to the poor. Bob Drinan was, indeed, a priest.

He, when he went to teach at Georgetown, this was no favor to the law school. I had to go on a tenure track like everybody else, 7 years of writing. Bob Drinan did not, he had been a dean of a great law school, he had gotten his tenure, and he was welcomed with open arms at the law school. He was no first-time scholar. What was his discipline? In law school you have to teach what the law school needs, but if you have a specialty, it becomes yours. Can anybody doubt why Father Drinan focused on legal ethics and international human rights?

Mr. Chairman, you have said he virtually created the field. It is a field now that our students, Georgetown and throughout the country, study. It is one of the great and growing legal disciplines of our time. One of his last statements was made in a book called, "Can God and Caesar Coexist," balancing religious freedom and international law? For Bob Drinan, father and priest, God and Caesar existed together, but the magic and marvel of the man, that when he spoke and acted for Caesar, for the State, he understood that he was subject to the discipline of the State, and that meant the first amendment of the United States Con-

stitution, which protects, after all, the State and the church from each other.

They are dangerous for each other. They can impose their will on each other. It is the great first amendment that keeps that from happening, standing side by side, freedom of religion, but that is impossible in our country only when there is no action connoting the establishment of religion.

The President, Mr. Chairman, and you have already, I think, entered for the RECORD, the statements of those who spoke at the funeral, you and I, and many other Members who attended, President of Georgetown, John DiGioia, said in his statement something that reminds us the deep character of man for whom choices that many of us would find difficult were easy because he had assimilated who he was decades before, and our President DiGioia said, At the peak of his engagement Bob Drinan was told he could no longer serve as an elected Member. And we can all imagine how difficult that choice might have been for us. But for Bob, there was never any real choice. The true character of the man, the depth of his identity as a priest was revealed by his act of obedience.

Mr. Chairman, my appreciation is particularly great to you. I have waited my turn. I have waited my turn, not because of seniority, but because those of you who came from the Massachusetts delegation were, of course, those who spoke first and foremost for and about Father Drinan. But if I may say so it is with the greatest sorrow and the greatest respect that the residents of the District of Columbia, the faculty and students of Georgetown University join you in honoring a remarkable Member of Congress, a remarkable priest, a remarkable son of Massachusetts and, yes, a resident of the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman.

As I summarize, let me say I think there is a common theme here. We have discussion again about the global morality of politics, and the role of morality in our lives. Father Robert Drinan exemplified that. In his personal life for over 60 years a priest, he gave the exemplary disciplined life that he chose as a priest and adhered to a code of personal morality that very few human beings achieve with a dedication and a belief.

At the same time, he recognized that the personal moral choices he made as a priest, and that he urged others to make, were those personal choices and voluntary choices, and he understood the difference in the scope of governance. He understood that there is a private morality and a public morality. Not that they are in conflict, but that they cover different spheres, and where human beings interact with each other, it is required that government set the rules.

He was a man who did as much to make sure that those interactions were governed by a set of moral principles founded on what was for him a fundamental religious belief and the dignity of man, and in his side-by-side example of a strict code of personal morality, which he followed as a matter of choice, and his insistence that government, when it became coercive, followed the morality of recognizing the dignity of all human beings, he helped us, if, when we listen and read the lesson of his life, to understand what for some people is a difficult decision.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to honor a remarkable man, whose recent passing leaves a tremendous void in the world. I am referring of course to Father Robert Frederick Drinan, the first Catholic priest to serve as a voting Member of Congress and a pioneer advocate for human rights.

According to news reports Father Drinan passed away from complications from pneumonia and congestive heart failure, but during his life Father Drinan spoke out clearly and loudly on behalf of those without a voice. His passion to protect the fundamental rights of the human condition both great and small was second to none.

Mr. Speaker, Father Drinan's was a powerful force on behalf of human rights and he helped pave the way for the establishment of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. Although I came to Congress after he was forced to resign his seat, I fondly remember working with him in the defense of Soviet Jews in the early 1980s and I recall that he was routinely denied entry into the Soviet Union because of these convictions.

I think it is poignant to know that Father Drinan never got caught up in the trappings of power or the personal ambitions of high public office. The best evidence of this fact is that Father Drinan never considered resigning from the priesthood when Pope John Paul II asked him to retire from Congress or resign.

Robert Drinan was born in 1921 in Boston and entered the Society of Jesus after graduating from Boston College in 1942. He completed his seminary work at Weston College, where noted activist Daniel Berrigan was a classmate. After earning a master's degree from Boston College in 1947, Father Drinan headed south to Washington, DC, where he received two law degrees from Georgetown University. Father Drinan was ordained in 1953 and completed his doctorate in theology from Rome's Gregorian University. In 1955 he returned to his native Boston to take a position as associate dean and professor at Boston College Law School. He became dean of the law school until 1969, when he left to run for Congress. After besting a 14-term Member in the Democratic primary, Father Drinan sailed to victory to become the first Catholic priest to be elected as a voting Member of Congress. During his 10 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, Father Drinan was an active member of the House Judiciary Committee and brought the first resolution of impeachment against President Nixon. For years after he left office until his death he continued to write and teach as a professor at the Georgetown University Law School.

Mr. Speaker, during his time in Congress Father Drinan's dual role as priest and Rep-

resentative personified the beauty of our constitutional underpinning of the separation of church and state. Using his priestly authority, he easily fit the mold of moral architect on efforts to end the war in Vietnam and to highlight abuses of human rights around the globe. However, he also disregarded church doctrine to faithfully represent the views of his "pro-choice" constituency on issues like abortion that rankled and angered many conservative Catholics.

Truly, Father Drinan was a beacon to follow for those of us who know the difficulties and challenges of having to fight for sometimes unpopular positions. He fought those fights all of his remarkable life that we will long remember.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of our former colleague and man of faith, Father Robert Drinan. I never had the honor to serve with Father Drinan in Congress, but the effects of his advocacy and leadership remain. In the years after he left Congress and continuing through my election and service, I was encouraged and honored to have the friendship and counsel of Father Bob.

His life is unique in American history. He was the only Roman Catholic priest to be elected to Congress. He represented the best that we, as Members of Congress, can aspire to. Not bound to special interests or enticed by political gains, he truly cared about the people who had elected him and those around the globe who were persecuted or malnourished, who could be called "the least of these."

He was a passionate advocate for the poor and he called ending world hunger his "number one passion." His opposition to the Vietnam war was the centerpiece of his 1970 campaign. Asked by a reporter for the Boston Globe why he decided to run for Congress, Father Drinan replied, "Why? Why not. Jesuit priests have always been avant-garde. Right?" Born in Boston on November 15, 1920, Father Drinan never strayed far from the city and people he loved. After earning his bachelor's degree at Boston College in 1942, he enrolled in the Society of Jesus. He completed his seminary work at Weston College, earned a master's degree from Boston College, and a law degree from Georgetown University. In 1953, Father Drinan was ordained and shortly thereafter completed his doctorate in theology from Gregorian University in Rome. As dean of the Boston College Law School, he transformed the institution into one of the premiere law schools in the country.

In 1980, when he left Congress, he returned as a teacher to Georgetown University Law School. It was there that he not only taught but wrote important works of scholarship and continued to serve as a moral compass to his students, government officials and all Americans. He was deeply interested in human rights, constitutional rights, civil liberties and ethics. Until the very end of his life he continued to celebrate Sunday evening mass with the law students he taught and loved.

It has been recalled recently that when asked about his decision to wear a clerical collar and a black suit, his standard reply was, "It's the only suit I own." He was a sharp wit, but also a deeply moral man. Many current and former members have called Father Drinan "the conscience of the House." Senator EDWARD KENNEDY said of Father Drinan that, "of all the hats he wore, none fit better

than teacher, for he was a teacher to all of us." Father Drinan will be sadly missed by this institution and our Nation. I am glad that last year the House honored Father Drinan with the Distinguished Service Award for his decade of service in the House.

I knew Father Drinan best from his work as chairman on PeacePAC, a division of Council for a Livable World, and as director of the Center for Arms Control & Non-Proliferation. He was a man who believed deeply in world peace and he struggled mightily to achieve it. He and the Council for a Livable World encouraged me when I first considered running for this office, and I will always remember their support and true belief that peace should be a goal of all Members of Congress.

In November of 2006, the Council for a Livable World established the Father Robert F. Drinan National Peace and Human Rights Award to be given annually by the council to the individual who best exemplifies Father Drinan's commitment to peace. As Father Drinan said at the unveiling of the award, "people will be reminded that: you cannot just make war." He was right to oppose the Vietnam war and right to oppose the Iraq war. We can all learn from his life's commitment to peace.

Georgetown University President John J. DeGioia recently eulogized that, "Bob Drinan never faltered, was never discouraged. It remains for all of us to carry on the work for which he prepared us, to build an earth in which justice will prevail."

Mr. Speaker, let us carry the spirit of Father Drinan in our hearts as we in Congress continue to work to complete the work he called us to do.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Father Robert F. Drinan, his enduring faith, and lifelong commitment to human rights. Father Drinan passed on January 28, 2007, at his residence in the Georgetown University Jesuit community in Washington, DC. He was 86 years old and had recently been ill with pneumonia and congestive heart failure.

Father Drinan was an unwavering defender of the civil and human rights of all Americans. His commitment to these principles was anchored by his religious conviction and a fundamental belief in the rights of all people to be respected and protected by their governments and elected leaders. It was this conviction that led Father Drinan to politics in 1970 when he sought a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. During his tenure in Congress, Father Drinan was an outspoken opponent of the Vietnam War and was the first person to call for the impeachment of President Nixon. Father Drinan was re-elected four times, serving from 1971 until 1981. He stepped down in accordance with a directive from Pope John Paul II, barring priests from holding public office.

Father Drinan was the first Roman Catholic priest to serve as a voting member of the U.S. Congress. I had the honor of serving with him on the Judiciary Committee during the Watergate proceedings. He was a man of deep convictions, a passionate leader and a good friend. Long after he left Congress, Father Drinan continued to be a vocal supporter of human rights. Through his words and his actions he demanded morality in our political leadership. Ever committed to his work, Father Drinan spent the past 21 years as a professor

at the Georgetown Law Center where he focused on legal ethics and international human rights.

We all mourn the loss of Father Robert F. Drinan, a man who committed his life to standing up for what he believed. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate the indulgence of the House; I appreciate the Members who spoke and submitted information and material for this RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD the eulogies for Father Robert Drinan referred to previously.

St. Aloysius Church, Washington DC,
February 1, 2007.

HOMILY FOR THE FUNERAL OF ROBERT DRINAN,
S.J.

(By John Langan, S.J.)

John XXIII, in his great encyclical, *Pacem in terris* (1963), which was written exactly halfway through the course of Robert Drinan's life, has a passage which puts before us an important goal, the vision of a society of citizens exercising and claiming rights: It is agreed that in our time the common good is chiefly guaranteed when personal rights and duties are maintained. . . . If any government does not acknowledge the rights of man or violates them, it not only fails in its duty, but its order completely lack juridical force." *Pacem in terris* (60-61)

A society built on the practice of rights is not so sweetly transcendent as the holy mountain of feasting and joy which Isaiah summons up for us; it is not so intimately and delicately responsive as the virtue of charity or agape which St. Paul commends to us. But it is essential to the realization of the common good in a world which is marked by enormous human diversity and intermittently intense social conflict. It is a reality which protects those of us who are neither beasts nor angels from our own worst impulses and from the harms which others would do to us. It is the not the realm of the best but of the imperfect good and the necessary. It has been the favored realm of Anglo-American jurisprudence and a refuge for those who suffered from brutal and destructive social experiments carried on in the name of ideology and religion. It is a realm which Robert Drinan, as a distinguished American lawyer and professor of law, and John Courtney Murray, the great American theologian, valued and commended to other Catholics, especially for its affirmation of religious liberty. It is a realm of ideas which has enabled Catholicism to flourish in this country and which has taught Catholicism important lessons about the theory and practice of human rights, a cause to which Bob Drinan devoted enormous amounts of his apparently inexhaustible energy and many years of that life whose end we now mourn. It is a realm which always needs to be defended, but especially in times of fear and uncertainty when false prophets would persuade us that the magnitude of some threat justifies the overriding of those rights which constitute the core of our liberty. It is a realm which we as Americans have been anxious to extend, perhaps even beyond the limits of our capabilities. In taking up the causes of South African victims of apartheid, of Soviet Jews, of the disenfranchised in Central America and the disappeared in the Southern Cone, and of the Muslims of Darfur, and in arguing for effective judicial protection for universal human rights, our friend Robert was preaching the same values and ways of thinking as he did in opposing segregation and capital punishment and protecting civil liberties in this country.

For the most part, his advocacy of human rights harmonized with the social and moral teaching of the Catholic church. But it must be acknowledged that on the immensely painful subject of abortion there was sharp conflict, a conflict which I wish neither to minimize nor to revisit but only to put into a larger context of common concern for the well-being of women and children in a society wracked by moral disagreement. This point also reminds us that the notion of human rights is not transparent in its content but is often used to express profound conflicts in a common legal language. It is not what Bob would call a MIGA, it does not "make it go away." In the matter of abortion, it is important to remember that a decisive point of disagreement for many Catholic politicians is about the appropriate limits of state action and about the attainability of a stable democratic consensus on a matter on which the major religious and philosophical traditions reach conflicting conclusions, not about the moral issue in itself or about Catholic teaching. The shape of legislation can be a matter for prudential disagreement, not an issue of faithfulness.

Three years after Bob began his career in Congress, *Roe v. Wade* turned abortion from a contested legal issue to a divisive political issue. This he had to live through, for in addition to being an advocate for human rights, he was also a practicing politician. This, in combination with his priesthood, was the feature of his life which most attracted the attention of the media and the general public. It was also what made him particularly significant to his colleagues; for here was a moral and religious leader who was ready to walk the walk and talk the talk of politics with them. In fact, it became clear to everyone that he enjoyed doing so and that he was very good at it. In listening to comments from various of Bob's colleagues over the years, I heard a gratitude and a pride which arose from the fact that he as a priest was ready to work alongside them in the demanding though often derided task of legislation in a modern democracy. This is an indispensable and noble contribution to our common life, a vocation in itself. Bob had the vision and the grace to combine two difficult vocations in a way which strengthened the commitment and the morale of his colleagues. His ability to do this was a consequence of the fact that he lived what he was doing as the work of justice, not merely the ambitious pursuit of a career.

The contribution which he made as a priest in politics was a suitable prelude to the work of his later years in promoting the study of legal ethics and in founding the *Journal of Legal Ethics* here at the Georgetown University Law Center. Events of the last twenty years have presented a series of disillusioning crises which have created widespread public demands for reform of the profession and a continuing need for careful scholarship and prudent judgment. This was a work in which Bob could find a happy convergence of his professional and priestly roles. It also provided an academic and professional counterpart to the concern he always had for the growth and the well being of those aides whom he called his "minions" and whom he enjoyed for the generous energy which they brought to political life. This energy was, of course, their imitation of and response to his own enormous energy and sharpness of focus. If Robert Drinan, was like Christ and all Christians, a grain of wheat destined to fall into the earth and die, as today's Gospel reminds us, he has born much fruit in those supporters and aides and in the generations of students who cherished him as one of the most remarkable teachers they ever had and who have been filling up the web page at the Law Center with testimony to his impact and his dedication.

But the underlying unity of the incredible amount of work he did as teacher, writer, speaker, political leader was his commitment to his identity as a member of the Society of Jesus and as a Catholic priest. When he was confronted with a very stark and public choice, he made it clear what his own priorities were. This may have puzzled and pained many of his friends and colleagues, but it made it clear that his commitment to the work of justice in the law and in politics was truly an expression of his response to the love of God, a response which affirmed that love and justice are indeed bound together, but that neither requires a particular office or role, that at the center of his being he would be God's faithful servant first, last, and always and that this meant he would continue to be a very American, very pragmatic idealist, an advocate of the society of right in which the work of justice still needed the dedication and guidance of one who would remain priest and prophet.

I do not know what purgatory will be like for Bob. He would dismiss any form of physical suffering or infirmity as a trivial restraint on the desire of his heart for the good and an empty distraction from the important work to be done, as he did in the year before his death. I surmise that the central part of his purgatory will be accepting that he has indeed arrived in a jurisdiction where justice can be attained without lawyers and where the administration is reliably good and beyond impeachment. But I cannot imagine that this will be a long or traumatic episode.

Through his eighty-six years he learned much and gave much to his students, his colleagues, his country, and to his community of vocation and choice, the Society of Jesus. As a result, so many of us mourn him and look to him as an iconic and exemplary figure, a man in whom the religious and political issues of our age came together fruitfully, if not always happily. We salute a life well lived for the good of others. We recognize a Catholic son of New England, who learned Protestant virtues and institutions and who came to share Jewish joys and sorrows, and who in consequence became more comprehensively Catholic and more universally human. We give thanks for a man of talent who seized opportunities to serve and a man of peace who was not afraid of conflict. We give praise for a friend who gave generously of his time and his knowledge to so many of us even while he remained splendidly and eccentrically himself.

But in this task of capturing Bob's special union of the vitally personal and the universally good, the deeply Christian and the proudly American, I will give the last and best word to our fellow Jesuit, Gerard Manley Hopkins, who wrote in 1881 this sonnet:

"As kingfishers catch fire, dragonflies draw flame;
As tumbled over rim in roundy wells
Stones ring; like each tucked string sells,
each hung bell's
Bow swung finds tongue to fling out broad
its name;
Each mortal thing does one thing and the same:
Deals out that being indoors each one dwells;
Selves—goes itself; myself it speaks and spells,
Crying What I do is me: for that I came.
I say more: the just man justices;
Keeps grace: that keeps all his goings graces;
Acts in God's eye what in God's eye he is—
Christ—for Christ plays in ten thousand
places,
Lovely in limbs, and lovely in eyes not his
To the Father through the features of men's
faces."

So we salute a man who has challenged our judgments of what is truly important, who has given a superlative example of generous service, and who never rested from his desire to do the work of justice. As he said to me in what turned out to be our final conversation, "I do not rest in the daytime." He goes on one final trip back to the district, where he will finally rest with his brother Jesuits in New England. We pray—may God be with you, Bob, and may God be with us as we take up our share in the great work. For, as Congressman Hoyer reminded us the other day of the motto above the Speaker's Rostrum in the House, where Bob spent his happiest and richest years, "In God We Trust."

EULOGY FOR FR. ROBERT DRINAN

(By Ladislav Orsy, SJ)

At this sacred place,
As the ancient and solemn prayers are unfolding,
And our spirits are finding peace and rest,
We remember the faithful servant of God,
Robert Drinan, our friend.

He was a priest who offered prayers on our behalf in troubled days;
He was a teacher who had no fear to tell the truth in confused times;
He was a voice for those who had no voice;
He reached out for those who were in distress.

In our spirit he is still alive, his words still echo in our mind.

Now, a silence envelops him,
A silence surrounds us.
How shall we keep his memory alive?

Powerful persons build monuments for themselves so that they are remembered: the pharaohs built pyramids in their quest for immortality.

But, a good person will be remembered for what he was: he needs no monuments; he lives in the minds and hearts of those who knew him.

My task is to speak well of him (this is what eulogy means).

This task is hard and easy.
It is hard because he had a rich and complex personality.
And throughout his life he struggled to receive an abundance of grace.
And God struggled to get hold of him.

It is easy because what I am going to say you already know, all I do is to articulate what you have perceived.

Let me then say it simply and plainly—with no ornament:

Fr Robert Drinan was a good man.
He had an immense capacity to give: that tells it all.

Whenever his restless eyes caught sight of someone,
He or she could be a local or a visitor, a student or a teacher, a poor soul or a rich benefactor,
If conversation ensued
Fr. Drinan invariably unflinchingly was ready to help him, to help her; and then he the helper said gently "Thank You!"

He fulfilled the greatest commandments in the law:
"You shall love the Lord, your God"
And "you shall love your neighbor as yourself."

These two commandments—Jesus said—Are the perfection of the law (cf. Mt. 22:34-40).

He was therefore a good lawyer: he fulfilled the greatest commandments of the law.

How did he come to that? He gave from his own riches.

I presume, (I do not know, but no other assumption makes sense),
That once upon a time,
The young Robert Drinan discovered the gift of this beautiful creation,
And had a glimpse of its almighty Creator,
Thus he became rich
And he conceived a gratitude
For all that he received,
And responded by enriching others.
And then the decisions that shaped his life simply followed:
He became a priest, a teacher, an advocate of human rights, a helper of those in distress.

The goodness that he received and possessed shaped his personality,
And throughout his life he kept giving,
Assiduously and impatiently,
Perfectly and imperfectly,
But always magnanimously
To all and sundry.

In one way or another, we all experienced it.
I am indeed articulating what you know.

Indeed, he was a good lawyer.
And he fulfilled the perfection of the law.

In response to the gift that he has received he wanted to mend a broken world.

Now we understand his bursts of energies, his broken sentences, his impatient gestures, and—the quiet retreats year by year.

Fr. Robert Drinan needs no monument to be remembered:

His spirit is alive in many minds and hearts,
May his spirit be the driving force of our lives.

FATHER DRINAN FUNERAL MASS FEBRUARY 1,
2007, ST. ALOYSIUS CHURCH, WASHINGTON, DC
(By John J. DeGioia)

"Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen one in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him and he will bring justice to the nations."

These words of the Prophet Isaiah describe a man we all know as a true servant of the Lord, because he was a true servant of justice.

Our University community, our country, our global community—we were all profoundly fortunate to have known him, to have benefited from his wisdom, his keen intellect, his principled leadership, his great heart.

A devoted patriot, he demanded that the government serve all of the people and not only the wealthy and the influential.

A cherished pastor, he shared the joys of countless weddings and baptisms and provided guidance and unwavering support to so many as they wrestled with difficult questions and great personal challenge.

A gifted teacher, he expected that students master the letter of the law, while cultivating in them a respect for the spirit of justice and preparing them to accept the ethical responsibilities of their profession.

A man of deep and abiding faith, embraced the command to love his neighbor—and for Bob, that meant solidarity with those in need throughout the global community.

Bob understood that human dignity is not contingent on the whims of the state. It is an absolute, objective good that government, that power, that the rule of law must protect and promote. Human dignity is not constrained by manmade boundaries and borders, and neither is our obligation to foster and support it. Bob traveled the globe on human rights missions, telling the stories of those whose voices those in power could not or would not hear, and championing those who could not fight.

The way Bob brought his faith into public life can be an inspiration to us all. Public

service was a means of living out his deep faith, his vocation as a priest. And so, he was a public servant of extraordinary compassion and conviction, conscience and character who knew that the power and platform of public office were subordinate to justice.

It was the depth of commitment to his vocation that was the most striking dimension of Bob's character.

I first met Bob more than 25 years ago when I was serving as assistant to Father Tim Healy, then President of Georgetown. For those of you who knew Tim, you will remember that he was not easily awed.

When he spoke of Bob Drinan, there was a sense of awe in his voice.

No doubt, Tim was as impressed by Bob's achievements as all of us were. But there was something else that moved Tim when he reflected on the example of Bob Drinan. They shared the most profound dimension of their identities—they were both Jesuit priests.

When asked about his ability to serve Georgetown, Tim would often say, "I serve at the will of our Board of Directors, but I am available to serve because my superiors in the Society of Jesus permit me. If my superiors believe that I can best serve in some other way, then I will do as I am told."

At the peak of his engagement in the Congress, Bob Drinan was told he could no longer serve as an elected member. We all can imagine how difficult the choice might have been for us. But for Bob, there was never any real choice. The true character of the man, the depth of his identity as a priest, was revealed by his act of obedience.

The passage from Isaiah concludes, "He will not falter or be discouraged until he establishes justice on earth."

Whether as a dean of law school at Boston College of 14 years, or as a member of Congress for 10 years, a member of our Law center faculty for 26 years, a Jesuit of 65 years, the call was that of justice. Bob Drinan never faltered, was never discouraged.

It remains for all of us to carry on the work for which he prepared us, to build an earth in which justice will prevail.

REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY
AT THE MASS OF THE RESURRECTION FOR
REVEREND ROBERT F. DRINAN, SJ

Father Brown, Father Langdon, Madam Speaker, Helen, Betsey, Suzy, Anne and all family and friends of Father Drinan, and members of his Georgetown Community. It's an honor to join in celebrating Bob's extraordinary life and enduring legacy. More than any person I've ever known Bob took to heart the belief that here on earth, God's work must be our own.

We know how hard he worked every day to make our community, our country and our world a better place. Now he is with God, and we know the Lord has told him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Well done indeed Bob.

To look back over the sweep of his incredible life is to see vivid proof of what even lone individuals—armed with moral clarity and courage—can do when they set their minds on making a difference. He demonstrated constantly that each of us has the capacity to work for change and have an impact, and he did it by example—through his service, his faith and ministry, and his writings and his passion for education.

Of all the hats he wore, none fit him better than that of teacher, and we'll never forget all he taught us.

His election to Congress was a dramatic turning point in the effort to end the tragic, misguided, and wasteful war in Vietnam. We miss him more than ever in the halls of Congress today, when that cruel history is repeating itself.

He stood up to the abuses of a President— at first as a lonely voice, but in the fullness of time, the nation agreed and the President stepped down.

He took on immensely challenging and often unrewarding tasks such as rewriting the federal criminal code to make the administration of justice both effective and fair. The challenge was tough; it was complex; it was thankless; it took a decade—but it was no match for the brilliant legal mind and the will of iron of this Jesuit.

He summoned all of us to ease the plight of the oppressed—whether African Americans in our own country; Jews in the Soviet Union, or the countless heartbreaking number of impoverished, dispossessed and neglected throughout the world. He held up a mirror to our conscience, both in and out of Congress. He touched us all, and made us see in our own lives the truth of those great words:

For I was hungry, and you gave me food,
I was thirsty, and you gave me drink,
a stranger and you welcomed me,
naked and you clothed me,
ill and you cared for me,
in prison and you visited me. . . .
whatever you did for one of these least
brothers of mine, you did for me.

When I think of Bob Drinan, I'm reminded of the famous lines from Oliver Wendell Holmes: "As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

He served with us in Congress for only ten years, but for that brief time, he was like a meteor across our sky. I think back to that first campaign, and to the team of extraordinary young people he inspired—like a young John Kerry—whom he affectionately referred to as his "minions."

They were brimming with ideas and determination to change our nation for the better, and—decades later—many remain passionately engaged in the public square unbent and unbowed in their commitment to serving others.

That's how great his influence was, and I'm grateful too to Bob, because from this group of young idealists, I think I've gotten a Senate colleague; at least two chiefs of staff; a pollster; a team of advisors; and one determined core of volunteers. So thank you Father!

That his droll wit, immense intellect, and his unwavering commitment to justice and peace are gone from us now, makes me sad.

But we know that "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God"—and we know too that our great teacher, friend, and leader is smiling down on us today. God Bless you, Father Drinan.

Your inspiration still guides us.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER DRINAN

(By Max M. Kampelman)

Father Drinan and I first met in early 1980, the last year of the Carter administration. President Carter had unexpectedly asked me to spend three months in Madrid heading the American delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, known as the Helsinki process and consisting of thirty-five countries.

The Congress had established a joint House and Senate Commission to make certain that the United States would not permit the human rights dimension of the agreement to be buried by the Soviet Union and those states more interested in economics and security. Father Drinan was an active member of the Congressional Commission.

In my role as Chairman, I invited the Commission to be an integral part of our delegation and urged its Members to spend as much

time in Madrid with me as they could. Father Drinan took advantage of that opportunity and I was proud to have him, a frocked Jesuit and a Member of Congress, symbolically and actively representing our country and our values.

The meetings lasted for three years and not for three months. With the help of Father Drinan and the Members of the Commission, our Delegation decided not to bring the meeting to a close until we could see signs of improved Human Rights on the part of the Soviet Union and its Eastern European colleagues. We quietly negotiated significant achievements in that area.

Father Drinan and I remained friends even after he left Congress. The decision by the Pope that he leave politics and, in the Jesuit tradition, engage in teaching was, we know, not an easy one for him to accept. My own view was that the Pope knew that Massachusetts would be in good hands with Ted Kennedy in the Congress and that there was an urgent need for the legal profession to learn what Father Drinan would teach.

Our last meeting was a few weeks ago when he invited me to lunch in the lovely new dining room for Priest at Georgetown University. I pointed out to him that I was five days older than he and, therefore, should be considered the senior, but he insisted on paying the bill. He had read an article I had written which was published in *The New York Times* calling for a serious active rebirth by our government of the Reagan effort for the world to destroy all of our nuclear weapons of mass destruction. This interested him immensely. I told him of the progress being made in that direction and I promised to keep him informed. I will. Death, after all, is only a horizon; and the horizon is only the limit of our sight.

□ 2130

COUNTDOWN TO TAX INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLSWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we would like to take some time this evening to continue the conversation that we began the first full week of Congress, talking about the impact of world view on policies that affect the creation of jobs, that affect families, working families, creating hope and creating opportunity for the future.

As we have shared each week, we want to point out that though there were a variety of motivations in the most recent elections, one thing is clear that was not talked about by the American people, I don't think realized the full impact and the emotion of many of the votes that were taken, is that we are now 1,426 days away from one of the largest tax increases in American history.

It has only been 18 days since the last time the Democratic Party voted unanimously to raise taxes in this Chamber. The reason that I bring this up is I go back to the last time there was a significant raising of taxes. In 1992, Bill Clinton was elected President of the United States. He promised to cut taxes on working families, and, in

fact, came into office and decided that he needed to change his mind based on a different statistic and brought about what was the largest tax increase in American history.

Now that was particularly interesting to me. I remember the night of that election, was not in politics, was working in business, and was getting ready at that time, had just started, my wife and I started a manufacturing consulting business to begin working with other companies, helping them with their business systems, helping them to improve productivity to compete in the international arena and helping them to create jobs and keep our jobs in the Midwestern United States in the Ohio Valley.

I was informed by the Internal Revenue Service the next year that I was going to be allowed to invest in our government. And what it did was that investment took away money that was hard earned by all of the families that were working together with us.

Over time what that would have added up to would not have been a fancy lifestyle, because we were focused very much on serving our community. What it would have added up to quite simply was more jobs. It would have been not only more jobs in our company where we would employ people to empower others to work together, but especially where we saw the impact of these regressive tax policies was in the damaging of the economy during the 1990s.

The Clinton administration actually inherited the fruit of Ronald Reagan's vision. Ronald Reagan cut taxes. He sought to streamline regulation. He sought to empower people. It led to the longest period of sustained continuous growth in the history of this country.

Mr. Clinton was able to inherit that. But Ronald Reagan was the author of that. The fruit of the policies of the Clinton administration were most felt in the late 1990s. They were felt as the Internet bubble burst, as we began to see increasing pressure from foreign competition, as we began to see jobs leave this country.

We saw regulation increase, we saw taxes increase. Ultimately, all of that adds up to money coming from one place, and that is the pocketbook of the American taxpayer. I look back on companies that we went to serve over and over again. We heard about the increased tax burdens that were on the working families, that were on the middle managers, that were on the engineers.

Out in the community, that translates into an increased burden on teachers and police officers, on people providing services, small business owners and the local community. It was something that was not often seen in the national press, but was felt very much in the Ohio Valley. It was felt in the Rust Belt; it was felt across the Northern Midwest.

We saw that working in manufacturing, in the machine tool industry,

where these taxes and regulations were difficult and created a tremendous burden. They did not create jobs, in fact, created quite the opposite. The cost of health care began going up.

There was a cost of compliance with environmental regulations that went up. And all of that was ultimately passed to the American consumer. When George W. Bush was elected President, he wanted to carry on that vision of Ronald Reagan and so did the Republican Congress that had passed tax cuts through the late 1990s that had been vetoed by President Clinton.

When President Bush came into office, he inherited a recession that was well under way. Combined with the 9/11 attacks, it was a devastating impact on the American economy. But the tax cuts that were enacted in 2001 and 2003 and that we extended each of the past 2 years had quite the opposite effect in time of war, in a time of national threat: seven million new jobs were created.

More importantly than that, I think that the leadership in the Republican Party, the conservative vision, the Ronald Reagan vision for America, understood one thing, that by allowing people to keep more of what they had earned, they will spend it wisely. They will spend it in a way that will bring back more to them and build for their future and invest in their future.

That is why we have constantly introduced legislation to allow people to keep more of what they earn. That is why last year we introduced the 401 Kids Bill, to allow parents, at the birth of their child, to set aside money for college that could be accrued year after year just like an IRA.

That legislation has no hope in this Congress, because the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has said that every one of the tax cuts that has created these record revenues will be repealed in 1,426 days. One thing that many of us did not understand before in this country, but I want to share with all of you tonight watching from home, is this: that in order for the Democratic Congress to bring about one of the largest tax increases in history, they simply have to do nothing.

The compromise that was negotiated for the original tax cuts was that those taxes had a sunset and that many of the taxes, particularly small business taxes, education tax credits had to be extended from Congress to Congress, from year to year to reauthorize them.

It is very clear from the candidates in the Democratic Party for Congress, over and over they are saying that taxes must be raised. The gentleman from North Carolina made a statement over the weekend that not only did taxes need to be raised, but we needed to have universal health care and dramatically encumber the cost of providing for health care for small businesses.

CHARLES RANGEL, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, said that he saw none of the tax cuts that

were passed in 2001 and 2003 and that we had extended in previous Congresses to see any merit in being continued.

What that means at the level of the working family, what that means for every family, for the vast majority of us in this Chamber tonight, and those who are watching at home, is this: you will have, if you are making between 30 and \$60,000 a year, at a minimum a \$2,098 tax increase, that will come automatically with no legislation.

The reason for that is, in 1,426 days these taxes simply increase. And I think that we need to keep in mind one thing. The goal of government cannot be and is not to create jobs, because government cannot create jobs. It does not have free assets that can generate value that can build a nest egg for a working family.

What we can do is create a framework to empower a framework that allows people to achieve, to pursue the American Dream, that allows them to go forth and to work, to create a vision for their own future, to build a future for their children and grandchildren, and to encourage their children that they can pursue one.

That is why America is the number one destination for people from all over the world, because America is the land to begin again. I saw that with the grandparents of my wife, Pat, who came through Ellis Island. My children have been to Ellis Island to see the names of their great grandparents on the wall.

They came to this country because they believed in their own way the streets were paved with gold, with opportunity, with a future that they could pursue by hard work, by savings, by serving others that they could make a difference. Within one generation of that, their children were educated. They had their children going through college, their children were out working in the economy. And they in two generations have created jobs.

My wife was the first woman in the history of her family to graduate from college, and she pursued that opportunity and that vision. I have a daughter now who is getting ready to teach school, who is student teaching now. She is not going to face that same kind of opportunity because the tax policies, the economic policies toward working families in this country are about to regress in 1,426 days.

I believe that our role must not be to raise taxes, to create additional burdens for small business, to create additional burdens for the creation of jobs, to create additional regulations. What we need to do is create taxpayers. And by cutting taxes, by allowing people to keep more of what they earn, a phenomenal thing has happened. The United States Government has had record revenue of taxes coming into the government.

And the challenge is not the revenue coming in by so many new taxpayers by the millions of new jobs that are created. The real challenge is reducing

government spending, addressing the validity of programs and whether they add value or not, and making sure that our bureaucracy is leaned up, flattened out and made more efficient to serve the taxpayer more effectively and allow those resources to go to the place where they are needed the most.

My colleague joining me tonight who has been the leader of this Countdown Crew over the past 5 weeks is my friend from Pennsylvania, BILL SHUSTER, also coming out of the small business world like me, who understands what it is like to meet a payroll, understands what it is like to pay for health benefits, understands what it is like if we do not get up in the morning and go to work, there is no salary at the end of the month, and in order to make sure that we can make a difference for our family, we had to go to work and work hard.

In that time, we both understood the impact of those tax increases on limiting our ability to provide for our children's future and also to have money in the economy that is going to create more jobs. With that I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this evening's hour, as we count down the tax increase that is going to occur in this country in 1,426 days unless this Congress acts, unless the Democratic majority acts to stop it.

I think it is important, you pointed out, that you are a small business owner. I was a small business owner. I know there are many small business owners in Congress. And I think it is important that the American people understand there are people serving in Congress that know what it is like to meet a payroll, to get up and unlock the doors every day and make sure that your business and the people that you employ have a job there.

It is extremely difficult to do when the tax burden goes up. And if we do not act, as I said in this Congress, the Democratic majority does not even have to act; it just has to run out the clock.

As you mentioned, what we will experience on January 1, 2011, is over a \$200 billion tax increase. And that will occur over the next 3, 4 years as tax cuts that we put in place in 2001 and 2003, if they are not extended as you pointed out, that there was a deal made that we had to have them sunset. But we need to make sure that those tax cuts stay in place so that the millions of small business owners and families, hardworking families in this country, get to keep more of that money in their pockets, so that they can go out and spend it or save it for whatever the purposes that they have.

You have, I know, six kids. So you know what is coming down the road for you, and college tuition is going to be a lot of money. And for you to be able to save, as millions of hardworking Americans being able to save, that

money is extremely important. My daughter, we just had her at Penn State this weekend. She was accepted there. As we start to look at colleges, you start to realize the expense. It is not just tuition, but kids going away to school, and living expenses.

A family in this country of four that make 40, \$50,000 a year, if we do not extend those tax cuts, they are going to get a tax increase of about \$2,000. \$2,000 is a lot of money to hardworking Americans. If you take that \$2,000 and invest it in an account that is going to get you 5 percent, a modest 5 percent return, you do that over 10 years, that grows to \$30,000. That is a significant nest egg of savings that you can spend on your children's education.

It is better that we leave it in the pockets of the American people than to bring it here in Washington and spend it on the array of things that do not make sense to the people back home. It is their money. They worked hard for it. And they should be able to keep most of it and not send it here to Washington.

What happened when we cut taxes in 2001 and 2003? Well, over the last 4 years alone, we have created 7.2 million jobs in this country. That is something that is very worthwhile.

The unemployment rate is down to 4.5 percent. That is well below what it was in 2005, and on average it is the lowest in four decades. This economy is moving forward. You mentioned that the national media did not cover something very well in the past. Well, this is one of those cases where the national media is not covering the strength of this economy.

4.5 percent unemployment is a good number. Creating 7.2 million jobs over the last 4 years is a good number. In December alone, 167,000 jobs were created, in December. We have not got the January numbers, but the estimate is it is going to be in that 150,000 job-creation range.

The 7.2 million jobs we have created, that is more jobs than the European Union and Japan combined created in the last couple of years.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was talking about the employment impact numbers, particularly when the tax cuts came in. I can remember working on a factory floor in Orleans, Indiana in the weeks immediately after 9/11, and the economic shock that hit the entire home products and office products industry, every segment of our economy, but in this particular town this factory was the largest employer in that area.

□ 2145

And there was a great fear about what the economic impact was going to be over time. I was working in business, I was contemplating running for Congress at that time. And the one thing that we began to see as we entered 2002 in that work with that business was that the economy, even then, began creeping back because those tax

incentives to working families, to individuals, to reinvest their money, to invest in the economy, to continue to save made a tremendous difference. In fact, that company continued to grow. It came out of that post-9/11 slump and continued to grow in a great way.

And when you talk about 4½ percent unemployment, it is remarkable to me. I remember about the time that we graduated from college, right when Ronald Reagan was introducing his proposal that was said to be so radical and they were going to be ineffective, that even though we had unemployment that was approaching 10 percent at that time, they said that the best economy, 6 percent in this economy would be the very best you could do for full employment. And here we are at 4½ percent. But on top of that, we are at record manufacturing productivity levels in this history of this Nation. And I think it just further personifies the point that you are making.

Mr. SHUSTER. And it is no mystery what happens when you cut taxes. And as you mentioned, I heard the same interview you heard on Meet the Press, or Tim Russert's show, I forget what it is called. John Edwards, the 2004 vice presidential candidate for the Democratic Party, said quite matter of factly and calmly that yes, we are going to have to raise taxes; yes, we are going to have to raise taxes to provide a universal health care that is really code for a Federal Government program that is going to take the decision-making process out of the American people's hands, and there is going to be some bureaucrat sitting in some cubicle in Washington deciding what medication you can take or can't take, what procedure you can have or can't have.

And I think that we have proven that when you put the forces to work in the marketplace, like we did on Medicare part D, that not only do you give people a choice, but with that choice comes competition and with competition comes the stabilizing and in some cases the decrease of prices. And that is the way we need to move forward, not with a huge tax increase which John Edwards, as I said, I think he had a Walter Mondale moment with Tim Russert saying, oh, sure we are going to increase the taxes. And you know, for a guy who is a multi-millionaire, who I see lives in a multi-million dollar home in North Carolina, it is certainly easy for him to say, well, sure we are going to increase. Now, he says they are going to do it on just the wealthiest. But I think we all know when you increase to get the kind of revenues that he is talking about to fund a huge government run program, it is going to trickle down and the people that are making 50 and \$60,000 a year, people in my district, two-income earners, if they are teachers from the Altoona School District, two teachers that have been around 15, 20 years are making \$100,000 or better now. And those are the people that are going to get hammered on these tax increases.

But back to the point I was making. It is no mystery what happens when you cut taxes. And don't listen to me. Don't listen to George Bush. Don't even listen to Ronald Reagan. Go back in history to when President Kennedy in the sixties when he cut taxes, cut the marginal income tax rate, it spurred the economy on. Revenues to the government increased. And again, that is what happened under Ron Reagan and that is what is happening today under George Bush. Cutting taxes is a positive thing. When you let people keep more money, they spend it. They spend it on what they want to spend it on, which helps to spur the economy on. So once again, don't listen to me, if you are a Democrat. Look at what Jack Kennedy did back in the sixties. I think that is the way we want to move this economy forward.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think it illustrates a universal principle too that if you, kind of like the verse in Ecclesiastes of casting your bread upon the waters and it will come back to you and by allowing a seed to be sown, to grow over time it will make a big difference. And the real difference, I think, that needs to be highlighted is this is a fight, a battle of world views, of seeing, really, the short term versus the long term. A lot of money can be taken into the Federal Government in a short term by raising taxes. But in the long term it could have a devastating effect.

I think if the gentleman from North Carolina who is running for President had laid out what he actually did with his tax money or the money that he earned, the American people would probably have a somewhat different view of things. And when I see a super rich Senator, or a very, very wealthy liberal who in many cases inherited their money, making statements about wanting to raise taxes on the rich, what they don't talk about is the tremendous amount of money that they spend to create special investment trusts where they effectively don't pay taxes.

And again, to your point, it comes back down onto working families. It comes back down onto teachers, onto police officers, small business owners, people working in retail, people in transportation, pilots, engineers, the folks who keep our economy moving forward. And to our point, leave it in people's own pockets, and they will make a difference.

But I think it is especially important that the message gets sent, that our friends and neighbors are going to see that increase.

Mr. SHUSTER. If the gentleman would yield. I have started to accumulate little stories of people in the ninth Congressional district of Pennsylvania that I represent, what has happened to them over the past several years with these tax cuts. Gregg Rothman, who owns or is partner in RSR Realty in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, which is the county seat, is Carlisle,

Pennsylvania, which is known to many where the War College is and where Jim Thorpe made his name at the Carlisle Indian school.

But Gregg Rothman, he became a partner with this firm in 1999. Because of the reductions in the capital gains tax, that has allowed many empty nesters to enter the housing market. It has increased sales and their business has grown tremendously. And, in fact, since 1999 when they went into business, or when he bought into the partnership, they had 20 realtors. Today they have 60, and that is an addition of 40 new jobs of people out in Cumberland County, in central Pennsylvania, working. Creating jobs is what these tax cuts enabled people like Gregg to do. He saw his highest volume of sales since entering the realty business just in the last couple of years.

Now I have got another story in my hometown in Everett, Pennsylvania. A couple of young guys started BC Stone several years ago. Travis Collins is the President of that company and he went to high school a couple of years behind me. What they have been able to do is create a tremendous business. In this little town of Everett, Pennsylvania they are selling stone granite tops, marble tops all across the State of Pennsylvania, all across the region, in the mid-Atlantic region. He has grown from 16 employees in 2001 to today he employs 70 people. And that is because this economy is growing. Not only are people building and buying new homes and remodeling them, which helps his business, but he is able to go and buy equipment, modernize what he is doing there and along the way, go from 16 employees to 70 employees in this town of about 2,000 people. And they are good paying jobs.

They have been successful enough that they have bought an old hotel, the Union Hotel in downtown Everett, and they are renovating it and going to revitalize it and they hope by 2008 they are going to open up this hotel and restaurant and employ 20 full-time employees. Adding on to the, from the 16 to the 70 and then this new business with 20, and that is all because of this, of the tax cuts we have put into place in early 2000, 2001, 2003 and extended them here a couple of years ago. That is what makes this economy, or helps to make this economy move forward, by letting people keep their own money, by letting entrepreneurs and small business owners and families decide how to spend their money, not the Federal Government.

And as you mentioned earlier, your background as a small business owner, your background as a person who has children, who has a family, you know the importance, and it is important for the American people to realize that if this Congress doesn't act in 1,426 days, a \$200 billion tax increase is going to occur. And if anybody doubts it, you mentioned earlier, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman RANGEL from New York, said quite

frequently and quite clearly that all those tax cuts were on the table. He didn't see any of them or many of them that were, that he thought were good or that they were tax cuts that he supported. And, in fact, I don't think he supported any of them, if I am not mistaken.

But further than that, the Democratic majority, when they came to Congress, one of the first things they did was to make it easier to raise taxes. They call it PAYGO, which sounds good but really it is TAXGO because what they are going to do is they will ratchet up spending. They will pay for their increase in spending by increased taxes. And so you have PAYGO or TAXGO is what it really should be called.

And then they decreased, or they made it easier to raise taxes by going from a three-fourths majority, which the Republicans put in place, because we wanted it to be difficult to raise taxes on the American people. But they changed it from three-fourths to a simple majority. Now, many of the incoming Members on the Democratic side I know ran on a conservative agenda. You know, I want to see how they are going to go back home and tell the people back there that we made it easier to raise taxes on you. They talk about, I know the Blue Dogs come down here and talk about fiscal responsibility and talk about cutting the budget or balancing the budget. But how are they going to do that if they are not willing to make the hard choices on what programs, not just to cut, more importantly to reform the entitlement programs. Reform doesn't necessarily mean cut. It means make them efficient. Make them produce or become more efficient. You get more out of your bang for your buck. You don't have to necessarily cut the programs. But so more and more people can get those programs more efficiently, instead of just raising taxes or slashing benefits.

At the end of the day, if you are going to increase spending, I believe this has been very clear by the Speaker and the leadership of the majority party, that they are going to increase spending and they are going to increase your taxes. Why else would you make it easier to pass a tax increase? And that is, again, one of the very, very first things they did when they came into the majority party here. So it is going to be interesting to watch how that plays out with the Blue Dogs and many of the incoming Members that they claim that they are going to be fiscally responsible, that they are going to be conservative, that they are not going to tap into their constituents' wallets and bring more money here to Washington instead of leave it home with them.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think that is a good point. The whole PAYGO budget system really is more smoke and mirrors than it is reality, because I think the thing, again, the American

people were not told by the media and certainly weren't told during the run-up to the election that they exempted their existing programs from that. They say there has to be a spending cut or a tax increase to offset any other increases in spending in other programs. But there were loopholes that were left for them to increase spending.

But I think the real thing that we have got to look at here is the impact on American families that will come from the tax increases that are coming if Congress does not act. And this is not a Democrat or Republican issue. This is an American issue, this is an economic security issue.

And I would just like to recap. Nationwide, a family of four making \$65,000, which is the midpoint income for all families in the United States, will see their taxes go up over \$2,000 if nothing is done by Congress. Married couples with an average income like this family I just mentioned would experience a 12 percent tax penalty just for being married. For focusing on the values of family, the strength of the family, there is going to be a tax penalty reinstated upon them. I think that is simply unacceptable that that would take place.

More importantly, the cost of raising children has gone up. We certainly know that. We have six children. We have one in college, one who is on deck to go to college, another one who is going to be in college shortly behind the first two. These children are working hard. They have jobs. They are contributing now to the economy and the community and they are taxpayers. And they understand firsthand the impact of these policies. But our family, for the cost that we have in raising our children, making sure they are not a burden on society, making sure that we are providing for all of their needs, appreciated the \$1,000 tax credit that was provided by the Republican Congress in 2001, and what we are going to see is that is going to be reduced by \$500.

A family with four children will see a \$2,000 increase just on their tax bill because they have children. They will see an additional 12 percent penalty because they are married. This flies in the face of the kind of empowerment and freedom and opportunity that families need. We need to have policies that encourage families, that encourage moms and dads to stay together. I think every child deserves to have a mom and dad. I grew up without a dad. I know what that is like, to be alone, to have my mom working sometimes two jobs to make sure that our needs were met. I remember going to work when I was 16. And the first time I saw, wondering what those taxes were, all that money that had come out of my pay then.

One of the things that were done, and I entered that as a minimum wage worker. One of the things that was done, again, by a very progressive focus, conservatives in Congress, was to create a 10 percent tax bracket. We

took millions of people at the lower end of the economy off the tax rolls for a simple reason, to make sure that they could keep more of what they earn. And it is important that we keep in mind the impact on families of every one of these decisions.

I wish that everybody in Congress had been in business in some capacity where they created jobs, where they had to make a payroll, where they had to generate opportunity for others, where they had to personally make sure that health benefits were paid. And I think that they would experience is a very different perspective when it is your name that is on the bottom line having to produce that revenue to provide for those benefits.

And I remember times that those of us in our little company family would go without a paycheck or take reduced pay simply to make sure that we got those benefits paid. And regressive policies that increase taxes discourage people from doing what I think is the right thing and taking care of their employees.

Tax increases and health care are very much this way. We saw in Kentucky, in my State, or in the commonwealth, a very devastating approach to health care that had a huge rise in cost by driving 45 of 47 carriers out. It was a program very similar to what HILLARY CLINTON wanted to see passed back in 1993. And what was the impact of that? Was there an increase in the quality of health care provided by small business owners? No, it was a significant decrease. It was a significant driving of people out of health care and into other means of provision for that care.

□ 2200

Why was that? Because the incentives mostly punished the small businesses. We need to allow small businesses to band together to get the same low rates that big businesses do. But in that vein I want to keep in mind what the impact is. We saw businesses that provided for their employees, that provided for basic benefits either give their employees a cash subsidy because they wanted to get out of the business altogether or they simply had to cut benefits because costs were going up so much. And there are many hidden taxes in this process that have a tremendous impact over the long term.

Payroll tax is another issue. There is a lot of talk about Social Security right now. The system needs to be reformed. I think if we sit down and do the numbers and we see that the increase is at three to three and a half times the rate of inflation for Medicare and Social Security that down the road we are going to have a significant problem.

But we are not talking in this Congress now about reforms in the system. What is the novel solution that is being provided? Raise taxes. That would be, in fact, the largest single payroll tax increase in history, to take the cap off

the Social Security taxes. And who gets hurt? It is not the super-rich. It is not the billionaires who are calling for tax increases because they don't really pay taxes the way you and I do. It is going to be those folks who are in the middle who bear the burden of this economy who are going to bear that burden as well. And I think that the impact of millions of jobs is simply unacceptable. It has a ripple effect throughout the economy and a regressive effect.

Just keep in mind, as we talk about competition with China, people see the Chinese economy as this great juggernaut; but one point that I would like to make in particular when we look at the increases, in less than 3 years the U.S. has added economic output by over \$3.2 trillion of additional economic output. That number of our increase in economic output is bigger than the entire economy of China. That is a staggering statistic when we think about that, the economic engine that we have. And it would be a grave error to put additional burdens on the families who are the producers, who create the value in that economic engine, that would hurt the generation that comes behind us.

Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania have some other perspectives?

Mr. SHUSTER. Absolutely. And you talked about the size of the U.S. economy. Those tax cuts that we put in place from 2001 and 2003 that helped this economy move forward, the reason it happened is because those tax cuts put \$1.1 trillion in the pockets of the American taxpayer, \$1.1 trillion. And a lot of that money went into savings, but most of that money went back into this economy directly, into whether it was paying for your child's college education, whether it was to buy a washer and dryer, buy a new car, buy a house, remodel your house. I mean, there are hundreds of thousands of ways that people put that money back into the economy. And we did that by cutting taxes on every American that pays taxes. Some folks in this country were even taken off paying taxes. We lowered the rates so that there were many people that didn't have to pay taxes. And once again, when you put money back into people's pockets, what happens is the economy grows.

I have another story from my district. Smith Elliott Kearns & Company, it is a regional accounting firm located in my district in Franklin County, Pennsylvania, and they service clients throughout central Pennsylvania, western Maryland, and actually up and down the east coast. They have clients from New England to Florida. And they characterize their clients as mom and pop shops, small and mid-size companies. And they told me about one of the tax cuts we put into place, which was a section 179 deduction, which allows smaller companies to elect to expense up to \$108,000 of equipment purchased in the year of the acquisition, and that that is phased out from 108,000

up to over \$400,000 of equipment. They phase out the amount of money they are able to expense. But that has tremendous growth in this economy of people going out and buying equipment, whether it is a truck to do pickup and delivery or whether it is a piece of equipment that makes the company more efficient. And in 2009, at the end of 2009, beginning of 2010, those deductions will revert back to the amount before we passed the law of \$25,000.

It is amazing how much money companies are saving and reinvesting in their companies to make them more efficient, to add jobs, create jobs. And when you buy that equipment, not only does it make your company more efficient but some other company has to produce it, and those companies have to put people back to work. So it is a snowball effect on our economy. And once again, it is something that the national media is just not covering it the way it should. I watch Lou Dobbs, and he is doom and gloom all the time about what is happening in our economy. All he sees is the negative side, and there is so much positive occurring in our country.

As I mentioned, this accounting firm has hundreds of clients that are using these tax cuts, using these ways to save themselves money, to reinvest in their company, to create jobs. And that is why it is so important for the American people to really pay attention to what is happening here in the United States Congress.

The Blue Dogs have been down on the floor. They haven't been down in a week or so, but they talk about the change, the American people want a change. And they may be right. The American people want a change. But there is nobody that I know of in the United States, in the Ninth Congressional District and across this country, that I have heard say they want a change to increase their taxes. I haven't heard it, except for maybe folks like George Soros and Bill Gates and, of course, John Edwards, who are multimillionaires and multibillionaires. They don't mind paying more taxes. But when you have that much money, there is certainly a lot less pain, or I should say there is no pain at all when you have that much money.

But if you are a hardworking American in Pennsylvania, in Kentucky, in Indiana, in Missouri that are out there every day getting up, trying to save money for your kids to go to school, trying to pay the bills, it is significant when the Federal Government reaches into your pocket. And as we talked about here earlier tonight, a family of four that earns \$40,000 to \$50,000, when these various tax cuts expire, people are going to get about a \$2,000 tax increase. And that is significant for a family of four making that kind of money, and it is just wrong.

And we here in Congress have to make sure that we are making the

tough decisions on controlling spending. Controlling spending and continuing to see this economy grow because we are getting record levels of revenue flowing into the Federal Treasury because this economy is growing, because of the Gregg Rothmans of the world and the Travis Collinses and the people throughout this country, the small businessmen, the small entrepreneurs that are creating jobs, buying things, putting people to work so that this economy continues to flourish.

So as the sign says there, in 1,426 days, which means December 31 of 2010, this Congress and the next, all we have to do is run the clock out. Run the clock out, and the American people are going to get a huge tax increase.

And we need to make sure that we are here fighting. But we can't do it without the help of the American people. The American people have to be communicating to their representatives to keep those tax cuts in place because it is good for America, and the numbers bear out: 4.5 percent unemployment, 7.2 million jobs created over the last 4 years. These job gains are throughout our economy. Also, when you look at the different segments, the educational attainment groups in this country, all those groups have seen unemployment drop. Even for those without a high school diploma, we have seen their jobless rates drop by about three quarters of a percentage point just last year, and over the last 2 years a 1½ percent drop in the unemployment rate of people who don't have a high school diploma. That is significant.

And if you look at the want ads, I think in almost any newspaper in this country, you will see where people are advertising for jobs. It takes training. It takes some level of education to get these jobs, whether it is a truck driver, which is a pretty good paying job. Today it is a very good paying job. You have got to have the training. So the way to do it is, I believe, not to have some new vast government program, but to keep cutting taxes on people so that people who are in a job can get some training so that maybe they can get another job that pays more.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Relating to your point, if I may reclaim my time for a moment, the welfare to work tax credits that have been extended progressively every year are a perfect example of that by giving incentive to a small business owner, considering that 88 percent of all new jobs are created by small business owners, but to give them a direct tax incentive to take that risk, to invest in an individual, to teach them and train them to give them a job, it proves your point.

Mr. SHUSTER. Right. And just to sum up, there are millions of Americans out there, hardworking Americans, that in the last election didn't vote to see their taxes increased. And I defy anybody in here to show me that their constituents, that the majority of their constituents, the vast majority of

their constituents voted to have a tax increase.

It is going to be very interesting here in the coming months. We are going to have the budget come up here next month. It is going to be very interesting to see what our Democratic colleagues on the other side propose. The President has proposed a budget that is a budget that is controlling government spending. It is extending the tax cuts that we have put in place, and along the way we are going to move towards a balanced budget and even surpluses. But the only way we do it is not to increase taxes but to allow this economy to grow so that the revenues continue to flow into the Federal Government and that we control spending.

Control spending and reform entitlements. Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, we have got to look at reforming them. That doesn't mean cutting benefits. That doesn't mean necessarily increasing taxes. It means looking at ways to better provide those services so that we are not wasting as much money in the entitlement programs.

So as I said, I think it is going to be an interesting next couple of months. We are going to see what the Democrats propose as their plan. And as I mentioned earlier this evening, I think we are going to see the proposal of significant tax increases, which I think is going to make many Members on the other side of the aisle very uncomfortable if they have to vote for a tax increase. But if we don't act, if we run out the clock, in 1,426 days, January 1 of 2011, we are going to see one of the most massive tax increases in American history.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to close by a sharing a little bit of a story I think that brings some of this into perspective.

You heard us share earlier that 88 percent of all new jobs created in this country are created by small businesses, companies that employ less than 500 employees, and those small businesses are started by men and women who have vision, that want to take risks, that are willing to step out. Congressman SHUSTER and I know that feeling of taking that step. That is a scary thing when you are going to make it on your own and not try to depend on a large corporation, suddenly realizing that you can create that value, create that future, and that others will follow and join with you and that you can begin to perpetuate it and grow. And the great industries, the great technologies that have come in this country, the great opportunities that have been created have been by those entrepreneurs who have gone out and made that difference.

See, our key must be to create taxpayers, not raise taxes. Our goal is very simple in government. We want to provide policies and we must provide policies that empower people, that don't restrain them or constrain them

from achieving their fullest potential. And I shared earlier one thing I think that is very, very important. We have a kind of have-it-now view in society of what is in the 24-hour news cycle, what is the impact going to be of this decision in the next 24 hours or in the next three months or one year on Wall Street. But those whom we are competing with internationally right now think in terms of generations. They think in a 20- or 30- or 40-year window, what the impact of their policies will be on their children or their grandchildren. If we step back and we take the vision of our Founders or even the vision of some of our leaders in the community, we will prove the fact that those who are forward thinking, who want to see into the future and invest accordingly and make that difference to create opportunity, they are the ones who will be successful.

And one of the stories that comes to mind, I am going to end it with a small business, but it began over 20 years ago in Kenton County, Kentucky, in the city of Covington.

□ 2215

Covington basically laid in the shadow of Cincinnati. There was residential development up in the hills, but once the great flood levee, as one of the great entrepreneurs in that region shared with me, when the flood levee went up after World War II, much of the business began to leave, the riverfront literally died and the tremendous amount of river commerce.

As the decades went by, small businesses began to leave. There was a movement out to the suburbs. Then Interstate 75 came through. Even more business was diverted from downtown and the economy became weaker and weaker. There were less good jobs there, less jobs for the payroll tax base to support community services.

As we entered the 1980s and the Reagan tax cuts were beginning to take hold, some interesting things happened. Some business people, some developers, community leaders, had a vision that they could reform the way the city looked, they could change the image of northern Kentucky.

It included many people from all different backgrounds. But they agreed on one thing, that they were going to change the direction of their city. They were not going to depend on outside government to do it. They were going to do it themselves, by investing their time and their talent and their treasure in that vision.

What began to change was, first of all, a significant change in image. And then a few years ago, the mayor, my friend Butch Callery, who is a Democrat, and I want to say this for our friends at home, for my conservative Republican friends, Butch is a real Democrat, but he is a Democrat who cares deeply about his city, and we worked together, any way we can help with development and growth.

He went from being on the city commission into the position of mayor,

leading with this vision of economic development. And he saw two things to do that were very critical. He has developed and empowered a new arts district, where we have artists and artisans who are coming literally from around the Nation to bring their businesses, their galleries and outlets into Covington, Kentucky. The city fathers, 50 years ago it would not have looked anything like it is starting to look right now in development. It is an awesome thing to see happen.

But the second thing, and to me the even more exciting thing, is the broad public-private partnership that he has forged, working with the chamber of commerce, working with the State, working with other elected officials and working with the business community and working with the educational community.

Getting the proper incentives and then joining with northern Kentucky University and Gateway Technical Community College, he worked to create a project called the Madison E-Zone, an enterprise zone for high technology businesses where there were going to be special opportunities to work together, to network together. And right there, in the urban heart of Covington, they laid this in.

The vision is very simple. We want to get the synergy of high technology education. Northern Kentucky University started a School for Informatics. Instead of simply bringing an academic in, though there are many, many competent academics out there, when we deal with high technology, when we deal with information technology, electrical engineering, it is good to have somebody coming from industry, and they brought a man named Bob Farrell, a tremendously successful information technology entrepreneur, to come in and begin running that School for Informatics. They have a School for Entrepreneurship that is also tied into the same venue.

Finally, these incentives, working with the local businesses, have created a new knowledge base. That is how Silicon Valley got started in the community around Stanford University. We may not have Stanford University here. We are starting in a new way with a new vision. But like my colleague to my south, HAL ROGERS, likes to say, we are going to have "Silicone Holler" in Kentucky, because we are going to create those technology jobs, and we are not going to see our young people have to leave the State, because now new businesses are not only coming, but they are small businesses, and what is so exciting is they are new businesses that are starting by Kentuckians who have grown up in Kentucky who are educated here and they are creating a future here.

One of those companies is Tier 1 Software. It started out when two of the partners, Kevin Moore and Norm Desmarais, reached out. They took that chance. They took that big step to start their business. They began seek-

ing opportunity to do software development, implement the applications that they developed, begin to build that business, beginning to create additional jobs, working alongside the School for Informatics. They began doing work with the Department of Defense. Again, what they are working on is knowledge preservation.

My point in bringing this up, it all started note just 2 years ago or 4 years ago, it began with that long-term vision, with an application of policy from the Federal Government to make a difference in development. Here is the challenge. Even these businessmen are inheritors of Ronald Reagan's legacy.

When these tax increase Goss into effect in 1,426 days, businesses like Tier 1, companies with startup potential to create jobs in my State for my citizens and my constituents so they don't have to leave are going to go away because of the burdens that will be restored. A regressive burden will be restored with payroll taxes, with income taxes. And also the inability to depreciate or write off investments for hardware, as Congressman SHUSTER mentioned earlier, are going to go away, and it is going to put a tremendous burden on the economy and our region.

I want to see it flourish. I want to see us continue to grow and change and transform and create more taxpayers in the future. That is why progressive tax policy reduces the rates, allows people to keep more of what they earn, and, in the end of the day, we don't burden them unnecessarily. We empower them and free them to build a future for their children.

IMPACT OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET ON AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLSWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are going to initiate the 30-something Special Order, as we have done so many times in the past. I am filling in for our colleague Mr. MEEK from Florida, who usually is in this spot leading the way. But he attended the Super Bowl, which was in his district yesterday, and made it back today and had some things to take care of. So we are going to do ably in his absence tonight. But I appreciate the Speaker's generosity to give us the hour tonight.

We are going to talk tonight about the President's budget and the impact that is going to have not only on the Nation and on the Congress and what we are going to need to do, but I am going to talk specifically about what this budget does to my home State of Pennsylvania. I have some statistics on health care and veterans and Social Security recipients, and we will go right down the line and talk about my home State, but also what this budget is

going to do for the country and what we are going to have to deal with as a Congress.

I brought down a copy of the budget so the folks at home can see what was dropped in our lap today. Each office got a copy of this budget. This is what we are talking about tonight. It is the President's fiscal year 2008 budget which we are going to talk about.

Now, as he has done in the past, 6 years in a row, now seven including this budget, the President's fiscal year 2008 budget continues with more of the same, the wrong priorities from the past 6 years and the same fiscal irresponsibility and misguided priorities that have been taking our country in the wrong direction. The President's budget is fiscally reckless and adds \$3.2 trillion to the deficit over the next 10 years when we use honest accounting.

Despite the President's claim, his budget does not achieve balance, Mr. Speaker, in the year 2012. The President leaves out many programs and uses accounting gimmicks to reach what he claims is a balance. But an honest assessment of what this budget does shows an increase in the deficit of \$3.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

Now, that is on top of what has already happened over the past 6 years, which has been to increase the Federal deficit, the Federal debt, by \$3 trillion. I would remind my colleagues that when this President took office, we had just had four consecutive years of budget surpluses and those surpluses were forecast to continue as far as the eye could see. In fact, the 10 year budget projection was a surplus of over \$5 trillion.

Well, now we are 7 years down the road, and let's take a look at what has happened since then. As I said, instead of having a surplus of \$5 trillion, this President has added \$3 trillion to the national debt, and from this point forward, using honest accounting, this budget which the President has submitted here today is going to add \$3.2 trillion more to the national debt. This is fiscally irresponsible, but the cuts that the President makes in programs are morally irresponsible, and this is what I am going to focus my remarks on tonight.

He cuts health care. He cuts Social Security through his privatization scheme which he continues to try to push, even though the public clearly opposes it. He cuts \$300 billion from Medicare and Medicaid programs. He cuts terrorism funding. He cuts the COPS Program.

Mr. Speaker, this is just incredible, that the President came here for the State of the Union and talked about what his budget priorities were and what his goals were, and this budget doesn't represent any of the rhetoric that we heard in the State of the Union. Unfortunately, the reality of this budget doesn't match the rhetoric that we heard.

Now, we have been joined once again by our 30-something colleague from

Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, and I would yield to him to discuss his views on this budget.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. ALTMIRE. It is a pleasure to be with my new 30-Something colleague on the floor here to discuss what I think you set out before us very accurately is a fiscally reckless and irresponsible budget, but also a morally irresponsible budget.

You outlined what the problem here is. The problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that we have got a budget that doesn't paint the whole picture for this Congress, doesn't tell the whole story for this country. We have got a budget which claims to be in balance.

Mr. ALTMIRE, I remember being here for my first State of the Union speech, I did not sit too far away from you, and we listened to the President stand up at the podium there at the second level and say we could work together on a balanced budget, that we could do the right thing for the American people, do the things that Mr. MEEK and Mr. RYAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ have been talking about for 2 years in the 30-Something Working Group, and that is making sure that we don't pass on the cost of government to our children and our grandchildren by these massive deficits that we are racking up.

Instead, the President handed us a budget today, a pretty big stack of papers there, that claims to balance the budget, but does so by omitting some of the biggest costs within the budget.

At the top of the list is the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are not in that budget. Those are emergency expenditures, emergency appropriations, and so the President hasn't seen fit to incorporate those in the budget.

He also doesn't include the cost of fixing what is called the Alternative Minimum Tax, which is a tax that, if not repealed, it was supposed to be for the wealthiest taxpayers, but because we haven't made any adjustments over the years, this Alternative Minimum Tax is all of a sudden not going to be much of an alternative, because millions of middle class families throughout this country are going to have to pay it. So that is not in there either.

By the way, it also assumes that we are going to take in billions of dollars in revenue beyond what most reasonable economists will tell you we are going to bring in in the next 5 to 10 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a budget that doesn't tell the whole story. I can balance my budget pretty easily at home if I just, for instance, don't include the cost of my mortgage. I could spend everything. I could buy five flat screen TVs for my house, I could get a caretaker to mow my lawn and cut my shrubs, so long as my budget didn't include my mortgage. But, do you know what? My family and your family and everybody else's family in this country has to make their budget meet, their revenues and expenditures

meet, by incorporating all of their costs. The budget that you held up there doesn't do that. It only encapsulates parts of our costs.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Reclaiming my time on that point, what the President has done does not coincide with what the Congressional Budget Office says the cost of these programs is. Just because in his budget he estimates costs and ignores issues like the Alternative Minimum Tax, which needs to be fixed, doesn't mean those things aren't going to happen.

He can ignore some of the costs of the Iraq war and the actions in Afghanistan and pretend like we are not going to spend as much money as it is going to take to carry on activities there. That doesn't mean those dollars don't add up. And the Congressional Budget Office and any reasonable economist who has taken a fair look at this budget shows that he is hundreds of billions of dollars below in his estimations what it is going to cost to carry out those.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. We are talking here about adding \$3.2 trillion to the deficit over the next 2 years, \$3.2 trillion to a deficit that is already exploding beyond any numbers of previous Congresses. Remember, this Congress inherited when the Republicans took control in 1994 a surplus. They had money to spend and they have turned it into record deficits, and now the President is going to add on to it.

□ 2230

Now, here is the other part, Mr. ALTMIRE, that creates the problem. This budget that was presented to us today not only doesn't include the cost of the war, doesn't include fixing this middle class tax increase, also paints a real rosy picture in term of revenues, but it also has some tax breaks in it, but they are tax breaks for the very, very wealthy. We have got another \$2 trillion in tax breaks over the next 10 years in this budget, and as we know because we have all seen the charts in the 30-something Working Group, because I have watched them on TV talk about it for the last 2 years. Those tax breaks, Mr. ALTMIRE, are going to end up going to the richest 1, 2, 3 percent of Americans, and the hard working middle class families in and around the Pittsburgh area where you are and in and around northwestern Connecticut aren't going to get the benefit of those tax breaks.

So what throws this thing so out of balance is not just that we are not counting some massive expenditures in the war in Iraq, and hopefully the Congress is going to do something about that, but it also includes in it these big tax breaks that just aren't going to go to families like yours or families throughout Philadelphia, throughout Connecticut, in fact throughout this whole country.

So Mr. Speaker and Members, we have got some work to do on this budget. And I am frankly upset by the budg-

et that the President put before us, but I am glad that we have a party in control and a leadership in control of this House that is going to take that budget, it is going to take that budget and twist it and turn it so that middle class families end up coming out in the lead at the end of this process. Because what has happened in the past is the President puts forth one of these backwards budget, the Republicans sort of tinker with it here and there to make sure that it ends up favoring the special interests of the lobbyists that are currently in favor in Congress, and in the end people that we care about don't get helped at all.

So, Mr. ALTMIRE, I am just looking forward to a budget process here which takes I think what is a very flawed document and turns it around and makes it work for regular middle class, working class families throughout this country.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate Mr. MURPHY's remarks. And for the folks here listening, I just wanted to let them know how we are going to approach this tonight for the remaining time that we have. I am going to give a broad overview of the cuts that have been made in some of these programs at the national level included in this budget that we received today; then I am going to yield time to Mr. RYAN, who has joined us and can ably respond to his side of things and how he views this budget. Then, Mr. MURPHY, you can go again. And then I am going to focus my remaining time on Pennsylvania specific programs and how this is going to affect my home State of Pennsylvania.

But for the national overview, I mentioned that this budget cuts Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Would the gentleman yield briefly? I didn't see where I fit.

Mr. ALTMIRE. That is because you weren't listening. I did mention your name. I am going to give a broad overview, and then I am going to give you as much time as you need.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. You get 2 minutes, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. ALTMIRE. To complete whatever it is that you want to say.

So the Medicare and Medicaid cuts of \$300 billion, that is outrageous, that at a time when the number of Medicare beneficiaries is growing every year, the baby boomers are starting to qualify for Medicare in fiscal year 2008, which is where this budget takes us, and they are going to start retiring en masse in 2011 which is during the 5-year budget, that they would reduce spending for Medicare beneficiaries at a time when the number of beneficiaries is going up exponentially.

Now, these Medicare cuts include premium increases for millions of beneficiaries totaling \$10 billion over the next 10 years. Let me repeat that. Medicare beneficiaries at home, many of them, are going to see their premiums increase to the point where it is going to add up to \$10 billion in premium increases over the next 10 years.

But, at the same time that this budget slashes Medicare funding, of course it protects special interests, it leaves untouched massive overpayments by Medicare to the HMOs in the Republican's Medicare Modernization Act of 2003.

Now, many of the Federal Medicaid cuts simply increase cost to the State. These aren't costs that are going away, they are just passing the buck along to the States. So instead of assisting State efforts to reduce the number of uninsured, this budget actually impedes progress on States being able to insure children and others.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield for a moment on that point? Just very quickly, I want to hammer that home. Because when people out there in the public, and I did this too when I was watching Congress for years, sees some of these cuts to programs here that people up here in Washington talk about, you know, the government tightening their belts and doing the right thing for curbing the growth of spending programs; what they don't understand is that just passes on the buck, as you said, to the states. Now, the States sometimes pick up the tab and pass it along in increases in the sales tax or the income tax. But in Connecticut what often happens is that the cuts to these programs just get passed down again. In Connecticut, they get passed down to the local towns, counties, and other States. And in Connecticut, the property taxes just go up. So all of this supposed belt tightening that happens here to programs that need to get taken care of, whether they be education programs or health care programs, just get passed down and somebody else pays for them. That really in the end, Mr. ALTMIRE, to me is one of the worst cases of fiscal irresponsibility, because you are pretending that you are taking care of a problem when really you are just handing it down for somebody else to take care of. And we will take some hits up here if we need to in order to get taken care of what needs to be taken care of here rather than just making somebody else be responsible.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate Mr. MURPHY's comments. When the President gave his State of the Union Address, he talked about energy independence and he always talks about energy independence and our addiction to foreign oil, which he likes to talk about. But here again, the rhetoric did not match the reality.

President Bush promised in his State of the Union speech that he was committed to reducing our dependence on foreign oil, but this budget fails to fulfill this promise. For example, and this is just a few examples, total energy efficiency and renewable energy funding is essentially at the level from when President Bush first took office. That doesn't make any sense for someone who claims to want to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

In addition, the President's budget severely cuts weatherization assistance and low income home energy assistance.

Now, this budget also cuts most egregiously renewable energy grants programs. How can we expect to reduce our dependence on foreign oil if we are actually cutting the amount of money that we are putting into research and development for alternative fuels? It just doesn't add up.

Most alarming, under homeland security: Now, if there is any issue where we should be able to achieve bipartisan support on funding levels, it should be homeland security and keeping us safe at home. But particularly disappointing is this President's request for programs that support first responders. Under the President's budget, State preparedness grants and training are reduced 33 percent. They are cut by a full third. Fire fighter grants amazingly are reduced by 55 percent. State and local law enforcement grants through the Department of Justice also have deep cuts, thereby depriving our communities of the critical support they need to operate in this post 9/11 world. It just doesn't make any sense.

On jobs and the economy, the folks who came before us on the other side bragged about the economy and the job situation, but 3 million manufacturing jobs have been lost over the past 6 years. Families continue to struggle to pay the bills. I know that is the case in my district in western Pennsylvania. But this budget slashes funding for the manufacturing extension partnership which helps small U.S. manufacturers, everything from plant modernization to employee training, it cuts them by 60 percent.

Funding for the advanced technology program which sponsors research to solve manufacturing programs is also slashed.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would. And I would say that that concludes my overview, so the gentleman has as much time as he needs to continue the discussion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. And part of what you were saying, some of those initiatives, the manufacturing extension program and some of these initiatives that we have had in this country that have really been able to help small businesses kind of retool themselves, where this budget is cutting them we have had to fight over the last few years to get the levels up. These are budgets we need to not only not be cutting, but we need to be probably doubling the size of the budget because of the kind of value that they yield and the kind of businesses that they help.

When you look at what has happened over the past 5 years, we have had economic growth, but wages are down 3.2 percent. We are not arguing that the economy is not growing. We all know it is. We all see the same statistics. What we are saying is that it is not bene-

fitting everybody. And what does our response need to be from the President, from the Congress as to how do we close that gap between the rich and the poor? And some of the initiatives that are being cut are going to further harm and aggravate and exacerbate the problems that we have now that we are trying to fix.

So a couple points that I want to make here, and I want to thank you guys for being down here, that the President just doesn't even address. Here they are: Updated by Tom Manatos, one of the go to guys in the Speaker's office. Here we have the new charts for the budget, 2008 budget authority.

Interest payments on the debt. That in the red is the interest payments. We are talking about \$230-some billion of what we are going to spend. That is what this country will spend just on interest on the debt; not paying the debt down, just paying the interest payments from the people we are borrowing the money from.

This is what we are going to pay in education or spend on education, and green what we are going to spend on veterans. This is what we are going to spend on homeland security. So the American people, Mr. Speaker, know quite clearly that we are spending too much of our money on paying down the interest.

Now, it is an important point to be made that this President, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and the previous Republican Congress borrowed more money from foreign interests in the last 5 years than every President in Congress previous to them combined.

So I find it very interesting that we hear our friends talk about how when they owned a small business they had to balance the budget. We know that. But when you got into this institution, this is what you did. So please spare us the lectures on fiscal responsibility.

Mr. ALTMIRE. If the gentleman would yield on that point. That is a tax on everyday Americans. When you increase the national debt to that extent, and we are talking trillions of dollars, not even billions of dollars, that adds to the cost of every American's mortgage, for example. Interest rates go up. If you have a house that is \$200,000, you are going to be paying between \$1,500 and \$3,000 more every single year as a result of the interest rates going up because we have to pay for that debt. When we have \$400 billion of this budget that is dedicated to reducing the national debt or paying the interest on the national debt, that reduces all of our ability to meet our needs at home, because that increases interest rates and we all have to pay for that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So not only is the government not making the investments to keep tuition costs down, not making sure that we try to invest our money to reduce the cost of health care and Medicare and Medicaid, SCHIP, and some of these fundamental programs that we all believe in. We are

not only not making those, but here is the critical components because, as you said, you get the additional burden of the interest rates going up for credit cards and everything else that ripples throughout your own than personal life.

Here is the kicker. Of that red graph there, that red bar of net interest that we are paying interest on the debt, where are we getting the money? That is the question that we ask. Where do we get the money to close the budget deficit? Here it is, ladies and gentlemen: Foreign debt held doubled under the Bush administration to over \$2 trillion.

So we are not only spending money we don't have, we are not only giving millionaires tax cuts. But in order to close the gap, we are borrowing the money from the Chinese, OPEC countries, the Japanese in order to close this gap. So our kids are going to be paying the Bank of China and the Bank of Japan and the countries from OPEC, which is totally, totally ridiculous as to what our priorities need to be. So we need to get this budget balanced.

I want to make one final point before I kick it back to you guys. We are going to ask people who make millions of dollars a year to pay more in taxes, because they have benefited from this system. Here is our option: We either go back to the Chinese and we borrow more money from them, or we ask people who have made millions and hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars to help us close this budget gap.

□ 2245

Now what would you do if you were in our position? Do you ask a millionaire to pay a little bit more in taxes or do you go borrow more from the Chinese and ask middle class kids and lower middle class kids to foot the bill?

There is not a decision to be made. We have got to ask the wealthiest in our country to be responsible citizens of the United States of America. You benefit from our military. You benefit from the stability of our markets. You benefit from our public education. You benefit from our public infrastructure. You benefit from the water lines and sewer lines, clean air and clean water. All we are saying is we have to ask you to contribute so that we do not have to borrow money from the Chinese in order to fund it.

We cannot be afraid. We do not want to stymie small business. We do not want to take away tax incentives from small business people to reinvest back into the economy. We want to keep things like that intact, but we do need to ask the wealthiest in the country to pay their fair share.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much to my good friend from Ohio. What is more baffling is that it is bad enough that the President is, in this proposed budget, asking for more tax cuts for the wealthiest few, but what is more disheartening, deflating, insulting is that he is doing it on the

backs of Medicaid recipients and Medicare beneficiaries.

There is a \$252 billion Medicare cut, a net \$28 billion Medicaid cut in this budget. Yet still there are billions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy. I mean, how do you stand behind a podium at a press conference, how do you hold up this big, thick, hulking document and say that this is a representation of your values, of our country's values?

Tax cuts for the wealthy and slashing health care for those who need it most and who can least afford it. I just honestly wonder every single day who raised these people. What were they talking about around their dinner table? It was obviously a different conversation than what was discussed around my dinner table.

I come from not a poor background, not a wealthy background, but you know, I ate every night, we woke up and ate breakfast every day. Because I was comfortable in that regard and because my family was able to provide for us, we were taught around that dinner table that you took care of and gave back. In the Jewish religion, it is called Tikkun Olam. You give back to the community and help people who can least afford it, and this budget is the antithesis of that. This is give to the people who can best afford it and do it and take from the people who can afford it the least.

I guess that is another example of why Democrats were successful across this country. Why both of my colleagues were successful in defeating Republican incumbents because the message was clear and they wanted a new direction.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You know what is interesting, and it just hit me, that if we were not here, if NANCY PELOSI was not Speaker of the House, that budget would get implemented. That budget would become law in the United States of America. The only thing standing between that budget and the American people is NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, or that stack of paper would become law, and the wealthiest in the country would continue to get tax cuts. We would continue down this road, borrow more money from Japan and China and OPEC countries. There would not be an investment in S-CHIP. There would not be all the stuff that Mr. ALTMIRE listed. It is interesting to just say, hey, the American people did make a point to put us between that budget and their everyday lives.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Speaking of S-CHIP, the children's health insurance program, there is actually a proposal in this budget document that narrows who would be eligible for the children's health insurance program.

Right now, I think the eligibility is twice that of the poverty level, and Secretary Leavitt just signed off on a formula that would narrow those children who could potentially be eligible for children's health insurance, I mean, at a time in our country when people

are struggling to afford health care, when we have more and more people, especially children join the ranks of the uninsured, which means when you are sick, they cannot afford to go to the doctor and they use our emergency rooms as primary health care. Like I said, where are their values coming from?

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. To me, this budget does not spare anybody in who it offends. This budget has something to offend poor people, middle class folks, and it has a lot to offend rich people in this country.

My district is good enough that it has a little bit of everything, and part of the reason that some of us got sent here after having the other party represent our districts for a very long time was that the fiscal policies of this President, which are symbolized by this document he sent here, are offensive to people of every income bracket. For the folks at the bottom of the scale who need those public schools, who need those health care programs, well it takes money out of their pocket. From middle class families, who are trying to get their kids through college, who are trying to fill up their tank and go to work, it does not do anything for them either. It cuts alternative energy programs.

For people at the top end of the income scale who admittedly are giving a decent percentage of their income to the Federal Government, they are looking at the charts that Mr. RYAN is throwing up here and saying how on earth can I justify giving a big chunk of my income to the Federal Government and the Federal Government sending more and more control of our money overseas to Chinese and OPEC Nations.

One last thing on that point. We also do not give people at the upper end income brackets enough credit. They see what is happening to the poor families, to the senior citizens struggling to decide whether they pay their property tax bill or whether they pay their prescription drugs. Those same people who have enjoyed these massive tax breaks, a lot of them will say to me, you know what, I cannot understand the government who has the choice to put \$40,000 in my pocket or help the guy around the corner from me pay for his prescription drugs for another month and he chooses to give me \$40,000.

There are people of every income in this country who will find something offensive in this budget, and Mr. RYAN is exactly right. For the last 6 years, as you guys said over and over again, all this House was was a big rubber stamp on that budget when it showed up here and no longer.

We now have to stand up for all the people who have found something to object to in that budget.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Just actually if you are momentarily at a loss, I have the privilege of sitting on the House Appropriations Committee, as does Mr. RYAN, and we will have a

chance to take this document apart pretty carefully, one of the things that I was reviewing as we received this today was just the continuous example that this administration provides in representing a policy in one way and doing something completely different.

I mean, we have to be careful about the words we choose when we are on the House floor referring to the President, but I will point you to the section of the proposed budget that talks about how we finally are including at least some portion of the war budget inside the budget, instead of doing it all as emergency supplemental funding. So we have to give the President credit for at least including a portion of that in the budget.

However, he actually does not have any funding for the war, assumes no funding for the war past the end of 2008. There is no funding in his proposed budget for 2009. I think probably everyone in this country would like nothing more than for us to be completely finished in this war in Iraq by that point, but that is not the track that we are on and it is not the track that the President has suggested that we are going to be on.

So, there is a certain lack of clarity in terms of the distinction between what his budget represents and his rhetoric. They are not matching each other, and I think people see through that. We are fortunately now running this institution. So, through our accountability process, we can show the disparity between what the budget represents and what the actual policy implementation is.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think what is important, too, is we are not sitting here saying, and I do not want anyone, Madam Speaker, to misconstrue what we are saying. We are not just saying we are going to write bigger checks and all these problems are going to disappear.

Included in our analysis of that document are going to be hearing upon hearing upon hearing. I have seen the schedule. We are going to get into the nuts and bolts of that to figure out how we can make these programs run better, how we can make S-CHIP with the same amount of money or more money cover more people, how does it get executed, the same with what we need to do with FEMA. Obviously, we saw that in Katrina.

Mr. MURTHA's having hearings and Mr. SKELTON in the Armed Services Committee about the war, and how do we make that mess go away and make it work better, the execution of war and what we are trying to do, how do we make this thing work better.

So this is not just about writing bigger checks. This is about making this whole system run better and more efficiently and more effectively and serve more people.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank Mr. RYAN from Ohio. I did want to take a moment or two and just point out the impact specifically that these cuts are

going to have on my home State of Pennsylvania because we have talked a lot about what the budget does for the Nation and the impact those cuts are going to have. I wanted to bring it closer to home for some of my constituents, and this is what they can expect out of this budget in Pennsylvania.

We talked about Social Security and the fact that the President inexplicably once again moves toward his privatization scheme. Well, in Pennsylvania we have 1.7 million Social Security beneficiaries, many of whom could see retirement savings cut if we moved in that privatization direction.

More egregiously, the Medicare program, as we have talked about sees dramatic cuts, \$300 billion of cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

In the State of Pennsylvania, I want to talk about what this does. Pennsylvania's Medicare beneficiaries would have to pay higher premiums for coverage of prescription drugs and doctors' services.

Reimbursement cuts are going to take effect to home health agencies, to hospitals and to nursing homes. That is what the President's budget does not only around the Nation but in Pennsylvania.

This administration's budget, which we talked about assumes, an eight percentage point cut in reimbursement for Medicare physicians. I do not think anybody thinks the cost of health care is going to go down over the next several years. It is certainly not going to go down 8 percent. It usually rises in double digits each year.

The number of Medicare beneficiaries, as we have talked about, is going to go up exponentially over the next several years. Yet, this budget cuts physician reimbursement for Medicare by 8 percent. There is no excuse for that.

The State Children's Health Insurance Program, which is a program that was enacted during a period of bipartisan government, one of the ways that this Congress and the White House worked together back in the 1990s when the situation was reversed, they put together the children's health insurance program. Well, this budget submitted by the President gives \$10 billion less than is needed just to maintain the current level of coverage in services.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I suggest you just let the other Members know exactly who this S-CHIP is supposed to cover, what it is.

Mr. ALTMIRE. It is covering children that are uninsured. In Pennsylvania alone, there is 281,000 uninsured children. We are talking about children in this country that lack health insurance, and this program in States all across this country has gone above and beyond and covered these children. But again, the President's budget gives \$10 billion less than is needed just to maintain the current level of service, not even moving in the direction of extending the program.

□ 2300

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We often hear in these debates how, you know, a certain party wants to spend money and waste money on this or that, and we are not saying that there is not waste in government, and we certainly want to address that. Our friends, our Republican friends, have done absolutely nothing to try to improve that. In fact, they borrowed more money from China to help fund the inefficiencies.

But what we are saying here is here is a program that covers poor kids. It gives health care coverage to poor kids. So they don't go to school and cough on your kid and get your kid sick, not to mention the humanity of trying to make sure that they have the proper amount of health care.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. RYAN, naturally we should cut it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Yes, so this is what the President is offering to cut in his budget. And, as we said before, would pass if it was not for Speaker PELOSI.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Now, I wanted to talk about education funding. The President is going to talk about how he proposes an increase in Pell Grant funding for the first time in many years. But what he doesn't tell you is in this budget, it again cuts or freezes funds for key college programs like work study programs, which many of us benefited from, and there are millions of students around the country that benefit from that today, and it zeroes out, completely eliminates, supplemental education opportunity grants.

Now, that doesn't add up. If you are going to claim you are helping education by increasing Pell Grants on one side, and you are going to cut, and in many cases, completely eliminate other programs for higher education, those two things don't balance. As tuition and fees at schools like Penn State University and my home State increase year after year, the administration's cuts in student aid will put college further out of reach for many Pennsylvania students and students all around this country.

I wanted to close my Pennsylvania portion by talking about something I mentioned earlier, which is perhaps the most egregious part of this whole budget, and that is the fact that funding for Pennsylvania's terrorism prevention and disaster response is slashed under this budget. The President's budget guts programs that help Pennsylvania's local governments, prevent and respond to acts of terrorism and other major disasters.

The State Homeland Security Grant Program is cut. The Bush administration also cuts law enforcement, terrorist prevention programs which have helped prevent terrorist attacks. They cut the intelligence gathering, and they cut interoperability. Now, if everyone remembers back to 9/11, the biggest issue that was exposed, the biggest flaw in our response, our disaster response, was interoperability.

The police and the fire units could not coordinate and communicate with each other, and that was what we wanted to fix. What we saw in 2005 with Katrina, 4 years later, the problem had not been addressed at all.

Now, a year and a half, going on 2 years later, not only has the problem not been addressed, but the President, with this budget, does not even take it seriously, because they are cutting interoperability to find solutions to those problems.

Lastly, with regard to Pennsylvania, this budget again proposes elimination for two local crime-fighting tools that are used extensively in Pennsylvania, the Community Oriented Policing Service programs, the COPS program, COPS, and the justice assistance grants. Now, the COPS program helps Pennsylvania's law enforcement agencies hire police officers, enhance crime fighting technology, and supports crime prevention initiatives, while the justice assistance grants support State and local task forces, community crime prevention, and prosecution initiatives.

What sense does it make to reduce funding for these programs, especially at a time when we are trying to remain safe in our homeland security while we have actions taking place overseas. So I just don't see the point of what the President has tried to accomplish with this budget. We will hold it up again one more time before I yield, just so everybody can take a look at what we are talking about. This is what was dropped on all of our desks today. It does not represent the values of the American people. It slashes key funding priorities.

I would yield at this point to Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I think every Member in this House, Republican or Democrat, can tell the same story about what this does for their district, and it is particularly acute in Pennsylvania. But let us hammer home what we are talking about. Mr. RYAN said it very eloquently, we are not just talking about writing a check. You are, Mr. RYAN.

We are talking about making choices, we are not talking about solving these problems by putting money into health care, putting more money in education. We are talking about where to make choices on the budget, on who to help and who to take from, who to help and who to take.

Let's start with the health care budget for a moment. Let's start with the premise that we need to rein in the health care budget. It is spiraling at a cost well above inflation, it is one of the biggest cost drivers in our budgets, in State budgets, families' budgets and small businesses' budgets. But here is the choice that you have. You can either raise the costs for beneficiaries for seniors and for people within the children with within that SCHIP program.

You can cut people out of the system, you can take kids off the rolls or sen-

iors off the rolls, or, you can choose to ratchet down some of the profits that you are handing to the drug companies, or you can choose to roll back some of the massive overpayments that we have given to the HMOs, the health maintenance organizations, in the 2003 Medicare Modernization Act.

Common sense tells you that as you are looking at massive record profits being wrapped up by the latter groups, that maybe, maybe, if you have that choice, you should take a look at wiping away that little slush fund that you gave to the HMOs, or allowing the Federal Government to negotiate using their bulk purchasing power to just trim a little bit off of those billion dollar profits being made by the drug companies. Instead, this budget makes a different choice. It cuts people off of the rolls and it raises the fees for people on there. So this is not just about writing a bigger check.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That brings me back to my, you know, sort of private thoughts, when reviewing the budget proposal, and the changes in the SCHIP program formula, where are their values, where are their priorities? If you lay out the choices they had, they choose covering the formula and covering fewer kids.

Perhaps it is that President Bush's daughters are grown now, or that they have always had health care coverage or that he grew up in a family that maybe didn't understand need. But there is something desperately wrong with the priorities and the values of this administration in terms of the direction they are moving in this country.

That is why, at least fortunately now, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MURPHY, we have some balance. We have the ability to exert Congress' role as a check and balance. We have the 30-something Working Group that can come to the floor each night and talk about those issues, talk about what is important to the American people, and the way we want to continue to move this country in the new direction that our constituents have asked for.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I find this an appropriate time, as we are wrapping up. I think, we only have a couple of minutes left, to remember what happened here in the first 100 hours that is in contrast to that document there. Of all the things we talked about in the last 55 minutes or so, 45 minutes, we should make note of that in the first 100 hours the Democratic Congress raised the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour. We cut student loan interest rates in half that will save the average family \$4,400, so you get a pay raise. If you have a kid in school that is taking out loans, we will save you \$4,400.

We allowed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate down drug prices so our seniors will have less cost to bear for their drug prices, and then we repealed the corporate welfare and invested that money in alternative energy and passed a stem cell research

bill to open up two new sectors of the economy for job growth. Compare the first 100 hours and who we helped, and you take that document there that cuts health care for poor kids. That is the difference between what the American people did in the last election, and what we had to deal with within the last, between 6 and 14 years, depending on how you are counting.

Now I get to do this again, show you guys how to do this. If you want to e-mail us, any of the Members, 30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov or you can get on the Web site at www.speaker.gov/30Something and send us your comments. All of these charts that we have here are available on the Web site for other members.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, at this time we yield back our time.

□ 2310

DOT-COM BUBBLE BURST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GIFFORDS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the time until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the presenters of the previous hour that have come down here, especially my friend, Mr. RYAN from Ohio. They have been persistent and they have been relentless.

At some point I think it would be very engaging for us to be able to actually share an hour and do that kind of point, counterpoint that can bring these issues to the top for the American people. And I want to say again, my highest compliment is for persistence. I am going to make some comments here on accuracy and on perspective.

I think we need to take us back. Since we have gone back to the future in this last hour, Madam Speaker, I would take us back to where we were here in the United States of America on the date, and I will call it September 10, 2001.

That was the date on which we were in the middle of the bursting of the dot-com bubble, the day before the September 11 attacks on our financial centers, the Pentagon and in the fields of Pennsylvania, which may have been the White House or this Capitol building itself, Madam Speaker.

On that day, the American people were just beginning to understand what had happened to our economy. We had this growing economy that has been credited over here many, many times over to President Clinton. I want to tell you that the Republican Congress balanced the budget through the 1990s. And they might have done so because they did not approve of the Clinton policies. There might have been a measure of spite. But they balanced the budget.

And the reason I will give that credit to the Republican majority in this Congress is because Bill Clinton vetoed

their budget several times. That kept us from having a balanced budget until finally they had to reach a compromise, and those balanced budgets flowed forward.

This economy grew, and it grew out beyond expectations. And the biggest reason, Madam Speaker, that it grew was because we had this economic phenomenon called the dot-com bubble. Well the dot-com bubble was that we had discovered in our research, in our technology and science and in information, that the microchip and the configuration of the microchip and the configurations of the software and our infrastructure that allowed us to put that all together, we found out in the middle 1990s that we could store and transfer information more quickly than ever before in all of history.

And when that happened, there were companies that looked around and said, voila, we have a microchip. We can find a way to do something with that. Let's start up a dot-com company and we will go public and we will sell shares on our ability to store and transfer information more efficiently than ever before, Madam Speaker.

And so those companies lit up and did that. And the stock market grew and grew and grew and grew. And there was a return on those investments, not because the companies were making money, but on the speculative value, Madam Speaker, on the ability to store and transfer information faster than ever before.

That went through the 1990s and into the year 2000. And in the year 2000, President Bush was elected. And about that time, sometime about the beginning actually of the year 2000, the market, the stock market began to understand that this dot-com bubble, which was this growth in the values of their shares on the New York Stock Exchange was really based upon the speculation that we could store and transfer information more quickly than ever before, and not based upon the economic value of the ability to be able to store and transfer information more quickly than ever before.

And so the adjustments began to be made in that stock market. And when they were made, it took it down to, what is this information worth? Just because we can store and transfer it more quickly does not mean it has more value, it has to add efficiency to the productivity of companies, or it has got to have a marketable value to people that will say pay a higher price for a higher speed Internet, not just for their business reasons, that is legitimate, but also for their recreational reasons.

Only two reasons this information age that had blossomed and grown, Madam Speaker, only had value because it added efficiency to the companies that we had and those that would be developed and grown, or that ability to store and transfer information could be marketed for recreational purposes.

Well, about the year 2000 the market began making those adjustments. And

the market decided there is too much capital invested in this. There is too much speculation invested in this. We really cannot turn out the kind of productivity that is necessary to justify the capital investment that had grown this dot-com bubble in our marketplace.

And so astute investors began to divest themselves of their investments within those dot-com companies, some of them not all of them. Those that had the highest promise, at least on the measure of the capital invested, the money stayed with them. Those that had the least promise the money left them.

As the market adjusted, we had this thing we called the bursting of the dot-com bubble. That took place in about the year 2000, 2000, 2001, as President Bush was being sworn in out here on the west portico of the Capitol for his first term in January of 2001, the bursting of the dot-com bubble was almost audible at that point.

Well, as that bubble slowly burst and flowed across the year 2001, Madam Speaker, it took us up to September 11 of 2001, when, as we know, the planes went crashing into the Twin Towers and into the Pentagon, into the field in Pennsylvania.

And the attack on our financial centers, and an attack on our strategic center over here at the Pentagon, of our military strategic center, was devastating. It was designed to take the financial center of the United States of America to its knees.

Well, that did shut down our financial center the rest of that week. We were open for business, might have actually been on the following Friday, but we were at least open for business the following Monday after September 11. But we got our stock market up and going again, our financial centers started going again. We patched things in. We rigged them up so that we could work and we could trade. As we began to trade, the markets began to adjust the impact on them.

That blow to our financial centers on September 11, on top of the bursting of the dot-com bubble where there were two devastating hits on our economy, yes we were cruising along, Madam Speaker, with anticipated balanced budgets as far as the eye could see. But those balanced budgets did not anticipate the bursting of the dot-com bubble, nor did they anticipate the attack on the Twin Towers in New York City.

And so we began to make our adjustments. And then following that, the obvious result was, that we had to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to protect us from the terrorists who were attacking the United States of America and western civilization itself.

That took money, Madam Speaker. And this Congress pulled together in bipartisan effort, Democrats over here, Republicans over here, came together and said we are one people. We are the United States of America and our number one most responsible Constitu-

tional position is to protect the American people.

And so we set forth here in this Congress to protect the American people. And some of the things that we did were to provide that our military could, number one, go over to Afghanistan and into the mountains in Pakistan and go take out those al-Qaeda centers where they had been strategizing and planning these terrorist attacks on the United States.

And in the process it was necessary to liberate Afghanistan and set up a government in Afghanistan that reflected the will of the people, a government of, by and for the people of Afghanistan. We did that within 2 to 2½ months of the September 11 attacks in 2001, at the cost of billions of dollars, Madam Speaker.

Now here we are, the bursting of the dot-com bubble, the attacks on the Twin Towers, our financial centers, and the Pentagon and in Pennsylvania, and the necessity to engage in military conflict clear across the globe over in Afghanistan and Pakistan, which our glorious United States military did so successfully, and took out the Taliban and liberated the Afghani people. The Afghan people went to the polls there in that country for the first time in the history of the world. A magnanimous thing, all at great cost for a great cause.

These three things that I have talked about, Madam Speaker, the bursting of the dot-com bubble, which brought our stock market down, the attacks on our financial centers at the Twin Towers took it down further, and the cost of supporting and maintaining and equipping our military to liberate the Afghan people all three things hit this budget hard.

Now, I do not think there was anyone on that side of the aisle that made the argument then that we should have only done these things within the confines of a balanced budget. I did not hear them say that. I did not hear anybody say that. I did not even read an editorial that said, well, you know, it is a pretty responsible thing that we have to do here, we have to recover from the bursting of the dot-com bubble, we have got to recover from the attack on the Twin Towers, and we have to spend tens of billions, in fact more than a hundred billion dollars going into Afghanistan to take out the Taliban and al-Qaeda and free the Afghan people, but we should only do so within the confines of a balanced budget.

No, nobody said that, Madam Speaker. Nobody on that side said that. Nobody on this side said that. We were unanimous in our judgment that we needed to protect the American people at whatever cost. And so our military went forth, under the command and order of our commander in chief and carried out their duty and liberated the Afghan people and took out the Taliban and took out al-Qaeda in the mountains in Afghanistan and in Pakistan.

□ 2320

They did their job. We all knew that we would be deficit spending here in this Congress to protect the American people because the decision of balancing the budget in a time of great national peril was not a hard decision. When you are in great national peril you go into debt.

Can anyone imagine fighting World War II when we spent 38 percent of our gross domestic product on our military, fighting that war without going into debt? We sold war bonds over and over and over again. We ginned up Hollywood. Hollywood started running movies to raise the morale of the American people and to keep us together as one people. And strategy after strategy was designed here out of Washington and from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to pull us together as a people, to not be divisive, to unify in our efforts against the Nazis to our east and the imperialist Japanese to our west. That was the strategy of the United States, and we pulled together as one people, Madam Speaker. And we spent 38 percent of our gross domestic product in those years of World War II.

And the zero unemployment that we have today at about 4.6 percent during World War II went to 1.3. That is closer to a full employment economy. It is still not a full employment economy, but that is a lot closer.

And we sit here today, and I am hearing the argument that somehow we should have walked through this whole thing with a balanced budget. You know, if we had done that, there is something my friends on the other side of the aisle that know to be fact and, in fact, I think they are whistling through the graveyard crossing their fingers behind their back saying I wish that that had been the case. They know that if we had done so and balanced the budget then we would have gone into a tailspin recession, if not a hard core depression.

But what happened throughout that, the bursting of the dot-com bubble, the attacks on the twin towers, the liberation of Afghanistan and subsequently the liberation of the Iraqi people, what happened, was our Commander in Chief, who also is the President of the United States, George W. Bush, came to this Congress with two financial proposals, two tax cut proposals, one in 2001 and one in 2003. And the vision was this, if we don't reduce taxes and stimulate this economy, the burden of this bursting of the dot-com bubble and the attack on the twin towers and the necessity to liberate Afghanistan and Iraq, the burden of all of that will fall on this economy, and the United States of America would certainly, and I don't mean, Madam Speaker, almost certainly, I mean the burden certainly would have fallen on this economy and it certainly would have put us in a recession, and perhaps a severe depression.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would submit that if we were to consider what

this country would have been like if we had not cut taxes, if we had not reduced capital gains, if we had not reduced dividend taxes, if we hadn't let people keep more of the money that they earn and allow them to reinvest it and get a return on that investment, if we hadn't made those changes in the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts, this economy would have slowed to a crawl. It would have tail spun into a recession, perhaps a depression.

But the President knew, and this Congress knew, and the Republican majority knew, and I thank you all of my colleagues for being part of that, knew that if we could cut taxes we could stimulate economic growth. If we can stimulate economic growth, we can grow our way out of this deficit spending that is necessary at this time of great national peril. And that is what we did. We did follow the leadership of the White House and President Bush. We did cut taxes in 2001. We did cut taxes in 2003. And the economy responded in kind. And there is no logical argument that the cutting of taxes did not stimulate the economy.

If anybody over on this side has a disagreement, I would be happy to yield some time. But it did stimulate the economy, and this economy grew. And quarter after quarter after quarter, we saw the longest period of economic growth in the history of the United States of America flow forth through this economy, quarter after quarter. And most of those quarters were over 3 percent growth. And I would quote it all back to you but it has been so good that I have lost track the last two or three quarters, so I can't tell you exactly what those numbers are. But I know there have many, many quarters that this economy has grown and grown significantly, perhaps grown dramatically. But this is a stable, long term growth just the kind you want if you draw it up on the chart.

And so here we are. After a political campaign, November 7 election, after I have heard over here this economy is bad and it is not providing jobs for people, well, when has it been better? If anybody on that side of the aisle has an answer to that, I would be happy to yield to you. Just stand up. I would be happy to yield to you. When has the economy been better than it is now? When has it grown more consistently? When has it provided more jobs? When has the private sector had more stimulation than it has now? Not in my lifetime, Madam Speaker. This is the best economy that we have ever seen.

And here we are, it is stimulated by the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003, and we are faced with, now, a Democrat majority that wants to increase taxes. So I have a few charts here to help people out, Madam Speaker. And this chart says, having called the tax cuts beyond irresponsible, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said, he cannot think of one of George Bush's first term tax cuts that merit renewal.

Well, those first term tax cuts include all of the Bush tax cuts, as my recollection is. So if he can't think of one that merits renewal, Madam Speaker, I would point out, I can't think of one that does not merit renewal, that this economic growth and this economic recovery has been almost a historical miracle.

But for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to not acknowledge an economic fact, Madam Speaker, is an astonishing thing. And as I listen to the debate here on the floor tonight, and as I listen to my colleagues here deliver their view and their opinion, which they are entirely welcome to, and I respect that, it occurs to me that their probably isn't one shred of empirical data that would pry them off of their political position.

But I will say that we have the ability over here on this side of the aisle to deductively reason, and we know that there are incentives for people, and when there is profit involved, people produce more. When there is less profit involved they will produce less. And if there is no profit involved, even if they want to produce, they won't last long. Their business will go under and they will go broke.

So in a free market economy, you have to have people that can make a little bit of money. And if they can make a little money, they are going to like it and they will make a little more money. And when you have a tax and a regulatory structure that allows for people to have some profit, they will continue to produce. And our gross domestic product goes up and the number of jobs go up and the wages that they can afford to pay go up and the benefits that they pay go up, which means the families are better off, that is more money, Madam Speaker, in the pockets of the families of the American people. And then we become a better place to live.

And these Bush tax cuts have not reduced the revenue stream into this country. They have increased it by every measure imaginable. And it might be possible to do a static kind of a calculation that says, well, yes, if we just increase taxes 50 percent we will get 50 percent more revenue. Madam Speaker, I won't disagree with that. You can do that static calculation, and you may actually even get 50 percent more revenue the very first quarter that you increase taxes by 50 percent.

But human nature has got to play into that equation too, and human nature says, well, taxes were too high. I don't think I really want to work those extra overtime hours. I don't want to do 60 hours a week. I am going to be happy with 40 because Uncle Sam takes too big of a cut. The taxes are too high. I am not going to sit there and make those extra sales phone calls at night. I am going to go home and see my family. I am going to settle for less income. Or the business owner that says well, the taxes are too high. I was going to add an extra line on to my

manufacturing plant here and hire an extra hundred people, but, no, taxes are too high. The regulations are too high. I am going to be just satisfied with what I have. Or maybe shrink it down a little bit and maximize my profits and just stay here, hold the status quo.

□ 2330

That is what goes on in the minds of the people who are creating the jobs in America, especially America's small business people. For when they hear over here, Madam Speaker, that they want to increase taxes and punish the producers in America, the producers aren't stupid. They are going to decide I can take so much punishment but I can't take that much punishment; so I am going to back up a little bit and I am going to back off. I am going to quit creating jobs and probably lay a few people off. I am going to consolidate my business, and maybe I will just coast out the rest of my life. And you have lost that business owner for the rest of their life. And you have got to then rely on some young entrepreneur to come in and light this thing up. But why will they if you take away, in your perverse way, taxing the incentives of the entrepreneurs of America, which is a life blood of who we are as a people?

So the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, having called the tax cuts beyond irresponsible, the chairman said he cannot think of one of George Bush's first-term tax cuts that merits renewal. Astonishing. Would you really want to back up and give up on the longest period of growth in history, and I have to be careful of that, at least in my history? And I know of no time in the history of the United States of America where we had more growth.

Well, it is one thing, Madam Speaker, to take the position that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee cannot think of one that merits renewal, but here is a statement that comes from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and that is September 26 of 2006, where he vowed to put all of President Bush's 2001 and 2003 tax cuts on the chopping block.

Why? Why in the world, Madam Speaker, would you take something that has proven success, this long period of growth that has run 3 percent and more for most of the last dozen quarters or more, dozen and a half quarters at least, and put them all on the chopping block and chop them off and let them go? Why? Why would that be the case? Aren't we looking forward to a chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that maybe is an economist or at least a well-versed, well-read amateur economist, and wouldn't an economist who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee want to have reasonable growth, maybe even dynamic growth, here in the United States of America? What would be the merit in trying to kill the economy of the country that you have sworn to defend and that you love, and, in fact, in

his case, has stood up and put his life on the line and defended, to his credit?

It can only be one thing. I do not think he really wants to destroy the economy of the United States of America, but I think there is a political agenda, Madam Speaker. And this will be devastating to the economy of the United States if these tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 are put on the chopping block. And it isn't that they have to be put on the block and voted down. These tax cuts sunset. They will need action in the House and the Senate to be renewed. And they need to be renewed because we know what kind of growth they have stimulated.

In fact, last September, and I believe the date was September 15, under these Bush tax cuts, the Federal Government collected more money on that day than any other day in the history of the United States of America. September 15, 2006. That would be the last time that happened under the Rangel plan.

So, Madam Speaker, I would submit that these tax cuts do have a sunset and that sunset for them, the date that they expire, is 1,426 days from now; 1,426 from now, Madam Speaker, and if this Congress does nothing, they expire.

Now, I would ask why would it be that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Speaker PELOSI, and the leadership on the Democrat side of the aisle would want to see the Bush tax cuts expire. Well, it is because if that does not happen, they cannot balance their budget. They can't balance their budget without an increase in taxes. And this brings about, when those dates expire, a real increase in taxes. Regardless of how it is voted, regardless of how the bill is brought forward, regardless of what might be amended, in the end if these tax cuts are not extended, the result is a tax increase. A tax increase will temporarily fund their spending increases, and they will be able to claim that they have a balanced budget for a little while.

But that won't last long, Madam Speaker. But the temporary timing of this comes together in such a way that the expiration of the Bush tax cuts in 1,426 days is nice and handy because they can use that to claim that they are complying with PAYGO, the pay-as-you-go plan, the not-going-to-spend-any-more-money-than-you-have-coming-in plan, the plan that says if we want to spend more money, we will just increase taxes on the backs of the American people, the hardworking American people. And I believe the government takes enough out of their paychecks, Madam Speaker.

I believe we have hardworking Americans who are still working hard and struggling to make ends meet. They have to have a budget. The American people have to meet that budget. When they look at what they need to do in order to live within their means, they make those decisions, Madam Speaker. And they don't have the option to de-

cide in 1,426 days I am going to raise taxes. I am going to kick that up to the point where now I can raise spending.

No. The American people have to be responsible. They have to look at the paycheck they have coming in and make decisions on what they can afford, what standard of living they can afford to have. And so they will decide if they can have that cabin at the lake or that new SUV or that boat or whether they are going to plastic their windows and try to keep their heat bill down so that they can live within their means. We all have to make those kinds of decisions to live within our means, and when a decision is made to take money out of the pockets of the American people, those people that are out there putting plastic over their windows in one of the coldest winters that we have had in a long, long time, Madam Speaker, and we are taxing them, raising their taxes so that this government can spend more money to buy more votes and influence more people across this country, it is a travesty of justice.

I have been with some of the Democrats, Madam Speaker, and some of them said they want to balance the budget. And when they say that, you can't get them to admit that they want to increase taxes to balance the budget. Some of the Blue Dogs will say they want to balance the budget in a responsible way. I can't get them to say they would do so without increasing taxes. In fact, whenever they have offered a balanced budget here on the floor, it always has had an increase in taxes as part of their balanced budget.

So I have taken a look at our budget, Madam Speaker, and decided what needs to happen. If we are going to balance the budget, the American people ought to know what it takes to balance the budget here in the United States of America. About \$2.8 trillion is our budget, and we have a lot of revenue coming in, and the revenue increase has been double digits the last 2 to 3 years because this economy has been so strong and the unemployment has been so low and the new jobs created have been so dynamic. All of this seems to be a secret to the American people, but that is all fact, Madam Speaker. But still we have this growth in entitlements. The entitlements of Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and you add to that the cost of interest that is going up, and as interest goes up, of course, the more national debt that we have. No one in this Congress aside from myself, Madam Speaker, is talking about how do you balance the budget, how do you balance the budget without increasing taxes.

I want this dynamic economy. I want to see double-digit increase in our revenue stream. I don't want to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. The people on this side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, have a belief that there is something evil about that goose that lays the golden egg, and they want to

kill that goose by increasing taxes. But as for me, I will submit that I am willing to cut some spending. Let us take this on down to the point where we can balance this budget and then balance the budget without increasing taxes, Madam Speaker.

And I have done a little calculation on this, and this is nothing but a little napkin calculation with a calculator off of my belt, and the final numbers will be coming in in the next couple of days, and if all goes well, I will be able to introduce a bill and we can have a debate on this floor on a real balanced budget, Madam Speaker.

□ 2340

But if we were to hold defense spending harmless, let defense spending grow the way it needs to, because we have to protect the American people, set that part aside, and then put into it non-defense discretionary spending, that is the spending that is not including the entitlements, being Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, also the necessity to pay for the interest on the national debt, those things all tied together, plus non-defense discretionary, all of that together, if we would look at the 2007 fiscal year budget and make adjustments in that for 2008, it would be necessary for us to cut about 8 percent across-the-board in all of those categories if we were going to balance the budget.

So when the American people clamor for a balanced budget, they need to understand what they are talking about. They need to understand the impact on their own budget, what happens to their Social Security benefits, their Medicaid and Medicaid benefits, and, of course, we have to pay the interest bill, and then how we have to shrink down some of the discretionary spending in this Federal budget.

All of that can happen with the support of the American people. An 8 percent cut seems to me to be a bit Draconian. But if we had frozen our Federal spending when I came to this Congress in 2003, we would have a balanced budget today, Madam Speaker, with a minimal amount of pain, and we would be able to have a debate for the American people that would be focused on what is the future of this country going to be?

We can't make these adjustments to Social Security if we are not willing to make those changes that were called for by President Bush with personal retirement accounts. If we can't give people a percentage of their Social Security that they are contributing into their own control so that they can have some investment in their own destiny, while we guarantee those benefits to our seniors, if we can't make those changes, the inevitable result is, Madam Speaker, we will have to cut the benefits to our seniors.

I want to keep that pledge to our seniors. Because of that, I want to configure a kind of Social Security reform that will allow for a measure of that to go into personal retirement accounts

so that we can get people with their own accounts down the road a ways that can be independent and stand up and take care of their own retirement. That an essential component of this.

If we don't do that, we are going to have to look the American people in the eye and say we didn't have the will to do the right thing. Now we are going to have to do the necessary thing. The necessary thing then would be to reduce benefits or increase contributions. In either case, increasing contributions at a time when we have fewer people working and more people collecting, as the baby-boomers come on line, and I am one, Madam Speaker, it is no time to put more burden on the workers in America. That will be the inevitable result if we are not able to bring reform to the Social Security plan.

So, 8 percent across-the-board, holding defense spending harmless, that will get us pretty close to a balanced budget. That is 8 percent plus or minus about half a percent. Closer numbers are coming in in the next few days.

Now, the question is, over here as I listen to the people on the other side of the aisle, they don't seem to trust the free markets. In fact, I don't know that they understand the free markets. But the question for the American people, Madam Speaker, is do you trust government or do you trust free markets? Do you trust them when it comes to who is going to do the best job of managing and controlling your money?

I will submit that the people that earn the money ought to have control of the money, and they will spend it better than government spends it almost every time. When it comes to health care, they need control of their own health care. They have to be able to control their own destiny, to have the freedom of choice to decide where they want to invest their health care dollars.

I appreciate the President coming here to this floor and speaking from the location where you are, Madam Speaker, about the need to provide for full deductibility for health insurance premiums, at least for those with under \$15,000 in health insurance premiums.

We have had a pretty good and healthy history with employer-based health care plans, but it is not enough. We have too many American people that are not insured for health care. If we can give them full deductibility of their health care benefits so they can make that deduction and make the calculation on their bottom line and determine it is better for them to be insured than not be insured, we will have, instead of having 47 million people uninsured, we will have far less uninsured, and this country is better off and people will be making more decisions individually between them and their doctor.

I want the American people to negotiate with their doctor, every individual American to have that personal relationship and be able to control that

account and have an insurance policy that they know and understand and one that is fully deductible and one that is portable; one that even though the employer may contribute to the premium, they can take it with them when they go from job to job, which there is more job moving now than in the history of this country.

I want the American people to have a Health Savings Account, Madam Speaker, that they can invest money in; that goes in tax-free, and then as the money rolls out that is spent back into premiums, in major medical health care and having regular annual tests to monitor their health situation, so that we have a healthy America with all the right incentives that are set up, rather than the perverse incentives being set up.

Then one day, having those Americans that are young today, they could put a little over \$5,000 into their Health Savings Account annually and manage their health care and get the tests done, watch their weight, exercise, abstain from tobacco, minimize their alcohol use and have a healthy lifestyle, those Americans will arrive at retirement with six figures times something in their Health Savings Account.

Madam Speaker, it is my view and my vision that that day will come when there are hundreds of thousands of dollars wrapped up in individual Health Savings Accounts that haven't been used because they have a healthy lifestyle, and they have been insured for catastrophic insurance and had enough money to take care of the deductible in order to do that, and saved hundreds and thousands of dollars in their health insurance premiums. When they arrive at 65 and qualify for Medicare, we can look at them and say, well, Joe and Sally, you have done pretty well. You have taken care of your health and you have got this nice nest egg in your Health Savings Account. And let's just say it is half a million dollars, just to put a big number up there on the board, and let's just say at age 65 they can negotiate for a paid up health insurance plan, Madam Speaker, for the balance of their life that would substitute for Medicare.

Let's just say the Federal Government can step in there and say, you know what we are going to help subsidize that? We would like to buy you down on that. We can get together on that. Out of your \$500,000 and our Federal Treasury, we will put together some money so that we can provide a paid health insurance plan, and that paid up health insurance plan would substitute for Medicare, and the rest of your life you would be covered under that, kind of like an annuity that takes care of your health care.

Then, let's just say that that takes \$250,000 out of the \$500,000 that happens to be in the Health Savings Account by the time Joe and Sally, who are now at the young age, arrive at 65 and qualify for Medicare, now they have a quarter of a million dollars left over. What we

would they do that? My answer would be whatever you so choose. You have managed your lives well. You have been fortunate. You have a strong Health Savings Account. You provided a paid up health insurance plan for the rest of your life, you and our Medicare funding has supplemented to create that. Now we want to reward you and let you take the money out of your Health Savings Account, travel the world, will it to your kids, do whatever you would like to do.

Madam Speaker, who could be opposed to such a thing? I would submit there will be many on this side of the aisle that will be opposed to such a thing because they don't want independence for the American people. They don't have confidence in the judgment of the American people. They want dependence for the American people. They want the American people to be dependent so they can come back to Congress and say I need you. Set me up a health care plan and tax my neighbor, tax that rich person, punish them for their productivity. Give me some of the benefits of that. They set up this class warfare which empowers them politically. That is the side of the aisle, the psychology that comes there.

Then, Madam Speaker, as I watch this clock tick down, there are a few other pieces of subject matter that need to be addressed. One of them was brought up by our group here in the previous hour, and that was the issue of energy.

I know that we have disagreed consistently on what we should do to develop American energy sources. My view is we need to develop our American energy sources. Every place where we can legitimately do so in an environmentally friendly fashion, we should open up American energy.

□ 2350

We have at least 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas offshore, and most of that is offshore around Florida and some in the gulf that is not Florida. 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas; and yet we sit here, and last fall, last minute in our lame duck session we opened up a tiny little sliver of offshore drilling.

We have mineral rights out to 200 miles, and yet the idea is if we would put a gas well down at 199 miles out, somebody that was planning on going to Florida to sit on the beach would hear about that and decide, well, I know I can't see 199 miles out offshore, but somehow I would know that was out there so I don't want to sit on a beach that has somebody drawing natural gas off a platform that is invisible to me and environmentally friendly.

And, by the way, there has been no gas well that has ever polluted anything anytime. If there has ever been a gas well eruption, it went off into the atmosphere. And so it is not an environmental issue; and because they are out so far from the shoreline it is not a scenery issue, which is no excuse

anyway, Madam Speaker. It is a political issue.

Here in this country we have people who are environmentalists who jump on the environmental band wagon and then they oppose anything that they decide could have an argument that would be against the environment, and they do so so they can raise political money and they can support political candidates, and they do so in defiance of rationale and they do so in defiance of logic.

Again, they have set aside this Western Civilization tenet of the age of reason, deductive reasoning. Deductive reasoning says, well, if you have a lot of natural gas offshore in Florida and if you can only see about 12 miles offshore, and even if you could see those rigs out there, it doesn't matter to me, I could sit on the beach with a rig out there, it is something to look at. But it is beyond where they could see.

Would you not in a deductively reasoning way, Madam Speaker, go in there and explore for that oil and the gas and open that up and bring that natural gas into the United States and produce all the things we do, plastics and fertilizer? I mean, the cost of our fertilizer is the cost of our food. The nitrogen fertilizer that goes in, 90 percent of the input comes from natural gas. So you can't grow anything without nitrogen. And our corn that produces our ethanol is founded in a nitrogen base.

So if we are going to be able to reduce our dependency on foreign oil, we have got to have more natural gas to produce the fertilizer. And we can go out there and explore for that and have American energy coming up out of the bottom of the ocean and pumping it into the United States and turning it into fertilizer and heating our homes and our factories and using it to produce all kinds of a myriad of products. But somehow the environmentalists have blocked that all down, not because it is rational, not because they can deductively reason that it makes sense, but simply because there is some visceral instinct that says we think we can raise some campaign dollars and we can get some people to oppose that.

And, by the way, if we are emotional about it, they won't even stop and think. Which is the truth, Madam Speaker. They didn't stop and think about ANWR, either. And I did. And I thought, well, if this is perhaps today's largest energy reserve that the United States of America has, and if I am seeing commercials that show the Sierra Club and they put out this commercial that shows this pristine alpine forest and they say don't go up there and explore in ANWR because you will be destroying this pristine alpine forest, and I looked at that and I thought some of that doesn't add up so good for me, Madam Speaker.

So I went up there to ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR, traveled all over it, flew over it, down low, looked for everything,

looked for wildlife, hours in the air at the lowest altitude they let us fly looking out the windows trying to find massive caribou herd or maybe reindeer herd or a lot of polar bears or maybe some seals swimming around out there. And in all of that flight back and forth and looking down and all of us looking out the windows, Madam Speaker, we saw two white birds and four musk oxen. And those four musk oxen were standing there with their heads down doing nothing, of course it was cold, and they weren't disturbed by anything going on.

Madam Speaker, I would submit that some of the environmentalists on the other side of the aisle, and one comes to mind would perhaps be my friend DENNIS KUCINICH from Ohio, go up there with me sometime and let's look out the window of the plane and fly along and see if you can point out the oil fields that are there in the North Slope, the North Slope that went through all the court action back in the early 1970s, the beginning of the Alaska pipeline, and point out there on the North Slope where are these oil wells; where is this desecration to our environment; where is the desecration to the scenery. Show it to me.

I will fly you over the whole thing, Madam Speaker, and look down. And I can point them out now because I have been there and I have been to school, and I will tell you there is not a single derrick sticking out of the air like you imagine, no Texas oil rig from the 1930s. There is not a single pump jack sitting there cranking out the oil out of the ground and leaking a little oil back into the ground. It doesn't exist. The only thing you will see, and now I will tip you off if you want to go, you might be able to see it as I tell you what you are going to be looking for, and that is a rock workover pad maybe 50 feet wide by 100 feet long, maybe a little longer, that sits up about 3 feet above the arctic tundra, white stone like limestone, probably is, a pad that you can bring a workover rig on if you need to work the well in the winter-time.

And as they come in to work those wells, they will come in on ice roads, ice roads that will melt in the summer-time that don't damage the tundra, and they will set the rig up. And the pumps are all submersible. You can't see the well, you can't see the casing, you can't see the pump, and you can't see the collection tubes.

That is all out of the sights and minds of the people that are up there because this is an environmentally friendly development of the North Slope.

Madam Speaker, we can do better in the development, even better in the development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We have technology to do directional drilling, and that will reduce our footprint considerably.

So why would we, the American people, insist upon going over to the Middle East and buying oil from, some are

friends, many are enemies, enriching them, making us more dependent on Middle Eastern oil while we have these massive supplies of energy within our own country? Why would we not, Madam Speaker, develop American energy supplies. Why would we not go down into the Gulf of Mexico and open up the Chevron fields down there that have been found that might increase the supply of our energy by 50 percent, just what is found offshore in the gulf south and west of New Orleans, the Chevron fields. Why would we not do that?

Why would this Congress, Madam Speaker, pass legislation that would change the deal that these companies have with the United States of America and say to our best friend oil companies who are developing this energy: we are going to have to renegotiate your leases. We thought it was a good deal when we made it, but now we know something that we didn't know then. So we want to scrap and tear up the leases that you had, the ones that gave you enough profit that you put some incentive into research and development and the exploration, and we want that money, we want that profit. We as a Federal Government want to tax your income more. And then if you don't do that, then we are not going to let you ever sign another lease with the Federal Government or the United States.

What are you going to do, Madam Speaker, if you are Chevron or if you are Exxon or if you are Shell or any other company that is one of those great oil companies here in the United States if you get that kind of message from this Congress? I will submit, Madam Speaker, that what you would do is you would take your investments over to foreign countries. You would go offshore in Australia, you would go somewhere else, you would go up in the North Sea, you would go somewhere offshore in West Africa and put your investments there where they are safer. They might be nationalized by some tyrannical government, but they are probably not going to come in and change the deal. They are probably not going to come in and confiscate your investment like this legislation that passed off the floor of this Congress last week or the week before. When the United States of America makes a deal, Madam Speaker, they have got to keep the deal.

We saw oil prices go up, we saw barrel price go up to \$75 a barrel. We watched it now drop down to the low \$50 a barrel. The reason for that is because the supply has gotten greater on the marketplace. The biggest reasons for that is because there was profit in it, that companies that were making money were reinvesting that profit in research and development and producing more oil and putting more of it on the market. We need to thank those companies that have provided this supply for the United States, not punish them for the extra taxes, because these

American companies have made us less dependent on Middle Eastern oil, not more dependent. And the actions of this Congress in this past month have made the United States of America more dependent on Middle Eastern oil, not less dependent on Middle Eastern oil. And that is the difference.

What we have passed has hurt America's economy, and what we need to do is allow the companies that invest in research and development to make some profit so they will do more of the same. And if there is more energy on the market, then energy will be cheaper.

So I will submit, Madam Speaker, that we need more BTUs in the marketplace; we need to grow the size of the energy pie. The more energy there is in the marketplace, the cheaper it all will be. And we have to have incentives for business to step in and do the right thing. That is the natural part that we should understand when we understand free enterprise capitalism.

If anybody has a little difficulty handling that, they should pick up a copy of "Wealth of Nations" written by Adam Smith published in 1776. He was an economist at the University of Glasgow in Scotland, and he laid out the principles of free enterprise capitalism, free market economics, and he understood human nature. And all of those things have to be tied together to make these work. We can't defy human nature, Madam Speaker. We must respect and honor human nature.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and February 6 on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HASTERT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. ROYCE (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 Ms. SOLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, February 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and February 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, February 6.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and February 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and February 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, February 7.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 2007, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

491. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

492. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 25(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

493. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 3(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Paragraph (5)(D) of the Senate's May 1997 resolution of advice and consent to the ratification of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty Flank Document of May 31, 1996; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

495. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification

under section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

496. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

497. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

498. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

499. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

500. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

501. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

502. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

503. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

504. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

505. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

506. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

507. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

508. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

509. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive & Political Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 547. A bill to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection; with an amendment (Rept. 110-7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. HALL of New York):

H.R. 797. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve compensation benefits for veterans in certain cases of impairment of vision involving both eyes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 798. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to install a photovoltaic system for the headquarters building of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. SHULER, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 799. A bill to reauthorize and improve the program authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HARE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WU, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIND, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SPACE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. BEAN, Mr. OBEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BACA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HILL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VISLOSKY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SHULER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DICKS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. REYES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HODES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WEINER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MATHESSON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. DOGGETTY):

H.R. 800. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or

assist labor organizations, to provide for mandatory injunctions for unfair labor practices during organizing efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. BEAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. WALSH of New York):

H.R. 801. A bill to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to require application to all vessels equipped with ballast water tanks, including vessels that are not carrying ballast water, the requirement to carry out exchange of ballast water or alternative ballast water management methods prior to entry into any port within the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 802. A bill to amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships to implement MARPOL Annex VI; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 803. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the procurement-related activities of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 804. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require certain coalitions and associations to disclose their lobbying activities, and to require reporting on a quarterly basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 805. A bill to provide incentives for the use of hydrogen fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy

and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H.R. 806. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the marketing of authorized generic drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 807. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the feasibility and suitability of establishing a memorial to the Space Shuttle Columbia in the State of Texas and for its inclusion as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 808. A bill to establish a Department of Peace and Nonviolence; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 809. A bill to repeal section 216 of the Federal Power Act (as added by the Energy Policy Act of 2005) providing for the use of eminent domain authority for the construction of certain electric power lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 810. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal Power Act added by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 relating to the use of eminent domain authority for the construction of electric power lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. LEE, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr.

KUHL of New York, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHULER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 811. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require a voter-verified permanent paper ballot under title III of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLINE of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 812. A bill to provide for the conveyance of an A-12 Blackbird aircraft to the Minnesota Air National Guard Historical Foundation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 813. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Prado Basin Natural Treatment System Project, to authorize the Secretary to carry out a program to assist agencies in projects to construct regional brine lines in California, to authorize the Secretary to participate in the Lower Chino Dairy Area desalination demonstration and reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 814. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue regulations mandating child-resistant closures on all portable gasoline containers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 815. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Clark County, Nevada, for use by the Nevada National Guard; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 816. A bill to provide for the release of certain land from the Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area in the State of Nevada and to grant a right-of-way across the released land for the construction and maintenance of a flood control project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 817. A bill to provide for the establishment of a working group to identify and advance the development and use of alternative sources for motor vehicle fuels; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 818. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of certain qualified ex-offenders who have served their sentences; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOV-

ERN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 819. A bill to expand access to preventive health care services that help reduce unintended pregnancy, reduce abortions, and improve access to women's health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 820. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, and Ms. HOOLEY):

H.R. 821. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. STARK, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 822. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and title 5, United States Code, to require individual and group health insurance coverage and group health plans and Federal employees health benefit plans to provide coverage for routine HIV/AIDS screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont:

H.R. 823. A bill to authorize Federal agencies and legislative branch offices to purchase greenhouse gas offsets and renewable energy credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 824. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to classify ethanol and biodiesel refining property as 7-year property for purposes of the accelerated cost recovery system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand tax incentives for renewable fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 826. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to improve the readiness of State defense forces and to increase military coordination for homeland security between the States and the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend bonus depreciation for 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 828. A bill to preserve mathematics- and science-based industries in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. HALL of New York):

H.R. 829. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to make certain changes in provisions relating to National Interest Transmission Corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 830. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Denali National Park in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 831. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Forest Service land to the city of Coffman Cove, Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 832. A bill to provide that Federal property reversions on land deeded to the Municipality of Anchorage be conveyed to the Municipality in order to unencumber the Municipality's title; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution celebrating the contributions of the architectural profession during National Architecture Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of Congress for the creation of a National Hurricane Museum and Science Center in Southwest Louisiana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution recognizing that the plight of Kashmiri Pandits has been an ongoing concern since 1989 and that their physical, political, and economic security should be safeguarded by the Government of India and the state government of Jammu and Kashmir; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas):

H. Res. 124. A resolution congratulating the Department of Agronomy in the College of Agriculture at Kansas State University for 100 years of excellent service to Kansas agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. FORTUÑO):

H. Res. 125. A resolution expressing deep concern over the use of civilians as "human shields" in violation of international humanitarian law and the law of war during armed conflict, including Hezbollah's tactic of embedding its forces among civilians to use them as human shields during the summer of 2006 conflict between Hezbollah and the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Mrs. BONO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California):

H. Res. 126. A resolution commending the University of Southern California Trojan football team for its victory in the 2007 Rose Bowl; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Res. 127. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the 50th anniversary of the entry of Alaska in the Union as the 49th State; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 63: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RENZI, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 73: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 111: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 119: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 156: Mr. POE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 161: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 201: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 211: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 237: Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 296: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 349: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 353: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 358: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. REBERG.

H.R. 359: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 365: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. COOPER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHULER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BACA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms.

BORDALLO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 368: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 372: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HODES, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 380: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 402: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 437: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCOUL of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. POE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERY.

H.R. 440: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 455: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 464: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 468: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 473: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 477: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 491: Mr. KIND and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 493: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KIND, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 508: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.R. 511: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SALLI, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 512: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 522: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 539: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. ROSS, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 547: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MCCOUL of Texas, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 548: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 550: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. MCCOUL of Texas.

H.R. 552: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 556: Mr. SHAYS and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 563: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 566: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 579: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 589: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 590: Mr. MCCOUL of Texas.

H.R. 617: Mr. MACK.

H.R. 618: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 620: Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 621: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 650: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 651: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 652: Ms. FOXX, Mr. POE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GINGREY, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 653: Mr. POE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 661: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 677: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HARE, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 683: Mr. POE.

H.R. 695: Mr. MARKEY and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 713: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 714: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 718: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 723: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 728: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 729: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MCCOUL of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 743: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. MCCOUL of Texas.

H.R. 746: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 748: Mr. PAUL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WICKER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 759: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 787: Ms. MATSUI.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. COSTA.

H.J. Res. 15: Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 16: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. PUTNAM.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HODES.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. MCCOUL of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WU, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WATT, and Mr. COHEN.

- H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H. Res. 37: Mr. FILNER.
H. Res. 41: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Res. 63: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Res. 79: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AKIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H. Res. 84: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Ms. HERSETH.
H. Res. 87: Mr. GINGREY and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 94: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 97: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. ALLEN.
H. Res. 98: Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 100: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H. Res. 101: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 102: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H. Res. 106: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H. Res. 113: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. CAPPs, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 120: Mr. WATT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. HERSETH, and Ms. WATSON.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2007

No. 21

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Great and everlasting God, who was and is and is to come, inspire all who work on Capitol Hill. Help us to see Your image in each other and to draw strength from an awareness of Your sovereignty. Empower us to serve with a spirit of humility and gratitude, remembering that to whom much is given, much is expected.

Strengthen our Senators. Give them the wisdom to know Your will and the courage to obey Your precepts. May they comprehend Your vision for our Nation and world, becoming instruments for Your glory. Lord, fill them with Your power so that no weapon formed against them will prosper. Help them to view the shortcomings of others with patience and to be grateful for the exemplary virtues they witness each day.

We pray in Your glorious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARK L. PRYOR led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PRYOR thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. today. During morning business, Senator BYRD is to be recognized for up to 60 minutes. At 4 p.m. we will resume debate on the motion to proceed to S. 470, the sense-of-Congress language relating to Iraq. Last Thursday I moved to proceed to that bill and filed a cloture motion. That vote is slated to occur today at 5:30.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I now ask unanimous consent that the time from 4 to 5:20 be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and the final 10 minutes prior to 5:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders, with the majority leader controlling the last 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ RESOLUTION FILIBUSTER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, all across America this past weekend, and even this morning in schools, cafés, pool

halls, I am sure, churches, synagogues, military bases, and all offices, people are talking about this war in Iraq. They are talking about President Bush's plan to escalate the war in Iraq—or "augment," as the amendment of the Senator from Virginia talks about. But if you look in the dictionary, "augment" and "escalate" have the same definition. So every place in America people are talking about Iraq—every place, that is, except in the Senate. I say that because in press conferences held, in statements made by the Republican leader, they have stated there will be no ability to proceed to the debate on this most important issue.

According to my counterpart, the Republican leader, the Republican Senators are going to say no and, he says, without exception. What does this mean? That we are not going to be able to move to proceed to this debate? What is more important than what we are trying to do here today; that is, move forward on a debate on Iraq? As I said, they are doing it every other place in America. Why shouldn't we be able to do it here in the Senate? We learned on Friday—it was continued over the weekend—that the minority is going to do everything in its power to block an Iraq vote. Are they so worried that a bipartisan majority of Senators might voice their opposition to this escalation; so worried that these Senators are going to prevent any Iraq debate?

Remember, this is a very delicate time in the history of our country. Not only do we have the Iraq debate to worry about, but we also, because of the mess, frankly, that was left by the prior majorities in the House and Senate, have no ability to fund this Government after February 15. We have to do that. This has to be completed by a week from this Friday.

I received letters from Republican Senators. They are going to filibuster the continuing resolution, which

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1545

means I have to move forward on this to keep the Government from shutting down. Our inability to go forward on the Iraq debate means we may not have the Iraq debate. Remember, we have lost, already, several days. We should be debating this right here today rather than having to vote at 4:30 on whether we can proceed on it.

What is the excuse—and I say excuse—that they are not going to let the American people hear the Senate debate the escalation of the war in Iraq? This claim—and I might say, it is a feeble claim—that they haven't been guaranteed a vote on amendments is not credible. It is simply not true. They have rejected, through their leader—they, the Republicans—three compromises that would have permitted the Senate to vote on the President's plan. I have done this privately. I have done it publicly.

I offered to schedule an up-or-down vote on McCain—that is a resolution supporting the President's plan—and on the Warner-Levin resolution in opposition. That is votes up or down on these two amendments. This offer was rejected.

We then offered the Republican leadership up-or-down votes on those two resolutions I just talked about and they had another one. The Republican leader had another one. I read it. It is the Gregg amendment. So we said let's go ahead and vote on that. I was turned down there also.

I don't know what more we can do. I even went one step further and said we will hold supermajority votes, 60 votes, on WARNER and on MCCAIN, two separate votes, 60 each. What more could we do? These were rejected. I have said this publicly, but I said it privately—and there were all kinds of witnesses to my conversation with the Republican leader—the Republican leader obviously can't take "yes" for an answer. They have been given all they asked. It is clear their actions are not driven by getting votes on Republican proposals, they are not being driven by getting votes on Republican proposals; they are driven by a desire to provide political cover.

The majority can't rubberstamp the President's policies on Iraq anymore so they decided to stamp out debate and let the actions in Iraq proceed unchecked. America deserves more than a filibuster on the President's flawed plan to add 48,000 troops to Iraq. It is not 21,000. The war in Iraq has taken a great toll on our country. Well more than 3,000 American soldiers have been killed, 24,000 or 25,000 of them wounded, a third of them missing eyes—head injuries. We have 2,000 who are missing limbs.

The war has strained our military. I have been told by leaders at the Pentagon that we do not have a single Army unit that is nondeployed that is battle ready.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator say that again, please?

Mr. REID. We do not have a single, nondeployed Army unit that is ready

to go to war. We have depleted our Treasury over \$400 billion—some say \$500 billion.

Look at this. The Congressional Budget Office is a nonpartisan entity set up by this Congress. According to the Congressional Budget Office, a surge of 21,500 combat troops really means up to 48,000 more troops when support personnel are counted. And, remember, the 3,180 American soldiers who were killed were not all combat troops. They were truckdrivers, they were working in commissaries, they were doing all kinds of things to support the combat troops.

So we are saying it is not 21,500, it is 48,000, and it is going to cost, this little surge, an additional \$27 billion. If the President wants to escalate the conflict and send, according to CBO, 48,000 more troops, given these costs alone—that is \$27 billion in addition—it is important the Senators have an opportunity to vote up or down on escalation.

But it is even more important because there is widespread opposition in Congress and the country to the President's plan. Those we trust the most do not believe escalation is the right way forward. America's generals don't support this. What does General Casey say? When he was in Iraq he said, I don't think this is going to work. General Abizaid said the same thing. Many others have told us the same thing.

More troops will not bring stability to Iraq. The Iraq Study Group sent this project in another direction. They made very different recommendations. America's generals—of course, they do not support this. The American people do not support the escalation. Look at any public opinion poll—Democrats, Republicans, Independents. The President has heard from the Prime Minister of Iraq, al-Maliki, that he doesn't want more troops in Baghdad; he wants American troops to leave Baghdad. He told the President that to his face. This is the message President Bush has heard from the generals, the people, the Iraq Study Group, even the Iraq Prime Minister. Now the President should hear from Congress. But is he going to? Perhaps not. The President must hear from Congress that he stands alone. A loud bipartisan message from this body will give him another opportunity to listen and to change course to a plan that gives our troops the best chance for success and gives the country of Iraq the best chance for stability.

Is there anyone who does not think this is an important debate? Is there anyone who believes the Senate should remain silent on the most pressing issue facing the country today? Unfortunately, the answer is yes. According to the Republican leader, all Republican Senators will vote not to proceed.

We are running out of time to find a new way forward in Iraq. That is certainly clear. Americans and our troops have waited 4 years for the Senate to get off the sidelines on this issue. They

shouldn't have to wait longer for a new direction in Iraq because the minority wants to protect their politics at home.

We have seen politics in this war before. Politics gave us "Mission Accomplished." Remember that? On the aircraft carrier, the President dressed in a flight suit said: The mission is accomplished; we have won in Iraq. Politics gave us the Vice President who said the insurgency was in its last throes, and the President saying: There are insurgents? Bring them on. Politics gave us a Vice President who promised America we would be greeted as liberators. So we have had enough of this politics for 4 years into this war—4 years.

What we need is a strategy that will succeed in Iraq, a strategy that is not an escalation. Last week, America's intelligence communities provided their latest estimates of conditions on the ground in Iraq. The picture they painted was bleak and was backed by events this past week in Iraq. Every day, with rare exception, this is what we see out of Iraq: More than 200 people killed—more than 200 people. Hundreds and hundreds injured. It was a 2,000-pound bomb in a marketplace. The Iraqi Interior Ministry, which has been very conservative, said last week that at least 1,000 were killed in Iraq. Two million, it was reported over the weekend, have left Iraq—2 million Iraqis have left Iraq.

We don't need the unclassified assessment of our intelligence community to know things aren't going well in Iraq—and that is an understatement—that the present strategy has failed and there are only nonmilitary solutions to address Iraq's problems. That is why the military surge makes no sense.

Again, the National Intelligence Estimate came out last week. It was months overdue, but it did come out. Here are some of the things it talked about. This is from our own intelligence agencies:

Even if violence is diminished, Iraqi leaders will be hard-pressed to achieve sustained political reconciliation in the time frame of this estimate.

Listen to this next one:

Iraq has become a self-sustaining inter-sectarian struggle.

This is not HARRY REID. These are the finest, the people who are doing their very best to make America safe. The National Intelligence Estimate:

The term "civil war" accurately describes key elements of the Iraqi conflict, but does not adequately capture the complexity of the conflict.

I have been saying, and the American people have been saying, for months this is a civil war. It is a civil war, but it is more than a civil war.

The National Intelligence Estimate:

The involvement of these outside actors, Iran and Syria and Iraq's neighbors, is not likely to be a major driver of violence or the prospects for stability.

In effect, they are saying the President is now sending battle carrier groups off the waters of Iran because

he is trying to blame them for everything that is going on in Iraq. That is not credible.

Am I saying Iran is the good guy on the block? Of course not. But let's not say they are the cause of all the trouble in Iraq because they are not.

The National Intelligence Estimate:

A number of identifiable developments could help to reverse the negative trends driving Iraq's current trajectory. They include, again, military solutions. Broader Sunni acceptance of the current political structure and federalism, significant concessions by the Shia and the Kurds, a bottom-up approach, mend frayed relationships between tribal and religious groups.

Mr. President, we need to work to come to a political solution for the problems in Iraq.

Surging U.S. military forces is not a development that is going to help in Iraq. That is because there is no military solution. Military escalation would not end this conflict that is more complex than a civil war. Military escalation would not make it easy for Iraqi leaders to achieve political reconciliation. Military escalation would not bring an end to Iraq's internal sectarian struggle.

Mr. President, as I said when I started, all over America today people are talking about what is going on in Iraq—every place you want to talk about, whether it is the water cooler at the office or truck drivers on their CBs talking back and forth to each other. It is in schools all over America, from elementary to college, talking about what is going on in Iraq. But in the Senate, are we going to have a debate on it? We have been told “no.”

The problems in Iraq are long term. Yet military escalation is a strategy that is shortsighted. This is the message President Bush has heard from the generals, the people, the Iraqi Prime Minister, the Iraq Study Group, and now he must hear from Congress. I hope this afternoon my Republican colleagues will do what is right and allow this important debate to go forward.

I don't know if the Republican leader wishes to be recognized, but I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield to the minority leader, if he wishes to speak first.

IRAQ DEBATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Illinois. Mr. President, this whole discussion can best be described as a bump in the road. The majority leader and I had a number of discussions last week about how to proceed with the Iraq debate. There is no reluctance on this side of the aisle to have that debate. In fact, we had a number of different Republicans who had different approaches to offer in anticipation of

the Iraq debate this week. We hear there are different approaches on the Democratic side as well.

In an effort to reach a unanimous consent agreement, we pared down our requests to two resolutions, one by Senator MCCAIN and Senator LIEBERMAN that basically embodied benchmarks for the Iraqi Government and one by Senator GREGG, a very important resolution that should be voted on in the Senate that deals with the issue of whether the Senate believes we should cut off funds for the troops. This vote this afternoon should not be misunderstood. This is a fairness vote. This vote this afternoon is a vote to insist that the minority have a fair process in going forward to this very important debate. I think I am safe to say every single Republican shares the view it is not requesting too much of the majority to have a fair process. We could have asked for many more than two resolutions. There were several other Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle who had what they thought were good ideas that should have been put in the queue.

With regard to what the vote should be, this is the Senate. With the exception of the budget resolution, I can't think of anything in the Senate we have dealt with in my memory, except some kind of consent on a non-controversial matter, that didn't require a 60-vote threshold. That is routine in the Senate. That is not extraordinary; that is ordinary. So what could be done and should be done—and I hope will be done sometime today—is the majority leader and myself will sit down and come up with a reasonable list of resolutions, all of them, as everything else in the Senate, subject to a 60-vote threshold. In fact, our good friends on the other side of the aisle in the previous Congress went to great lengths to establish that there even ought to be a 60-vote threshold for judges, something that had not been the norm in the Senate. So it looks to me like where we are today is that everything in the Senate requires 60 votes. Why would we not have a 60-vote threshold for the most important issue in the country right now: The Iraq war? So, of course, we think it should be dealt with in the same way that other issues are dealt with in the Senate.

So make no mistake about it. This vote at 5 o'clock doesn't have anything whatsoever to do with scuttling the Iraq debate. We welcome the debate. We are happy to have it. But the minority will insist on fair treatment, and our definition of fair has been pared down to two resolutions. And all of the resolutions, as everything else we consider in the Senate, would be subject to a 60-vote threshold.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Fairness. You start throwing the 60-vote number around when

you have something to hide or you want to stall, and it appears that is the case here. We have offered the Republicans an up-or-down vote on Warner, an up-or-down vote on McCain, and an up-or-down vote on the matter relating to Senator GREGG. How much fairer could you be on that? We have heard in this body from the Republicans for years now: Up-or-down vote, up-or-down vote. We want an up-or-down vote.

That is what we want. Why should there be an arbitrary ruling by the minority that this take 60 votes as to how people feel about the Warner amendment or the McCain amendment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Sure.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Isn't it true that any one Member of the Senate, just one Member of the Senate could insist that there be a 60-vote threshold on this issue?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, nearly everything we do in this body—and I will be happy to respond to the distinguished Republican leader—nearly everything we do in this body is determined by unanimous consent. We have matters that come before this body—and that is how we get here, is with unanimous consent. I can't imagine why there would be anyone who would require 60 votes unless they didn't want us to go forward—unless they didn't want us to go forward. That obviously is the message we are giving around the country. Look at any newspaper: “GOP Threatens to Block Vote on Resolution.” That, Mr. President, is USA Today. That is only one newspaper. They are all over America, the same thing.

This is an effort to stop. For every day we are not able to debate the Iraq resolution means one less day, and maybe we would not be able to get to it because of the continuing resolution. As I said earlier, we have been told by letters I received from Republicans that they are going to filibuster the continuing resolution. Today, starting today whenever we came in—and we came in late because we knew we had this procedural vote—we should have been debating Warner and McCain, but we are not. And now, if cloture is invoked, there is 30 hours after that before we can get to debating this and by then, frankly, it is too late. We will not be able to do it because of the continuing resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Of course.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me repeat my question. Isn't it true, I say to my good friend, the majority leader, that any one Member of the Senate could ensure that a matter has to receive 60 votes?

Mr. BYRD. Could do what, may I ask?

Mr. REID. Could ask for 60 votes. I say to my friend, hypothetically that is true, but that is the way it is with many things in this body. But that person would have to come forward, identify themselves, and stand up and say:

I do not want the debate on Iraq to go forward. This is a little difficult to do with the situation where, as I said before, everybody in America wants this debate to go forward. So let's hear somebody on the other side stand up, akin to a Senator who believes in something, and say: I don't want this debate to go forward.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say that there are many Members on my side who would argue we should not be having this debate this week at all. I hope none of those watching this on C-SPAN or any people in the gallery are confused. A 60-vote threshold is routine in the Senate. It is the ordinary, not the extraordinary. There was really only one exception to that, and that was the consideration of judicial nominees. My good friends on the other side of the aisle spent an enormous amount of time in the last couple of years trying to establish a 60-vote threshold for that as well.

There is nothing the minority is asking for that is in any way extraordinary, nothing extraordinary about it at all. It is really quite ordinary. We are prepared to have a debate on Iraq this week. We look forward to having a debate on Iraq this week. What should happen is the distinguished majority leader and myself should agree, by consent, to a reasonable number of resolutions. As I have indicated, some of the Republican Senators have given up their opportunity to offer proposals in deference to my request that we narrow down the number of resolutions to a reasonable number for consideration this week.

I hope that one of two things would happen: Either we vitiate the vote this afternoon because it is completely unnecessary or we will defeat cloture and the majority leader and I, hopefully, will be able to sit down and reach agreement for a fair consideration of alternate proposals that could have been reached last Friday and I had hoped would have been reached last Friday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, keep in mind what I offered the minority: up-or-down votes on Warner and McCain; up-or-down vote on Judd Gregg. I also offered a 60-vote on Warner and a 60-vote on McCain. That was also turned down.

This thing about 60 votes is exaggerated. I have been in the Senate 25 years. I have been involved in two filibusters, and that is two more than most anyone in the Senate has been involved in. Filibusters are just talk. Rarely are filibusters ever necessary or do they occur.

Therefore, this "everything is 60 votes" is simply not valid.

They want a fair process? Up-or-down vote on McCain, up-or-down vote on Warner, up-or-down vote on Judd Gregg. Okay, don't want that? I tell

you what, this has been stated publicly and privately long before today: We will give you a 60-vote on Warner, we will give you a 60-vote on McCain. Nope. Turned down.

Where does this fairness come in? Is fairness in the eye of the beholder? They have to get everything they want? I cannot imagine how we could be more fair. The American public would see a debate on Warner, see a debate on McCain. One is for the surge, one is against the surge. Why not have that debate? There will be lots of other times to debate other issues dealing with Iraq. We have the September 11 recommendation coming up; we have the supplemental coming up. Iraq is not going to leave the Senate. But it will leave this Senate if we are not allowed to proceed in this manner because—again I say that is because of bad housekeeping and the Republicans just simply leaving town after they lost the majority—we have to pass a continuing resolution. We have to. We have no alternative. We have to start on that by Wednesday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, first, with regard to the 60-vote threshold, the majority leader and I both praised the bipartisan cooperation we had in the Senate on both the ethics bill and the minimum wage bill, both of which had a 60-vote requirement. That demonstrates how extraordinary 60-vote requirements are. These were two bills which were widely praised by both the majority leader and myself as examples of bipartisan cooperation.

I heard the majority leader say up-or-down votes on McCain and on Warner. If he would throw in the Gregg amendment for an up-or-down vote—I am sorry, what was his offer?

Mr. REID. My offer has always been an up-or-down vote on McCain, on Warner, on Judd Gregg, and the Democratic alternative which basically says we are against the surge. It has always been the same. And the 60-vote would be on McCain and on Warner.

I would also say I appreciate my friend talking about the ethics in lobbying reform and the debate we had on minimum wage. However, I don't want to start a battle that is already over. But one reason we were able to get those two bills passed—we thought stopping debate on these was not the right thing to do. We spoke out loudly, and the American people said: Let's get on with those two issues. They held it up for a little while but not for very long.

Mr. McCONNELL. A further illustration of how ordinary it is to get 60 votes around here, there have been 9 cloture motions filed in this Congress alone, and we are now finally starting the second month. It is really not in dispute that a 60-vote threshold is quite common around here. It is ordinary rather than extraordinary.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have offered 60 votes on McCain and Warner.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. I understand he has offered 60 votes on McCain and Warner. The Gregg amendment is also important and would have to be included in any such negotiation which, hopefully, we will get back to having later today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with up to 60 minutes under the control of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, I inquire, at what point can other Senators speak? I presume at the conclusion of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have—

Mr. WARNER. Might I make that a unanimous consent, that I can be recognized following the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for 10 minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order is first the assistant majority leader gets 10 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. All right. That is fine. And I notice the presence of the assistant Republican leader, so I would want to accommodate the assistant Republican leader.

At some point, I am just asking, as a matter of courtesy, at what time may I speak? The Senator from Maine, Senator HAGEL—there are several Members who would like to speak. If the Chair could help us, recognizing the leadership precedes.

Mr. BYRD. What is the order that has been previously entered?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no order in effect except for Senator DURBIN and Senator BYRD.

Mr. WARNER. Could I then ask unanimous consent at the appropriate time that the Senator from Virginia be recognized for 10 minutes, the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Nebraska for 10 minutes?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I believe if Senator DURBIN and Senator BYRD speak before we get into the rest of the lineup, I would like to have an opportunity to have at least 5 minutes to speak after Durbin and Byrd but then go forward with the unanimous consent request of Senator WARNER for himself and others.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I am not sure a unanimous consent has been propounded, but

I would like to modify what is pending as follows: I have a hearing to chair at 3 o'clock. I have been allocated 10 minutes. I would like to use 5 and give 5 to the Senator from New York and allow the other Senators—I have noted several Republican Senators who wish to speak for whatever period the Senator from West Virginia would be prepared to work out with them. He was kind enough to allow me 10 minutes, which I will share with the Senator from New York if it meets with the approval of the Senate.

Let me defer to the Senator from West Virginia because I believe under the existing order I have 10 minutes and he has 1 hour, if I am not mistaken; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 60 minutes reserved for Senator BYRD is not necessarily following your 10 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. If I might inquire of the Chair, then, is the 60 minutes for Senator BYRD reserved after morning business or during morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. During morning business.

Mr. DURBIN. I defer to the Senator from West Virginia because he made the earlier request and was kind enough to yield 10 minutes my way, and I want to make sure he agrees with whatever we tend to think is a reasonable way to allocate time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I don't believe there is any order in place that Senator BYRD would go next even though there was, I believe, an order that he have an hour as if in morning business; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. My only reservation, not wanting in any way to cut off any Senator, is that there be some flow of back-and-forth after the distinguished whip has his time, along with Senator SCHUMER; that some of us be able to comment in response, perhaps; and that Senator BYRD, certainly, get his time, but Senator WARNER would also have an opportunity to get engaged in this lineup, and Senator COLLINS.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator from Mississippi propound a unanimous consent request based on that so we can decide whether that would be an appropriate way to proceed?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the 10 minutes that has been allocated for Senator DURBIN as he would see fit to use his time, that I have 10 minutes, to be followed by the time Senator BYRD has, to be followed by Senator WARNER, an equal amount of time as he would see fit.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the request?

Mr. LOTT. I believe Senator DURBIN would have 10 minutes as yielded by you, Senator BYRD, then I would have 10 minutes, to be followed by your time that you have requested, to be followed by Senator WARNER and others as they

would want to divide up that time. So we all would basically have an equal amount of time to go forward, but after an estimated 20 minutes, you would have your time to go forward.

Mr. BYRD. Is that the order that has been established or is that the request?

Mr. LOTT. That is the request.

Mr. BYRD. But the order as established is what, may I ask the Chair?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no order established. We have Senator DURBIN who is recognized for 10 minutes. The Senator from West Virginia has 60 minutes although there is no order established. In other words, it is not locked in that the Senator from West Virginia go immediately after Senator DURBIN.

Mr. BYRD. Well, what is the order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has proposed an order where he would give 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, which I assume is 5 for the Senator from Illinois and 5 for the Senator from New York, although it is 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not mean to be contentious, but what is the order without the request?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order without the request is Senator DURBIN, from Illinois, is recognized for 10 minutes; then, following that—but again, there is no sequence laid out specifically to what has been agreed to—following that, the Senator from West Virginia is to have 60 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Following that, if there is no sequence laid out, I would like for my time to follow the Senator from Illinois, and then we can talk about my time if Senators want some of it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, after Senator DURBIN and perhaps Senator SCHUMER speak, my request was propounded on the basis that we try to go back and forth between the two parties and that I be allowed to have an equal amount of time in response to the remarks of Senator DURBIN and then go forward with an order that would put Senator BYRD next in order, to be followed by Senator WARNER. I am just trying to establish some fair flow back and forth.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, is there a previous order to the effect that I have an hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. All right. The previous order is that I have an hour. When should I have the hour under the previous order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is what is trying to be worked out right now. Right now, the Chair asks the Senator from West Virginia if the Senator intends to use the full hour and if the Senator would like it all in one block or if the Senator would prefer to break it up?

Mr. BYRD. I don't know yet, but I want the hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In one block?

Mr. BYRD. I want the hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The full hour.

Mr. BYRD. An hour is a full hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Uninterrupted?

Mr. BYRD. As of now, I want the hour.

Mr. LOTT. Parliamentary inquiry: While there is an order that Senator BYRD have an hour, it was not put in place at a particular time or to follow in any particular order; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. My objection as of this point—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. If I could suggest, to speed this up, if instead of taking the 5 minutes Senator DURBIN was going to yield me, I would be happy to defer and let Senator LOTT speak for that 5 minutes, and after Senator BYRD finishes his remarks, I could speak my 5 minutes. That way we would have an order, and Senator BYRD would not have to yield any more time, and all of us would get to say whatever we wanted to say. I make that a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, could then the three colleagues I have mentioned—myself, Senator COLLINS, and Senator HAGEL—follow the distinguished Senator from New York?

Mr. SCHUMER. I have no problem with that.

Mr. BYRD. Well, before that, let me—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, had an order been previously entered for me to have an hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Let me read the order for a point of clarification. It says: Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with up to 60 minutes under the control of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

So it is in morning business, and the Senator from West Virginia has 60 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. All right. I thank the Chair.

Let's proceed under the order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. And also, the next Senator to be recognized is the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Illinois, all right.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Chair yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Absolutely.

Mr. DURBIN. Is there a record vote scheduled at 5:30 on the cloture motion?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a vote scheduled under a previous unanimous consent at 5:30.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 10 minutes before that vote be equally divided between the majority and minority so that at 5:20 a person speaking—sorry, I withdraw that request.

Mr. President, as I understand it, I am recognized for 10 minutes at this point?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. My intention is to yield 5 minutes to Senator SCHUMER. So I will begin at this point.

RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say, for those who have not followed this debate closely, I think we have made amazing progress until today—until today—because what happened before today was that we were moving on a bipartisan track, a track of cooperation, so that the Senate would exercise its responsibility and deliberate a topic that is being debated today in Springfield, IL, and Little Rock, AR. That is the war.

In an effort to reach this point, we have made accommodations. Senators BIDEN, LEVIN, and HAGEL worked long and hard on a resolution of disapproval of the President's policy. They reported it from the Foreign Relations Committee. Yet, we set that aside and said, in the interest of comity, in the interest of fairness, we will gather behind Senator JOHN WARNER, the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in a bipartisan fashion, and we will work together so we bring one resolution of disapproval to the floor.

Senator WARNER was kind enough to make some modifications in that resolution, and we were prepared to proceed. We felt that was fair. Throughout this process, we have not been asserting the rights of the majority. We have tried to work in a bipartisan fashion.

So now comes the moment of truth. Will the Senate, after all the sound and fury, finally have a debate? Now we are told by the Republican side, no. We are told by the Republican side that because they have several other amendments they want to have brought up, they will stop any debate on the Warner resolution unless they have their way on the procedure.

I am troubled by this. If the Republicans in the Senate cannot swallow the thin soup of the Warner resolution, how will they ever stomach a real debate on the war in Iraq?

What we face now is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

It is important. It expresses the feeling of the Senate. But it is not going to change the situation on the ground.

The President will not be held back from sending the troops that he wants to escalate the war, nor will there be any money moved from one place to another, nor any limits on the troops, nor any of the changes that have been discussed.

What we started to do here was to have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, a bipartisan resolution, introduced by Senator WARNER on the Republican side, as the basis for this debate. How much more good faith could we show on the majority side? And yet now we find that the Republicans have objected. We are witness to the spectacle of a White House and Republican Senators unwilling to even engage in a debate on a war that claims at least one American life every day and \$2.5 billion a week.

As we debate the procedures, as we go back and forth, day by day, we lose more soldiers and spend more money. I am sorry there is no sense of urgency on both sides of the aisle to move this matter to debate quickly. If the Republicans want to stand by their President and his policy, they should not run from this debate. If they believe we should send thousands of our young soldiers into the maws of this wretched civil war, they should at least have the courage to stand and defend their position.

One of their own on the Republican side, speaking before the Foreign Relations Committee, said he felt it was a matter of responsibility. He said: We are Senators, not shoe salesmen. I do not want to reflect poorly on entrepreneurs in America by referring to shoe salesmen in a derogatory way, but I would join in his remarks. If we cannot come together today and begin the debate on the single issue that is paramount in the minds of people across America, why are we here? What are we waiting for?

We have certainly tantalized them with the prospects of a debate. And now to have the Republicans pull the rug out from under us at the last minute and say, no debate this week, well, they understand, as we do, the continuing resolution is imminent. We have no time to wait. We have to move to it. And if they can slow us down and stall us for a few more days, then the White House gets its way: no deliberation, no debate, no vote.

The final thing I will say is this: Some on the other side have argued this is a vote of no confidence in the President and the troops. They could not be further from the truth. I cannot believe that Senator WARNER, a man who has served his country so well in so many capacities, would be party to a resolution which would express no confidence in the troops of this Nation. I would not be. He would not either.

This resolution expresses our confidence and our faithfulness in those men and women in uniform. Nor is it a vote of no confidence in this President. Of course it is his policy. But what we should debate—and we will debate—is

the policy itself, not the personalities involved. But for the Republicans, now in their minority status, to put a stop to this debate is to try to put a stop to a debate that is going on across America.

I will tell them this. They may succeed today, but they will not succeed beyond today. There will be a debate on this war. It may not be this week; it may not be this bill; it may not be this resolution. There will be a debate because the American people made it clear in the last election it is time for a new direction.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. BYRD. No, no. I asked—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not mean to be discourteous to my leader. I understand he yielded the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I was yielding the remaining time. I had 10 minutes, and I was yielding—how much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Illinois had the floor, and he was going to give 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. DURBIN. I was yielding my remaining 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding the time. And I thank my good friend from West Virginia. I know he will have a lot to say, and we will all listen to it with eager ears.

Mr. BYRD. And I am going to speak often. I do not speak often.

Mr. SCHUMER. I am sorry to delay that a few minutes and look forward to hearing it.

Mr. BYRD. That is all right.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let's make no mistake about what is happening today. The Republican side is afraid to debate even a nonbinding resolution as to whether this Senate supports an escalation. Simply put, this is a filibuster so that we cannot debate the war in Iraq. Some on the other side will say, well, the word "filibuster" should not be used. But that is exactly what is going on.

Some on the other side will say, well, Democrats filibustered judges. We did. They said that. We were willing to stand by it. Are they willing to stand by filibustering the war in Iraq? And let me say this—let me say this—the lack of debate on this war in this Senate, in this administration, and in this country has led to the muddle, the debacle we are now in, where 70 percent of the people do not support this war. And most experts you talk to say: What is the strategy? We do not seem to have one.

When General Shinseki, 3 years ago, said we needed more troops, there was

no debate. When CIA agents and others said there were not weapons of mass destruction, they said we do not need debate. When this war devolved from fighting terror and removing Saddam Hussein into a war that was a civil war, with our young men and women policing the age-old hatred between the Shites and the Sunnis, there was no debate.

That is why we are in the sad state we are right now. I fully support the troops. And I understand the need of a President to lead, but without debate, debate that has been the hallmark of this country, not words but a meeting of ideas, a meeting of disagreements so that the best policy might emerge? That is what America is all about. And when it comes to war, it should be all about it more than any single other issue.

Every one of my colleagues who is willing to block off this debate right now, who will vote against cloture, is saying: I don't wish to debate whether this escalation is the right thing. You can say the commas are in the wrong place or the dots are in the wrong place. Senator REID has offered both resolutions, the one by the Senator from Arizona and the one by the Senator from Virginia, both Republican resolutions—an equal place under the Sun—yes or no.

The ability to obfuscate, the ability to shade, the ability to hide should not be available here. Yes or no. Do you support this so-called surge, this escalation, or do you not? I believe the election answered that on behalf of the American people. They want their Senate to debate it. They would much rather have their Senator vote yes or no than not vote at all.

And here we are at this sorry moment. We are on the most important issue that has faced this Senate in quite a while. We are saying, at least those on the other side of the aisle: No debate, no discussion.

Again, I remind my colleagues it is that lack of debate and that lack of discussion that led us into the situation we are in now, where this war has dwindling support in this country, in this Senate, and even in Iraq itself.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LOTT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, all I am trying to do is get a chance to have a discussion on both sides of the aisle on the differing points of view on what is occurring. I do not wish to cut off or delay Senator BYRD. But my point is, if he does, in fact, use the next 50 minutes or an hour, we then will be out of morning business into the regular debate at 4 o'clock, without us ever having a chance to respond to the comments made by Senator DURBIN or Senator SCHUMER.

So I ask the Senator from West Virginia—and I address this question through the Chair—if he will allow me to proceed for 5 minutes so I could respond to some of the comments that were made by my two colleagues, Senator DURBIN and Senator SCHUMER, and then go forward with the time that was left.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator wish me to yield at this point?

Mr. LOTT. I would ask, Mr. President, the Senator to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am a reasonable man, a reasonable Senator. I yield 5 minutes now, and without losing my right to the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. And for clarification, the Senator—

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, if we can have one thing clarified. Under that time agreement, if we come to 4 o'clock, does that eclipse the ability of the Senator from Virginia to speak, the Senator from Maine to speak, the Senator from Nebraska to speak? Perhaps the two Senators from Nebraska wish to speak.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to intervene here?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not intend to take 60 minutes. But I do not want to waste 60 minutes before I start.

Mr. WARNER. I appreciate that. But the question before the Chair is, if we do not have time within that hour, are we then unable to speak?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will try to help if the Senator will let me get started.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague. I know we can go to the bank on your word.

I withdraw any objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi? The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for up to 60 minutes or until 4 o'clock.

Mr. LOTT. Has the unanimous consent request the Senator propounded been confirmed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not ask for that to be confirmed and didn't ask for any objection. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, would the Senator allow me to ask unanimous consent that I be recognized following the conclusion of such time as the Senator from West Virginia takes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, we will proceed to the Senator from Virginia for a few minutes, 5 minutes, after—

Mr. WARNER. I would presume that I would have whatever time is between the conclusion of the Senator from West Virginia and 4 o'clock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Correct.

Mr. WARNER. I intend to share it with other colleagues.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Virginia will be recognized after the Senator from West Virginia completes his remarks, and the Senator from West Virginia has given his first 5 minutes to the minority whip. Is there any objection to that? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. He has proven once again his knowledge of how things proceed. But he also is fair in how he proceeds. I thank Senator BYRD for upholding the tradition that he feels so strongly about.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me get right to the point. This is all show and tell. We know the Senate is ready to have a full debate on the question of how we proceed in Iraq. There are a number of resolutions that have been suggested that are pending. We know our leaders are going to find a way to work this out. So why are we here taking all this time to accuse each other of unfairness and trying to block and delay? We don't want to do that. There is a way we can work this out where resolutions of different points of view can be offered. I don't know what the magic number is. The leaders are going to work that out. But to come to the floor and suggest that we don't want a full debate—this is the Senate. We are going to have a full debate on this approach and a lot of others as we go forward—

Mr. BYRD. You bet.

Mr. LOTT [continuing]. Into the situation in Iraq. That is as it should be. I want to make it clear, this is not an effort to block debate. We could get an agreement, vitiate this vote this afternoon, and go right now into the debate. I think we ought to do that. What are the numbers and what resolutions will actually be offered, our leaders are going to work out.

But I do want to say this, too: If we really want to get to the debate about what is going to be the future there, we ought to be doing it in some way other than these nonbinding resolutions. This is a lot of sound and fury signifying nothing, so I question the whole process that we are under. I don't mind going forward. In fact, I want to go forward and have a full debate about what is going on here.

I recently had occasion to be at a meeting with a number of world leaders, and the discussion went back and forth. Finally, it came down to this: What do we do in Iraq? Stay, leave, or what? Well, they said: No, no, no, you can't leave. You have to stay. Then the question was, or then what? Well, they had no answer.

The President has been criticized for not coming forth with some changes to change the status quo. He did. Now he is being criticized with what he came

up with in this plan that we are going to be voting on later. I don't know if it is perfect. I don't know if it will work. But I do know this: he is the Commander in Chief.

We do need to change the dynamics there. We do need to go forward in a way that will produce a positive result or decide what else we are going to do. That is what the Senate, in the minds of our forefathers, was intended to do.

Let's stop questioning each other's motives or threatening to block this, block that. Let's work this out. Let's have a full debate on this issue, beginning tonight, going forward tomorrow. I think everybody will be satisfied with the results, once we actually get to some votes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. How much time do I now have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 56½ minutes.

MINE SAFETY

Mr BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the great labor leader—and I mean great labor leader—and legendary president of the United Mine Workers of America, John L. Lewis, pleaded the cause of America's working men and women, as he said, "not in the quavering tones of a feeble mendicant asking alms, but in the thundering voice of the captain of a mighty host, demanding the rights to which free people, free men are entitled."

This was the voice of a true coal miner. I know that voice. I grew up in the coalfields of southern West Virginia. My dad—not my father, my dad—Titus Dalton Byrd, was a coal miner. He belonged to the United Mine Workers, then district 29, now district 17, local union 5771. My coal miner dad worked in the coal mines with my father-in-law, my wife's father, Fred James. My wife's brother-in-law was killed by a slate fall in a coal mine. My wife's brother-in-law died of pneumoconiosis, black lung.

I—yes, I—married a coal miner's daughter. You have heard the song "I'm a Coal Miner's Daughter." By whom? By Loretta Lynn.

I married a coal miner's daughter a long time ago. We were married when we were 19. She was 19; I was 19. That marriage lasted almost 69 years, until her death. And today she is in heaven. She is in heaven. Yes, she is in heaven today. I believe that.

Together, my wife Erma and I—mostly Erma—ran a grocery store, yes, in Sophia, WV. Our customers were coal miners for the most part. Our neighbors were coal miners. Our friends were coal miners and others, but coal miners, surely.

Today my constituents in West Virginia, the core—certainly, the core in my viewpoint, but my constituents—

includes coal miners. When I speak about coal miners and their safety underground, I am speaking about coal miners, my people, my family. I am speaking from the bottom of my soul when I speak about coal miners. It is a different breed of people, coal miners. Yes, they would leave the open air and sunshine and go back into the bowels of the Earth to search for their brothers, their brother coal miners—Black or White, it doesn't make any difference. They are all black when they come out of that mine. But they are all coal miners. They are West Virginians. I am talking about my constituents. I am speaking from the heart because that is the heart of my background, the coal miners.

I know what it is to stand at the mouth of a mine after an explosion. I know what it is to see the widows and the children who are left to shed their tears and to bury their loved ones. I know. I have helped to carry coal miners who had died around the mountain-side. Their coffins are very heavy. I am no big man, never was, but I have helped to carry those coffins. And they are heavy, especially when we are walking on hillsides, yes. So I know what I am speaking about, and I am speaking from my heart. That is where I grew up. I expect to be buried there, yes, in the mountain soil of West Virginia.

The coal miner is proud—yes, you better believe it—of his profession. He is patriotic in that he mines the coal that fuels the American economy. You see those lights up there that are lighting this wonderful, beautiful Chamber of the Senate, the only Chamber of its kind in the world, the Senate, yes. The miner fuels those electric lights that surround this Chamber.

He, the coal miner, is religious in that he trusts in almighty God to keep him safe in his dirty, dangerous job; and he trusts in that God to keep and protect his family, while he, the coal miner, is away. He is courageous—you better believe it—in that he goes underground every day, even though he is surrounded by life-threatening hazards; they are overhead. I have been in the mines. I was not a coal miner, but I was in there with my dad—not my father but my dad. I have been in those mines. I heard the timbers, the tree trunks holding up the tons and tons and tons of earth and rock overhead to keep those rocks from crashing to the Earth and killing the miners. I could hear those timbers cracking. When I was in there, I heard the timbers—these trees, as they were. They are cut off, and they are 8, 10, 12, 15 feet, whatever the height of the covering earth is from the floor there; they were coming down. I heard them timbers cracking under that weight.

Coal miners provide so much for my country, for your country, for their country. And we—ROBERT BYRD, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and other Senators and Members in the House—owe them, the coal miners, our best efforts in se-

curing safer working conditions. Not as their alms but their right.

In 1977, the Congress passed—I was in this Senate in 1977—what is arguably the toughest worker safety law in the history of the world, the Federal Mine and Safety Health Act. I helped to write that law. I helped to champion its enactment in the Congress of the United States. It created the Mine Safety and Health Administration, MSHA, within the U.S. Department of Labor—MSHA, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, was in the Department of Labor—and the position of Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine, Safety, and Health. I helped. I was here.

The opening passages of the MINE Act tell us all we need to know about what MSHA's priorities ought to be:

The first priority and concern of all in the coal or other mining industry must be the health and safety of its most precious resource: the miner, the coal miner.

In recent years, that obligation has been neglected. It has been eroded by a Department of Labor that emphasizes so-called "compliance assistance" programs and has tried to recast its role as a technical consultant to business rather than a protector of working men and women. Let me read that again. In recent years, that obligation has been neglected. It has been eroded by a Department of Labor that emphasizes so-called "compliance assistance" programs and has tried to recast its role as a technical consultant to business rather than a protector of working men and women; namely, coal miners.

The Department's obligation to protect the safety of the coal miners has been eroded by arbitrary spending targets that are designed to appease the White House Budget Office rather than ensure the safety of the coal miners in the coal fields. These policies have fostered the highest casualty rates in the coalfields in more than a decade. Forty-seven coal miners perished—died, dead—last year, half of them in West Virginia. In the opening days of 2006, our Nation mourned as 12 coal miners—yes, my darling wife was on her deathbed at that time in the opening days of 2006; that was last year. Our Nation mourned after a 40-hour rescue effort was unable to save 12 miners at the Sago mine in Upshur County, WV. Our Nation watched with disbelief as an underground mine fire, days later, at the Aracoma Alma mine in Logan County, WV, killed 2 more miners after another exhausting 40-hour rescue effort. The disbelief—yes, the disbelief—soon turned to outrage as congressional hearings and investigative news reports revealed an atrocious safety record at the Sago and Alma mines. The Department of Labor had been lax in assessing penalties for repeat violations. When penalties were assessed, habitual violators were too often given minor slaps on the wrist or had their fines reduced or negated within the appeals process.

Congressional hearings revealed the Department of Labor had abandoned or

had withdrawn countless safety standards prior to the Sago and Alma tragedies, leaving coal miners underground with outdated emergency breathing and communications equipment. How would you like to be a coal miner in those conditions? Emergency preparedness and rescue training had been allowed to fall by the wayside, as the safety of coal miners became a secondary concern to what? To rising corporate profits. Shame, shame. This is the lives of men and women underground, in the bowels of the Earth.

The Department of Labor had allowed the Federal budget for mine safety to be squeezed by lesser priorities, reducing the number of coal mine safety inspectors by 217 since January 2001. The Government Accountability Office—the General Accounting Office—had warned as early as 2003 about the timeliness of inspections, and the Mine Safety and Health Administration, which was created to be an ever-vigilant advocate for the safety of coal miners, had been failing in its duty. Mine safety budgets and regulations had been allowed to erode at the Sago mine.

MSHA could have required better communications. That alone might have saved those miners. It could have mandated better emergency preparedness. It could have been more vigorous in its inspections and assessments of penalties. If MSHA, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, had used its authorities under the Mine Act to the fullest extent possible, those miners who perished at Sago and Alma might have survived. They might have been alive today. Who knows.

Coal mining communities across Appalachia were outraged by these findings, and they demanded action. They marched through the Halls of the Congress carrying pictures of their husbands, their brothers, their sons who had perished in the coalfield.

In response, my illustrious colleague, Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER, and I, along with the entire West Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives—two Democrats and one Republican—introduced mine safety legislation to force the Department of Labor to act. The chairman and ranking member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Senators MIKE ENZI and TED KENNEDY, rallied to our cause. Our offices began to craft, to shape, to write important and much needed mine safety legislation.

By the end of May—May, O May, when the flowers bloom—the Senate had passed legislation to add the first new safety requirements to the Mine Act since 1977. The MINER Act required additional oxygen. Oh, I can only live with oxygen. You can only live with oxygen. You, Mr. President, can only live with oxygen. You can't live without it. No, I mean by that, without it, a few minutes. Oxygen. It has been around since Adam and Eve inhabited the Garden of Eden.

The MINER Act required additional oxygen supplies underground. It re-

quired emergency wireless communications within 3 years. It required improvements in emergency preparedness, rescue teams, and accident notification.

Separately, I worked to secure \$36 million in the fiscal year 2006 Iraq supplemental for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, MSHA, to hire additional mine safety inspectors and for the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, to expedite the introduction of emergency breathing and communications equipment into the coal mines.

Who am I? I am a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Yes, I am the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. So I worked to do that.

By June—the merry month of June—the Congress had passed the MINER Act and added \$36 million to the Federal budget for mine safety. By the end of the summer, the Department of Labor had pledged, with the funds that I, a coal miner's boy, had secured, to hire 170 new coal inspectors by the end of the fiscal year 2007. By the end of calendar year 2006, the coal mining industry had at last focused on getting emergency communications and breathing equipment into the coal mines. That's late, isn't it? By the end of the calendar year 2006, while coal mining has been going on for decades—yes, yes, back beyond the beginning of the 20th century until now—by the end of the calendar year 2006, the coal mining industry had at last focused on getting emergency communications equipment and breathing equipment into the coal mines of America.

The question before the Congress now—do it here, do it now; do it here, do it now. Have you heard that on the radio or TV? Do it here; do it now. The question before the Congress now is, what happens next?

We know that extensive oversight will be required by the Congress not only to ensure that MSHA fulfills its duties under the MINER Act but also to ensure that the coal operators meet their duties. So we know that extensive oversight will be required by the Congress not only to ensure that MSHA fulfills its duties under the MINER Act but also to ensure that the coal operators meet their duties.

The House and Senate appropriations and authorizing committees have a significant role to play in this regard. We must do all—we must do all—that we can to ensure that the deadlines set by the MINER Act are met. We must do all that we can to ensure that wireless communications are available to coal miners within the next 2½ years, after all the many years that have gone before. If that means providing more funds to NIOSH to expedite the development of wireless communications and tracking and prodding the industry along to purchase and install that equipment, count on me. As the old Bible says: Here am I, send me. Here am I, send me.

We know also that several issues have not yet been addressed by the Congress from last year. The Congress has not yet addressed the issue of refuge chambers. The MINER Act required NIOSH to study the issue and report back by the end of this year. About what? Refuge chambers.

The Congress must require MSHA and NIOSH to find a way to make refuge chambers. What does "refuge" mean? A place to go. Refuge chambers, a place to go for refuge, for safety after an explosion. During the explosion, that's a big wind, a big explosion.

The Congress has not yet addressed the issue of whether belt air should be used to ventilate the working areas of underground mines—belt air, a conveyor belt that comes along, a belt, a wide belt that comes on rollers and comes into the mine.

Given how the use of belt air and inadequate safety precautions at Alma Mine resulted in the death of two coal miners last year, this is an issue that will not go away with yet another study and yet another report to the Congress. The Department of Labor must reconsider the belt air rule issued in 2004.

We know that the low level of penalties remains an ineffective deterrent for too many coal operators. I am not against coal operators. We have to have them. They invest money, their money. They invest money. We know the low level of penalties remains an ineffective deterrent for too many coal operators. I know many of them personally. I like them. They like me, I think. Penalties are not commensurate with the seriousness of violations.

The Department of Labor recently informed my office that the accident at the Jim Walters Resources Mine in Alabama that killed 13 miners in 2001 will be punished with a fine as little as \$5,000—\$5,000. That is disgusting. That is disgusting. It is clearly a signal to the Congress that the penalty system demands further improvement.

Last October, MSHA issued its procedural instruction letter to revise the structure for how penalties are assessed by its inspectors. That procedural letter implemented the minimum penalty provision of the MINER Act. However, if higher fines are being assessed by inspectors but continue to be reduced or negated within the appeals process, then MSHA's procedural letter is almost irrelevant.

How much time do I have remaining, may I ask the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we need to find a way to ensure that fair penalties are assessed by administrative law judges and the Mine Safety and Health Review Commission within the appeals process.

We must continue to review and ask questions about the structure of mine rescue teams and the changes codified by the MINER Act last year. Here is

another area where the rules issued by MSHA in recent years have contradicted the intent and spirit of the 1977 Mine Act.

We must continue to probe whether enough has been done. Two deaths last month in southern West Virginia serve as a macabre reminder that the crisis in the coal fields is not yet over—will probably never be over—but we have got to work at it. It is not yet over. We must be innovative. It is time for us to stop simply addressing mine disasters as they happen. We must seek opportunities to get ahead of the dangers. We must use foresight as well as hindsight.

Last month, I met with the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mine Safety and Health, Richard Stickler. Mr. Stickler is in his current position because of a recess appointment in October 2006. He has not been confirmed by the Senate, and so his appointment will expire at the end of this year. I am hopeful that he will prove himself a friend of the coal miner. He has a dedicated team at MSHA, which includes many former coal miners who would like to see MSHA do better. I am convinced that more can be done. The question is whether the Department of Labor and the White House will let MSHA do what needs to be done. The Congress will get some insight into that question as it reviews the President's budget request for mine safety, which was delivered today.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and as a Senator who will have some say about the Federal budget for mine safety, hear me when I say that the days of cheating the safety and well-being of our Nation's coal miners are over. The Senate Appropriations Committee will examine the various mine safety accounts, and the Senate Appropriations Committee will make its recommendations to the Senate about where improvements can be made. That process has already begun with the inclusion of \$13 million above—above, on top of, over—the President's request in the continuing resolution for the fiscal year 2007 for MSHA to hire and train additional coal safety inspectors. I and other Senators have encouraged the President of the United States—hear me—to include additional funds to retain those inspectors in his mine safety budget request for the fiscal year 2008, and I am glad that the President appears to have done so.

This is an issue that is close to my heart, and I pledge to do all that I can to increase congressional oversight in the coal field. As a son of the coal fields, the Appalachian coal fields, as the son of a coal miner, I am determined, yes, determined to be the "captain of a mighty host demanding the rights to which free men"—free men—coal miners—"free men are entitled." And women. Free men and women are entitled.

Mr. President, that concludes my prepared speech.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say this to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I have been privileged to be here but a small fraction of the time that he has, 29 years here and well over 40 for my colleague from West Virginia, but in that period we have worked many times on behalf of coal miners.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. As the Presiding Officer recognized, my fellow colleague from Virginia, our States are joined.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Those mines have a great deal of comparability, those in Virginia and those in West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Joined at the hip.

Mr. WARNER. They are joined. The plight of the miners and their families has been a subject that no Senator in the modern history of this Senate has fought harder for than the senior senator from West Virginia, and very often you have involved me and my colleagues, whoever they might be. I have served with three now, the distinguished HARRY BYRD, Jr., whom you will recall, Senator Robb, and Senator Allen. All of us have worked on this subject.

I hope to join you on this, and I hope the Presiding Officer, likewise, will work on this subject of coal mine safety. So I thank my friend.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished, the very distinguished senior senator from the great State of Virginia. I thank him.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, and we will work together.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IRAQ

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the cloture vote was very fully discussed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, with leadership and our ranking members, so I am confident that somehow this matter can be worked out. I want you to know, however, that I stand steadfast behind the content of a resolution I put together, along with Senator BEN NELSON, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, and some eight other cosponsors.

The question is how does the Senate bring it into focus under the complexity of our rules. I won't take the time to deal with that now, but I would say to those following this debate that we stand, the Senators I mentioned, the two principal cosponsors and myself, firmly behind this resolution, the content of which has been amended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amended copy of the resolution be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, allowing ready reference for those persons examining the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. WARNER. That resolution has been distorted and misunderstood in the debate thus far. That is one of the reasons I am so anxious to proceed with this debate. I want to make clear, because it was mentioned that perhaps these resolutions were brought along for political cover, that on that issue each Senator has to speak for themselves, but I assure my colleagues that this Senator from Virginia has moved forward with my thoughts and my ideas in the best interest of the country and the best interest of the men and women of the United States military, and not for any political cover. Nor will I, in any way, impugn the motives of Senators whose opinions differ from mine.

This being my 29th year in the Senate, I have never, to my knowledge, ever intentionally, and I don't think indirectly, impugned the motive of any Senator for the position he or she has taken on a matter. We are all patriots. We are equal patriots. We all support the men and women of the Armed Forces. Let that be understood.

I firmly believe, as we are approaching this debate, that it is imperative that the Senate work its will, and work its will in the open, on this issue which is so critical at this point in time in our many years of involvement in the Iraq situation.

I solidly support the President in his view that we cannot accept failure in getting a government, whether it is this one or an ensuing government, in Iraq up and running and functioning such that it can seize the full range of sovereignty in this nation, and not let this nation implode, causing absolute disaster throughout the region. Indeed, certainly as it relates to energy and other issues, it could impact severely on the rest of the world, not only in energy but in a signal that the terrorists have won. We cannot let that happen. So let's let the Senate work its will, and I think our colleagues here, the distinguished leaders, will work out a procedure by which we will do that. The comment was made, and understandably, that this is a nonbinding resolution. Nonbinding. Well, we have them in the history of the Senate. At this time, this Senator is not voting for any cutoff of funds. That is our one constitutional lever we can pull. As a matter of fact, in our resolution—I refer to our resolution as the one that I, together with Senator BEN NELSON and Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine have put together—we specifically have included an iteration of the concept advanced by our distinguished colleague Senator GREGG, which may come before the Senate. We solidly support that concept of no cutoff of funds.

What do we do short of that? Well, we have a debate. Somehow you have to have some focal point, something written down, some document in writing as to the ability of this institution, the Senate, to reach a consensus, and a bipartisan consensus, on how best we go

forward with a new strategy in Iraq. That has been my motivation from the very beginning, to put this institution on record on a bipartisan basis. I am not talking about one or two Senators on that side joining all the Senators on this side or vice versa, no, a truly on its face bipartisan consensus, albeit a resolution without any legal force and effect.

It is important that the people of this country give their support to the men and women in uniform and to a strategy which they hope will succeed in our goal of not letting Iraq implode and fall into greater disaster than it is experiencing today. So how do they go about it? The President, in his speech on January 10, explicitly said those who have other ideas, generally speaking, or concepts, bring them forward. That is what we have done. We have exercised what the President has given us, the option to come forward.

To quote the President: "If Members," referring to Congress, "have improvements that can be made, we will make them," he said. "If circumstances change, we will adjust, showing flexibility," said the President.

Using that as our chart, we then proceeded as a group to figure out how best to comment on the President's strategy. We did say, and I repeat it, that the Senate disagrees with the plan to augment our forces by 21,500 and urge the President, instead, to consider all options and alternatives for achieving the strategic goals set forth below. Each Senator has to interpret that phrase, that sentence, as he or she so desires. I repeat that. Each Senator has the right to look at that and decide, one, do you disagree in any way with what the President is doing and the force of 21,500.

I believe we can accomplish the goals this country has set out to accomplish in Iraq, goals that were enumerated by the Baker-Hamilton commission, in a manner that we do not need a full force of 21,500. Indeed, that force, we now learn, could be somewhat higher than that number if you are going to have the essential support troops joined. Unfortunately, there was no reference to that made in the President's speech, and right now it is a matter of debate and contention.

I don't know what the additional figure is, but in my judgment, I say most respectfully that we do not in this resolution in any way challenge or contravene the constitutional provision that you are Commander in Chief and that you can deploy troops which, in your best judgment, are for the security of this Nation and the welfare of the troops. We don't challenge that. We simply accept your offer, we have expressed it, so we support it.

I support, for example, additional troops if they are necessary over and above the current level for operations in Al Anbar. On my last trip to that region, it was clear that the marines had enough troops to do certain portions of

their mission, but it was also clear that additional forces were needed. Perhaps they could come from within the current force structure currently in Iraq. But perhaps you need—to use the word "surge"—some modest surge to meet the requirements for Al-Anbar to be brought under a higher level of security.

Nothing in this resolution prohibits the President from having some portion of that surge force of 21,500 utilized to do those things which are essential—further training of the Iraqi forces, further embedding, enlarging the number of troops to be embedded with the Iraqi forces. Those are the sorts of things this Senator supports. Within the framework of this resolution, I can take those stands.

But I turn now to the principal thing we have in this resolution, and that is one of the main things that I believe has to have greater emphasis. It is as follows. We state it very clearly in a provision in our resolution:

The United States military operations should, as much as possible, be confined to these goals, which were enumerated by the Baker-Hamilton Commission.

I go back and I read the goals here, all set forth on page 6 of the resolution. The military part of this strategy should: focus on maintaining the territorial integrity of Iraq, denying international terrorists a safe haven, conducting counterterrorism operations, promoting regional stability, supporting Iraqi efforts to bring greater security to Baghdad, and training and equipping Iraqi forces to take full responsibility for their own security.

Therein is the principal motivation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WARNER. I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent that I could proceed until such time as Senators desiring to come forth and address the standing order, namely—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have an order to lay down the motion to proceed. Will the Senator allow that to go forward at this time?

Mr. WARNER. Fine, if the Presiding Officer desires to do that.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IRAQ—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 470, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 470) to express the sense of Congress on Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I wonder if I can ask unanimous consent at this time to proceed for another 5 minutes. Seeing my distinguished colleague on the Senate floor—

Mr. BROWN. If the Senator will yield?

Mr. WARNER. If I might finish the unanimous consent request? Then I will be happy to listen to the Senator.

In other words, at this point in time I ask unanimous consent that we proceed as in morning business such that I could complete in 5 minutes. And my distinguished colleague. We have been waiting for about 2 hours this afternoon. I do not know—perhaps I am mistaken—if there are Senators in the Chamber who wish to address the subject matter of the order just given by the Chair. I wouldn't want to interfere with them going forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, there is an hour-and-a-half debate scheduled on this motion.

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. REED. Parliamentary inquiry: Is the Chair establishing an order for speaking?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No order has been established.

Mr. WARNER. If I might say to my distinguished colleague, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, I think the Chair has granted me 5 minutes, to be followed by a period of about 5 minutes to my colleague from Nebraska, Senator BEN NELSON. From that point on, there may be those who wish to address the underlying order, or the Chair could recognize other Senators who wish to speak on the subject.

Mr. REED. If the Chair is ready, I ask that at the conclusion of the 5 minutes of Senator NELSON, I be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous consent agreement stipulate that following Senator REED's comments, I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request as modified by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer and the preceding Presiding Officer, my distinguished colleague.

I was speaking about the need to have greater involvement of the Iraqi forces. I ask unanimous consent to have this chart printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSITION IRAQ TO SECURITY SELF-RELIANCE—IRAQI SECURITY FORCES Ministry of Interior Forces*

<i>Component</i>	<i>Trained and Equipped</i>
Police	***-135,000
National police	-24,400

<i>Component</i>	<i>Trained and Equipped</i>
Other MOI forces	~28,900
Total	**~188,300

Ministry of Defense Forces

<i>Component</i>	<i>Operational</i>
Army	***~132,700
Air Force	~900
Navy	~1,100
Total	**~134,700

*Total Trained & Equipped ISF: ****~323,000*

*Ministry of Interior Forces: Unauthorized absence personnel are included in these numbers.

**Ministry of Defense Forces: Unauthorized absence personnel are not included in these numbers.

***Army numbers included Special Operations Forces and Support Forces.

****Does not include the approximately 144,000 Facilities Protection Service personnel working in 27 ministries.

Note.—Data as of January 22, 2007 (Updated bi-weekly by DOD).

Mr. WARNER. It is dated as of January 27, 2007. It says, "Transition Iraq to Security Self-Reliance—Iraq Security Forces."

It lays it out. This is what the American taxpayer has been expending—an enormous sum of money for 2½ years to train the Iraqi forces. I bring to your attention, for the Ministry of Defense Forces: the army, 132,700; air force, 900; the navy, 1,100; total, 134,700. Ministry of Interior, trained and equipped: police, 135,000; national police, 24,400; other MOI forces, 28,900; total, 188,300. That is a total of 323,000 forces trained in the past 2½ years.

In the resolution my distinguished colleagues and I have put together, we specifically say look at all options. I say the Iraqi's are the ones who should be responsible for these problems in Baghdad. We will give them support. We will give them the training. But I say to my colleagues here in the Senate, this is what we have trained these people to do. The Iraqi forces understand the language. They understand the culture. How does an American GI, being thrust into the darkened alleys of this city, with all of the crossfire between the Sunni and the Shia, and Shia upon Shia decide whom to shoot, how to direct the force?

The National Intelligence Estimate just released made mention of this. The report states—I shall read it.

The intelligence community judges that the term "civil war" does not adequately capture the complexity of the conflict in Iraq, which includes extensive Shia-on-Shia violence, al-Qa'ida and Sunni insurgent attacks on Coalition forces, and widespread criminally motivated violence. Nonetheless, the term "civil war" accurately describes key elements of the Iraqi conflict, including the hardening of ethno-sectarian identities, a sea change in the character of the violence, ethno-sectarian mobilization, and population displacement.

I say most respectfully to our President: Mr. President, recognize what we have done in 2½ years to train these people. Let them take the point. Let them take the brunt of the fight. And maybe we do not need 21,500, together with support troops, to go in and do the

job we have trained these people to do themselves.

In this regard I would like to quote from T.E. Lawrence. This quote is also cited in the Army Field Manual on Counterinsurgency. Lawrence said:

Do not try to do too much with your own hands, better the Arabs do it tolerably than you do it perfectly. It is their war, and you are to help them, not to win it for them.

Additionally, the National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq also describes a very complex conflict between all parties in Iraq. Putting American soldiers in the midst of that will require military plans and orders to contain exquisite tactical detail sufficient to afford our men and women in uniform the ability to discern friend from foe in an urban environment.

I, and others, also remain very concerned about the command and control structure that has been planned for this operation in Baghdad. In his January 10, 2007, address to the Nation, President Bush stated that U.S. troops would be "embedded" in Iraqi formations. This left a very serious question about the unity of command. On February 1, General Casey described the command and control as "a non-standard arrangement." This non-standard arrangement must be clarified and our resolution addresses this serious concern.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

S. CON. RES. 7

Whereas we respect the Constitutional authorities given a President in article II, section 2, which states that "The President shall be commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States"; it is not the intent of this resolution to question or contravene such authority, but to accept the offer to Congress made by the President on January 10, 2007, that, "if members have improvements that can be made, we will make them. If circumstances change, we will adjust";

Whereas the United States strategy and operations in Iraq can only be sustained and achieved with support from the American people and with a level of bipartisanship;

Whereas over 137,000 American military personnel are currently serving in Iraq, like thousands of others since March 2003, with the bravery and professionalism consistent with the finest traditions of the United States Armed Forces, and are deserving of the support of all Americans, which they have strongly;

Whereas many American service personnel have lost their lives, and many more have been wounded, in Iraq, and the American people will always honor their sacrifices and honor their families;

Whereas the U.S. Army and Marine Corps, including their Reserve and National Guard organizations, together with components of the other branches of the military, are under enormous strain from multiple, extended deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan;

Whereas these deployments, and those that will follow, will have lasting impacts on the future recruiting, retention and readiness of our Nation's all volunteer force;

Whereas in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the Congress stated that "calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking

the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq";

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1723, approved November 28, 2006, "determin[ed] that the situation in Iraq continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security";

Whereas Iraq is experiencing a deteriorating and ever-widening problem of sectarian and intra-sectarian violence based upon political distrust and cultural differences between some Sunni and Shia Muslims;

Whereas Iraqis must reach political settlements in order to achieve reconciliation, and the failure of the Iraqis to reach such settlements to support a truly unified government greatly contributes to the increasing violence in Iraq;

Whereas the responsibility for Iraq's internal security and halting sectarian violence must rest primarily with the Government of Iraq and Iraqi Security Forces;

Whereas U.S. Central Command Commander General John Abizaid testified to Congress on November 15, 2006, "I met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the Corps Commander, [and] General Dempsey. We all talked together. And I said, in your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq? And they all said no. And the reason is, because we want the Iraqis to do more. It's easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future";

Whereas Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki stated on November 27, 2006, that "The crisis is political, and the ones who can stop the cycle of aggravation and bloodletting of innocents are the politicians";

Whereas there is growing evidence that Iraqi public sentiment opposes the continued U.S. troop presence in Iraq, much less increasing the troop level;

Whereas, in the fall of 2006, leaders in the Administration and Congress, as well as recognized experts in the private sector, began to express concern that the situation in Iraq was deteriorating and required a change in strategy; and, as a consequence, the Administration began an intensive, comprehensive review by all components of the Executive Branch to devise a new strategy;

Whereas, in December 2006, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group issued a valuable report, suggesting a comprehensive strategy that includes "new and enhanced diplomatic and political efforts in Iraq and the region, and a change in the primary mission of U.S. forces in Iraq that will enable the United States to begin to move its combat forces out of Iraq responsibly";

Whereas, on January 10, 2007, following consultations with the Iraqi Prime Minister, the President announced a new strategy (hereinafter referred to as the "plan"), which consists of three basic elements: diplomatic, economic, and military; the central component of the military element is an augmentation of the present level of the U.S. military forces through additional deployments of approximately 21,500 U.S. military troops to Iraq;

Whereas, on January 10, 2007, the President said that the "Iraqi government will appoint a military commander and two deputy commanders for their capital" and that U.S. forces will "be embedded in their formations"; and in subsequent testimony before the Armed Services Committee on January 25, 2007, by the retired former Vice Chief of the Army it was learned that there will also be a comparable U.S. command in Baghdad, and that this dual chain of command may be

problematic because “the Iraqis are going to be able to move their forces around at times where we will disagree with that movement”, and called for clarification;

Whereas this proposed level of troop augmentation far exceeds the expectations of many of us as to the reinforcements that would be necessary to implement the various options for a new strategy, and led many members of Congress to express outright opposition to augmenting our troops by 21,500;

Whereas the Government of Iraq has promised repeatedly to assume a greater share of security responsibilities, disband militias, consider Constitutional amendments and enact laws to reconcile sectarian differences, and improve the quality of essential services for the Iraqi people; yet, despite those promises, little has been achieved;

Whereas the President said on January 10, 2007, that “I’ve made it clear to the Prime Minister and Iraq’s other leaders that America’s commitment is not open-ended” so as to dispel the contrary impression that exists; and

Whereas the recommendations in this resolution should not be interpreted as precipitating any immediate reduction in, or withdrawal of, the present level of forces: Now, therefore, be it—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Senate disagrees with the “plan” to augment our forces by 21,500, and urges the President instead to consider all options and alternatives for achieving the strategic goals set forth below;

(2) the Senate believes the United States should continue vigorous operations in Anbar province, specifically for the purpose of combating an insurgency, including elements associated with the Al Qaeda movement, and denying terrorists a safe haven;

(3) the Senate believes a failed state in Iraq would present a threat to regional and world peace, and the long-term security interests of the United States are best served by an Iraq that can sustain, govern, and defend itself, and serve as an ally in the war against extremists;

(4) the Congress should not take any action that will endanger United States military forces in the field, including the elimination or reduction of funds for troops in the field, as such an action with respect to funding would undermine their safety or harm their effectiveness in pursuing their assigned missions;

(5) the primary objective of the overall U.S. strategy in Iraq should be to encourage Iraqi leaders to make political compromises that will foster reconciliation and strengthen the unity government, ultimately leading to improvements in the security situation;

(6) the military part of this strategy should focus on maintaining the territorial integrity of Iraq, denying international terrorists a safe haven, conducting counterterrorism operations, promoting regional stability, supporting Iraqi efforts to bring greater security to Baghdad, and training and equipping Iraqi forces to take full responsibility for their own security;

(7) United States military operations should, as much as possible, be confined to these goals, and should charge the Iraqi military with the primary mission of combating sectarian violence;

(8) the military Rules of Engagement for this plan should reflect this delineation of responsibilities, and the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should clarify the command and control arrangements in Baghdad;

(9) the United States Government should transfer to the Iraqi military, in an expedi-

tious manner, such equipment as is necessary;

(10) the United States Government should engage selected nations in the Middle East to develop a regional, internationally sponsored peace-and-reconciliation process for Iraq;

(11) the Administration should provide regular updates to the Congress, produced by the Commander of United States Central Command and his subordinate commanders, about the progress or lack of progress the Iraqis are making toward this end; and

(12) our overall military, diplomatic, and economic strategy should not be regarded as an “open-ended” or unconditional commitment, but rather as a new strategy that hereafter should be conditioned upon the Iraqi government’s meeting benchmarks that must be delineated in writing and agreed to by the Iraqi Prime Minister. Such benchmarks should include, but not be limited to, the deployment of that number of additional Iraqi security forces as specified in the plan in Baghdad, ensuring equitable distribution of the resources of the Government of Iraq without regard to the sect or ethnicity of recipients, enacting and implementing legislation to ensure that the oil resources of Iraq benefit Sunni Arabs, Shia Arabs, Kurds, and other Iraqi citizens in an equitable manner, and the authority of Iraqi commanders to make tactical and operational decisions without political intervention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I state again for my colleagues that this debate is not about support for the troops or support for their extraordinary work on the ground in Iraq. Our troops, the best fighting force in the history of the world, have performed admirably, honorably, and successfully under extreme and dangerous conditions in Iraq. We are not here today to besmirch their efforts, their work, or their sacrifice. To indicate otherwise is disingenuous and out of line.

This is not the time or the place for political attacks. The President even made an offer to Congress before a nationally televised audience on January 10 that, “if Members have improvements that can be made, we will make them.”

This is a debate about a serious topic: What is the way forward in Iraq? How can we achieve a political solution without the additional loss of American lives?

One of my colleagues has said over and over, “this comes down to if you support an escalation or not” and “the American people deserve this debate.” For me, the question is, Will the Senate lead? Will the Senate express its opposition to the surge? I know many do not think passing a nonbinding resolution is leading, and I know others say the resolution goes too far. I say that, on an issue of this magnitude, an issue this important, it is critical for the Senate to speak with the strongest voice possible. Generating a revised resolution with broader appeal was putting our best foot forward in securing the strongest bipartisan vote possible.

I am proud to have worked with my colleague, Senator WARNER, the most

recent past chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and our colleague, Senator COLLINS of Maine, in this cause. They have shown tremendous leadership on this issue, as have Senator LEVIN, Senator BIDEN, and Senator HAGEL. But it seems that even when it comes to the lives of our troops, partisanship prevails. Here we are, after weeks of negotiations, after weeks of public proclamations, after weeks of consideration, about to witness the minority choose politics over progress—and this is after we revised our original resolution to address some of the concerns that were raised by both Democrats and Republicans.

It is important that we point out that this is not simply about being opposed to a surge. It is about opposition to a surge to do what? To go into Baghdad? To go into the midst of sectarian violence, civil war, criminality? There is no opposition to continuing to support troops in Al-Anbar and even an increase in the troops to fight the bad guys in that location. But that is altogether different from going into Baghdad where our troops will be expected to be on the point and in harm’s way in the midst of sectarian violence that is unparalleled across our great world today. But in strong support of Iraq, we must, in fact, do what we can to support Iraq but without putting our troops in the midst of that caldron.

The Baker-Hamilton report made things very clear. We have established benchmarks as well—that we should empower the Iraqi Government to be able to do what it can to quell its own violence. We cannot win their civil war. We cannot stop the violence in Baghdad. Only a political solution achieved by the Iraqis will be able to do that.

If we are to do our duty, if we are to exhibit leadership, let us begin by allowing a full debate on the resolutions we have pending. Let’s talk about the President’s plan to deploy American troops to the crossroads of civil war in Iraq. Let’s talk about holding the Iraqi Government accountable for its responsibilities.

I am prepared to defend the resolutions I have offered with Senators WARNER, COLLINS, and LEVIN. I am prepared to vote on the McCain resolution. And I am prepared for the debate because its time has come.

I ask my colleagues, if not now, when? If not now, do we wait for more troops to die before we oppose the President’s plan? If not now, do we wait for more violence, more unrest, more danger for our troops before we act? Some have said the President deserves one last chance to succeed. How do we ask our troops to do again what has failed in the past? We have had other surges that have not succeeded for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the Iraqis have not shown up. So what is different this time?

I hope we do not look at this as our last hurrah.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, be recognized after the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a list of speakers on our side, and I would ask to be recognized to ask if the Senator would revise his request that following Senator REED, Senator SPECTER be recognized for 7½ minutes. Then if we can alternate sides, and on our side, then, it would be the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, for 7½ minutes; Senator LIEBERMAN for 10 minutes; and then Senator HAGEL, who would use the remainder of our time, which I believe would be 8 more minutes. If we could revise the UC to reflect that order of speakers for our time, I would appreciate it.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I get in the queue?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, might I suggest that while I speak an order be established, and at the conclusion of my remarks I would again make the unanimous consent for that order.

Mr. CORNYN. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I commend Senator WARNER, Senator NELSON, Senator LEVIN and others who have worked so hard on this resolution. I do believe, like my colleagues, that this measure and an alternative measure deserve an up-or-down vote by the Senate. That is what the American people want, and that is what they should receive.

We embarked on this effort in Iraq more than 4 years ago. From the very beginning I thought this was not a response to an imminent threat to the United States or even to the region. It was based upon highly speculative and, it turns out in many cases, flat wrong intelligence. It represents, in my view, a flawed strategy because the approach the President has taken in Iraq fails to recognize that the major regional threat was not Iraq but Iran and failed to recognize the huge amounts of resources that will be necessary to successfully occupy and stabilize a country the size of Iraq with the cultural and historical issues that are inherent in that country.

The strategy, as I said, I think was flawed. Strategy, to me, means having a clear objective and putting forth the resources necessary to achieve that objective. The objective in Iraq shifted from the WMD allegations, to terrorist connections allegations, to creating a transformative oasis of democracy and free enterprise in a country that has not seen that in many years. And the resources were never adequate for the task.

One of the most important resources in a strategy is public support. I think one of the major problems with the President's last address a few days ago

when he talked about Iraq and his so-called new strategy is that, I believe, he squandered significantly the willingness of the American public to support any proposal made. Without that public support, it will be very difficult to sustain our activities in Iraq.

I think the proof of this failed strategy is evident. Today Iran is in an enhanced strategic position vis-a-vis the United States and is being much more difficult to deal with, with respect to the region and to its aspirations of nuclear technology. We have compromised our efforts in Afghanistan and in Pakistan where real significant threats exist to the world and to the United States. We have diverted our attention from North Korea and from the Iranian aspirations for nuclear technology.

According to many experts such as Hank Crumpton, who is leaving as the Assistant Secretary of State for Counterterrorism:

We have made it more likely this country will be struck by terrorists, not less likely.

Of course, we can talk at length about the incompetent execution of these policies in Iraq, but I want to go right to the heart of what the President is talking about. He suggests that we have a changed strategy. I would suggest that perhaps we are changing our tactics; we are taking American units and putting them in the heart of Baghdad. But it seems that this surge is more of the same, more of the clear hold and build, more of involvement in the existing conflicts of the Iraqi people and not essential to our national security, which would be to protect ourselves from terrorists there, to stabilize the country so it doesn't disintegrate, and also to go ahead and to train, continually train the Iraqi security forces.

Many have criticized this surge on purely military grounds. Too few troops. The doctrine calls for more than 120,000 troops to cover the city of Baghdad. We will be lucky to muster 50,000 to 60,000 to 70,000. Including Iraqi security forces.

There is a lack of unity of command. There is uncertain leadership by the Iraqis. Their commanding general is a virtual unknown who has been plucked by Maliki to lead this effort, probably more for political reliability than for tactical skill. And the rolling start, the gradual buildup has already led many Iraqis in Baghdad to suggest that our efforts have further compromised their security, as evidenced by the bombing just a few days ago of a marketplace in a Shia neighborhood in Baghdad.

The strategy we have to pursue is a complementary and reinforcing strategy involving military, political, and economic steps, together with regional and international diplomacy. It rests fundamentally on the capacity of Iraq and non-DOD, nonuniform military advisers to carry the day. Frankly, the Iraqi Government is in too many cases dysfunctional and incompetent, and elements outside of our uniformed

military personnel—our State Department officials, our Agriculture officials, our Justice officials, our AID officials—have not been in Iraq in sufficient numbers and in sufficient quality to deal decisively with these issues. There is nothing in this plan which suggests that situation will change.

I think we are also at a point where we have been informed by the National Intelligence Estimate of the true nature of the struggle in Iraq. It is a sectarian battle between Shia and Sunni, with insurgents who, according to the NIE, accelerate the violence between these two sectarian groups. It is an existential battle where the Shias feel insecure because they have labored for many years under the yoke of the Saddam Hussein regime, and they don't want to go back there. It is existential from the Sunni position because they see themselves entitled to rule.

I think our best course is outlined in the Warner resolution, clearly stating our disapproval and disagreement with the augmentation as the resolution describes, and focusing ourselves on reconciliation, on both military efforts, but scaled back, and also concentrating on diplomacy and economic activities. I would hope that at least we could get a vote on it and, frankly, I think it will pass.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, is someone offering the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I believe under the previous UC, if I am not mistaken, the Senator from Pennsylvania would be the next in our queue on our side. If I may ask for clarification, the order that I believe was encompassed in the UC on our side was the Senator from Pennsylvania, then the Senator from Texas, then Senator LIEBERMAN, the Senator from Connecticut, and then Senator HAGEL, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I believe, again, the Senator suggested we would alternate from side to side, and at the conclusion of—in fact, if I may, I have a unanimous consent stating that after Senator SPECTER, I would suggest that from our side the order be Senator NELSON, 5 minutes; Senator BIDEN, 10 minutes; Senator LEVIN, 10 minutes; and Senator SCHUMER, 5 minutes; and they would be alternating between the Republican side and the Democratic side, and the Republican side would be—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas modify his unanimous consent request to include the remarks and the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. CORNYN. That is correct. If I could, just in the interest of clarity, and I know this is confusing, Senator SPECTER will be allocated 7½ minutes, followed by myself for 7½ minutes, Senator LIEBERMAN will be allocated 10 minutes, and then Senator HAGEL, 8 minutes, on our side.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not, I would like to have Senator COLLINS included for 10 minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we have 33 minutes total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 31 minutes to dole out.

Mr. WARNER. Could Senator COLLINS be accommodated subsequent to the other names that have been enumerated, just to add her to the list, for 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is being counted now until 5:20.

Mr. WARNER. Very well. I will try and work with colleagues to see if we can find time for Senator COLLINS on somebody else's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to oppose cloture on the pending motion to proceed on the issue of how to deal with the Iraqi problem.

As I look at this issue, it is one of enormous magnitude, and it ought not to be subject to shortcuts in the debate of the Senate. We pride ourselves on being the world's greatest deliberative body, and now is the time to show it. But what is happening on this motion for cloture and what is happening behind the scenes on negotiations is an effort to short-circuit debate on this matter of great importance, great magnitude. It is the issue which is engulfing the work of this body, the work of the House, and, really, all of Washington, and many of the eyes of the world are focused on this issue. There is no oxygen left in this town except on what to do on Iraq.

I suggest that this is not the kind of an issue where we ought to be short-circuited. There ought to be a full opportunity to debate this issue and all of its ramifications. What is happening behind the scenes is an effort to limit the number of resolutions and/or bills which may be offered as alternatives as to what the course of the United States ought to be on this very important subject.

Although it is arcane and esoteric and not subject to being understood, what is happening, again, behind the scenes, is the threat by the majority to fill up the tree, and that means when a bill is on the floor, if there is a first-degree amendment and a second-degree amendment, both of which are technical in nature and both of which may be offered by the majority leader because of the rule of priority of recognition, nobody else can offer an amendment.

Now, the countersuggestion has been made that there would be two amendments by the Republicans. That is down from five amendments, and it may be that even five are insufficient. As we debate this issue, other ideas may occur as to what ought to happen. But we are dealing with very complex issues.

On this state of the record, I cannot support an additional allocation of 21,500 troops because it is my judgment that would not be material or helpful in what is going on at the present time. This comes against the backdrop of extensive hearings in the Armed Services Committee and Foreign Relations Committee, and in the context of the military having given many estimates with many of those in key command positions saying that no more troops are necessary. This comes with the Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki saying a variety of things but at some times saying he doesn't want any more troops.

This debate ought to be taking up alternative proposals, and the one which is the most attractive to this Senator on this state of the record and has been endorsed by a number of the military is to give notice to the Iraqis that at some point in the future, with the exact time to be determined by the military experts, perhaps 6 months or perhaps some other point, that the Iraqis will be called upon to take over Baghdad, the security of Baghdad, to keep U.S. troops out of the line of fire between the Sunnis and the Shias, and that our current force would remain in Iraq to guard the infrastructure, to guard the oil wells, to give advice and to give training but not to undertake the major responsibility.

The obvious answer ultimately has to be a diplomatic solution, and as long as the Iraqis know that we are going to send in additional troops, that we are going to take over the responsibilities which they should be undertaking, they are going to sit back and let us do it. It is a matter of human nature. If Uncle Sam will do it, why should the Iraqis do it? But if we put them on notice that it is going to be their responsibility at a given time, then that puts the obligation on them.

In the President's State of the Union speech, he was explicit that the Iraqis had to do two things: No. 1, end the sectarian violence, and, no. 2, secure Baghdad. And on this state of the record there is no showing that the Iraqis are capable of doing either.

It is my hope, as we listen to the Senators who have been engaged in these hearings, who have studied the matter in some detail, and as we explore the alternatives, explore the alternative resolution of putting benchmarks that the Iraqis have to meet, when we explore the alternative of limiting funding—which I think there is unanimity we cannot limit funding at a time when American troops will be put in harm's way—this is the time for the Senate to assert congressional responsibility, which we have.

When the President says repeatedly he is the "decider," I say respectfully to the President that is a shared responsibility. Under the Constitution, the Congress has the authority to decide, to maintain armies. The Constitution specifically limited appropriations to 2 years.

However, if we are to assert that responsibility and that support, it seems to me we have to do it in a way which does not limit our debate. Right now, we are under a tremendous time pressure, with only an hour and a half to debate this important matter, and Senators are looking for more time. That is a very poor way for this Senate to approach this very important subject.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, in November, General Abizaid told our Senate Committee on Armed Services, when asked did he need any more troops in Iraq, he said "no." Admiral Fallon, who has been chosen by the administration to succeed General Abizaid, when asked did he think by the Senate taking a position in opposition to the President's determination to put 21,000 new troops in Iraq that was undercutting the military forces in Iraq, Admiral Fallon deferred and would not answer that, as some others had been quick to answer in the affirmative.

When General Casey was in front of our committee last week, when asked how many additional troops do you think should be put into Baghdad, he said two brigades—not the five brigades the President has determined.

What we have is a majority of Members in this Senate feel there should not be any increase. We have General Casey, the commander for the last 2½ years, saying there should only be a two-brigade increase. So there is, in fact, conflicting opinion.

If we are going to have any increase in troops in Iraq, the Marine generals in Anbar Province have convinced this Senator that an increase in Anbar Province would be helpful, but the conclusion of this Senator was that putting more American troops in the middle of Baghdad, in the middle of that sectarian violence, was not going to do any good; it was going to put more Americans in harm's way, particularly in the limited numbers the President is talking about.

If we wish to make a difference in Baghdad in the midst of all that sectarian violence, where it has been going on for 1,327 years, since the year 688 A.D., after the death of Mohammed, when the grandson was assassinated because he broke off and that became the Shiite branch and the Sunnis and the Shiites have been at it ever since, if you want to make a difference in Baghdad with all that sectarian strife, put in 50, 100, 200 or 300,000 troops. But 21,000—17,000 of which are going into Baghdad additionally—in this Senator's opinion, is not going to do the job.

As the Senator from Virginia knows, this Senator is one of his cosponsors. I support his resolution. I think it is very important there be truth and openness. In this Senator's position on

the Foreign Relations Committee, on the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and on the Intelligence Committee of the Senate, I have been hammering away at correct information over and over because what we have been dished out over the last several years has been incorrect information.

That leads us to this point where we have to make a judgment. We are a co-equal branch. We are part of the formulation of policy, and it is intended that way by the U.S. Constitution that the people speak through us as well as through the President.

It is my privilege to say I support the Senator from Virginia in his resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as I try to count up the number of positions of Senators articulating either for or against the various resolutions, I count at least six, and maybe there are more.

There are some who say, yes, that the President's plan—basically, that General Petraeus, the architect of that plan, will have responsibility for implementing—that plan ought to get a chance.

Then there are those who say: No, we disagree with that plan. We do not believe that General Petraeus should get the additional five brigades that the plan calls for, but we do think in Anbar Province additional troops ought to go in to fight al-Qaida in Iraq.

Then there is a third position I count that says we think there shouldn't be additional troops, and we want to cap the number of troops, period, and we want to set a timetable for their withdrawal. That would actually be No. 4.

Some of the distinguished Members of this Senate have said these non-binding resolutions are shooting with blanks. What we ought to do is have a vote on cutting off funds because that is the sole way that Congress can have a definitive impact on what is happening. We do not believe any funds should be appropriated for this effort. That is a fifth position, as I count it.

Then there are those—and I find myself in this group—who say: No, we shouldn't cut off funds that support our troops during a time of war. In fact, we ought to give this a chance.

Some of these positions may have some commonality and some may merge and diverge, but the point is, for the majority to say we have one vote on one resolution, in spite of the fact there are at least six positions, as I count them, on this issue is asking Members to accept limited debate and does not reflect the diversity of views in this Senate.

The vote we are going to have at 5:30 tonight—and I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia and others who, perhaps, share a different view from me on the substance of the resolution, for supporting our right to have a fair process and to have all the various resolutions or, I should say, at least two,

in opposition that ought to be offered, that Senators ought to be given the chance to vote for.

Senator REID, the majority leader, on the floor earlier asked rhetorically: What makes the Baghdad security plan different from the ones that have come before? Let me mention the specific answer to his question. First of all, this is an Iraqi-initiated plan for taking control of the capital of Iraq. No. 2, there will be adequate forces—Iraqis supported by American and coalition forces—to hold neighborhoods cleared of terrorist extremists. Third, there is a new operational concept, one devised not just to pursue terrorists and extremists but actually to secure the city once they are cleared. Fourth, new rules of engagement will pursue that Iraqi and U.S. forces can pursue lawbreakers, regardless of their communities or sect. Five, security operations will be followed by economic assistance and reconstruction aid, including billions of dollars in Iraqi funds, offering jobs and the prospect for better lives.

The reason I support the plan General Petraeus is largely the architect of, and the very same commander whom we have confirmed by unanimous vote about a week or so ago, is because I think it represents the last best chance for success in Iraq. I don't know anyone who believes the status quo is acceptable.

The question is, Are we simply going to give up and see a regional conflict? Are we going to see ethnic cleansing occur? Are we going to see countries that have Sunni majorities come to the aid of their Sunni brothers and sisters who might be the subject of ethnic cleansing by the Shia majority? Are we going to allow Iraq to become another failed state which will then serve as a launching pad for future terrorist attacks, perhaps including against the United States? The risks of that happening by doing nothing or by simply saying what we have been doing now is not working so we are simply going to refuse to endorse any alternative plan because we are not sure it is going to be successful is giving up before we should.

While opinion polls should not govern our conduct, it is significant the one question I have heard, when asked by Opinion Dynamics Poll on the process we are engaged in today, the question was: Congress has been considering a nonbinding resolution expressing opposition to the President's plan to send more troops. By almost two to one, Americans think passing a resolution would do more harm than good; 47 percent in this poll that was reported February 1, 2007, say it is likely to encourage the enemy and hurt troop morale compared with 24 percent who think it would make a positive difference to the policy of the United States toward Iraq.

Regardless of the sincerely held beliefs that I know Senators have on this very important topic, the last thing we

should be forced to do would be to vote on a single resolution when there are so many different points of view that deserve full and fair debate on what is the most important issue that conflicts our country and, literally, the world at this time and that is the global war on terror, the central front of that war in Iraq and what we are going to do about it, whether we are going to give up or whether we are going to try to secure that country in a way that will allow it to govern and defend itself.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, we will hear a lot, today and this week, of phrases such as "last best chance," "refuse to endorse an alternative plan," "Iraq is a central front of the war on terror." Virtually no one subscribes to any of those three points—all of the experts who have given testimony, the Iraqi Study Group, the plans that have been put forward that are real alternatives.

The President has not put forward a plan. He has put forward a tactic, a tactic that most experts, including his own military, think will make a plan for success less likely to be able to be arrived at.

No one in this Senate, at least in this debate, at least from my perspective, is calling for us cutting and running—none of that. I hope we keep our eye focused, our eye on the ball.

The Senate is today taking a first step toward a bipartisan effort to prevent the escalation of a war in Iraq and to adapt a strategy for Iraq for leaving Iraq without leaving behind chaos.

The first step is to debate and vote the resolution offered by Senator WARNER and reintroduced by Senator LEVIN and me as a bill. That says the Senate disagrees with the President's plan to send 17,500 more American troops into the middle of a city of over 6.2 million people in the midst of a civil war, because what we are afraid of is that the Senator from Texas may be right; this may make things so bad that everyone will conclude there is no more chance of succeeding.

We have vital interests in that region. I am afraid this policy, this tactic of the President, is going to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. The question before us today is whether a minority of Senators will even allow a debate to start. That is what this is about. All they have to do—there will be other resolutions brought up; they are able to be brought up—all they have to do is take issue with this. They can stop the debate by getting 41 votes. But they can actually engage in debate and try to defeat the notion, when the message of this resolution is: Mr. President, stop. No more escalation, Mr. President.

Everyone from the Iraq Study Group to the Biden-Gelb plan, to every other plan that has been put out there says the way to get the Iraqis to reach a political solution is to begin to draw

down American forces. No one, including General Petraeus, whom I know fairly well, suggests there is a military answer. A political solution is required. So to my colleagues who are thinking about trying to block the debate, let me say this: Iraq dominates our national life. It is on the minds of tens of millions of Americans. It shapes the lives of hundreds of thousands of our men and women in uniform and their families. And that the Senate would not even debate, much less vote, on the single most urgent issue of our time would be a total forfeiture of our responsibility.

We have a duty to debate and to vote on the President's tactic. We have a duty to debate and vote on our overall strategy in Iraq. And we have a duty as Senators to speak out and say where we are.

Three weeks ago, Secretary of State Rice came before the Foreign Relations Committee and presented the President's plan. Its main feature is to send more troops, increase the total number of troops, and send them into Baghdad in the middle of a sectarian war.

The reaction on the committee, from Republicans to Democrats alike, ranged from skepticism, to profound skepticism, to outright opposition. That pretty much reflects the reaction all across the country.

So Senator HAGEL joined me and Senator LUGAR and Senator SNOWE. We sat down and wrote a resolution to give Senators a way to vote what their voices were saying, for we believe the quickest and most effective way to get the President to change course is to demonstrate to him that his policy has little or no support across the board, Democrats and Republicans.

After we introduced the resolution, the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator WARNER, came forward with his resolution. The bottom line of the resolutions is the same: Mr. President, don't send more Americans into the middle of a civil war.

There was one critical difference. As originally written, the Warner resolution left open the possibility of increasing the overall number of troops in Iraq, when in fact the Iraq Study Group and others said we should be declining to get action from the politicians in Iraq.

We believe that would have sent the wrong message. Not ramp up; again, to draw down, redeploy forces remaining in Iraq. And the best way to make that clear to the Iraqi people is to let them know we are not going to be there forever, as the President said. And they must begin to make the hard compromises necessary for a political solution that virtually everyone agrees is necessary to end this war.

So we approached Senator WARNER to work out our differences, and I am very pleased to say we succeeded in doing that. The language Senator WARNER removed from his resolution removed the possibility that it could be read as call-

ing for a troop increase. With that change, we agreed to support his resolution. And I do.

When I first spoke out against the President's planned surge before the New Year, I made it clear I had one objective: I hoped to build and demonstrate bipartisan opposition to this plan because it was the fastest way to turn the President around. And that is exactly what we have done.

Now we have a real opportunity for the Senate to speak clearly. Every Senator should be given a chance to vote on whether he or she approves or disapproves of the President's tactic to send more troops into the middle of a civil war.

The debate we will have is important, but the debate is as important as the vote. And I hope the American people carefully listen. I predict they will hear very few colleagues stand up and support the President's plan to send more troops into the middle of a civil war. Listen to the voices. Listen to the voices as well as the votes.

Just as important as what we are voting against is what we are voting for. This bill, similar to the Biden-Hagel-Levin-Snowe provision, makes three things clear.

First, Iraq needs a political settlement. Second, the United States has to work with other regional powers. And third, the mission of our forces should be confined to counterterrorism, training, and maintaining the territorial integrity of Iraq.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes 55 seconds.

Mr. BIDEN. I will continue, Mr. President.

As I said at the outset, this is the first step, this rejection of the President's increase of more troops into Iraq into the middle of a civil war. But it can set the foundation for everything that follows.

If the President does not listen to the majority of Congress and the majority of the American people, we will have to look for other ways to turn this surge around.

Even if we succeed in this effort, we still need to turn our overall policy around. We need a strategy that can produce a political settlement in Iraq. That is the only way to stop the Shiites and the Sunnis from killing each other and to allow our troops to leave Iraq at an appropriate time without trading a dictator for chaos.

But today my message is simple. The American people want us to debate Iraq, the most important issue of our day. They expect it. They demand it. And if we attempt to hide behind procedure and delaying tactics, I believe the American people will not be very happy. They get it. The question is, Do we?

Are you for or against the President escalating this war in Iraq? I am against it. I believe the majority of Members on both sides are as well. We should vote on that.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, America has reached a critical crossroad in the war in Iraq. More than 4 years ago, this Senate voted to authorize the use of force against Saddam Hussein, a tyrant who slaughtered his own people, attacked his neighbors, and threatened our security.

Thanks to the courageous service of the men and women of the American military, that evil regime was overthrown and in its place came hopes for a democracy in the heart of the Middle East, hopes for a victory in the war for the hearts and minds of the Muslim world.

As of today, sadly, as we all know, those hopes have not been realized. Because of the ruthless conduct of our enemies in Iraq, as well as our own failures, we instead today find ourselves on a knife's edge in Iraq.

Now a new course has been chosen. A new commander is in place in Iraq, confirmed unanimously by this Senate. A new Secretary of Defense is in place at the Pentagon, also confirmed overwhelmingly by the Senate. And a new strategy has begun to be put into action on the ground in Iraq by American troops.

It is altogether proper that we debate our policy in Iraq. It should be a debate that is as serious as the situation in Iraq and that reflects the powers the Constitution gives to Congress in matters of war.

But that, sadly, is not the debate that the Warner-Levin resolution invites us to have. I am going to speak strongly against this resolution because I feel strongly about it. I do so with the greatest respect for my colleagues who have offered it. But I believe its passage would compromise America's security, and I will say so within the clearest terms I can muster.

The resolution before us, its sponsors concede, will not stop the new strategy from going forward on the ground in Iraq. In fact, as we speak in the Senate, thousands of American troops are already there in Baghdad, with thousands more moving into position to carry out their Commander's orders. This resolution does nothing to alter those facts.

Instead, its sponsors say it will send a message of rebuke from this Senate to the President of the United States, from one end of Pennsylvania Avenue to the other. But the President has made clear he will not be deterred in carrying out what he sees as his duties and responsibilities as Commander in Chief.

And there is a world well beyond Pennsylvania Avenue that is also watching and listening to what we do. What we say is being heard in Baghdad by Iraqi political leaders, by moderates trying to decide whether we Americans will stand with them over the long term.

What we say is being heard by our men and women in uniform who naturally will be interested in knowing whether we support the plan they have been asked to carry out at risk to their own lives.

What we say in the Senate will be heard by the leaders of the thuggish regimes in Iran and Syria and by al-Qaida terrorists eager for evidence that America's will is breaking.

And what we say in the Senate will be heard across America by our constituents who are wondering if their Congress is capable of serious action, not hollow posturing.

This resolution is not about Congress taking responsibility. It is the opposite. This is a resolution of irresolution.

For the Senate to take up a symbolic vote of no confidence on the eve of a decisive battle is unprecedented. But it is not inconsequential. It is an act which I fear will discourage our troops, hearten our enemies, and showcase our disunity. And that is why I will vote against the motion for cloture.

My colleagues, if you believe that General Petraeus and his new strategy have a reasonable chance of success in Iraq, then you should resolve to support him and his troops through the difficult days ahead and oppose this resolution.

On the other hand, if you believe this new strategy is flawed or that our cause is hopeless in Iraq, then you should put aside this resolution—non-binding—and you should vote to stop what is happening in Iraq, vote to cut off the funds, vote for a binding time line for American withdrawal.

If that is where your convictions lie, then have the courage of your convictions to accept the consequences of your convictions. That would be a resolution.

This nonbinding resolution before us, by contrast, is an accumulation of ambiguities and inconsistencies. It is at once for the war but also against the war. It pledges its support to the troops in the field but then washes its hands of what they have been commanded to do. It urges more troops be sent for Anbar Province but not for Baghdad.

My colleagues, we cannot have it both ways. We cannot vote full confidence in General Petraeus but no confidence in the strategy he says he needs for success.

We cannot say our troops have our full support but disavow their mission on the eve of battle. This is what happens when you try to wage war by committee. And that is why the Constitution gave the authority of Commander in Chief to one person, the President.

Cynics may say this kind of irresolution happens all the time in Congress. In this case, however, they would be wrong. If it passed, this resolution would be unique in American legislative history.

I asked the Library of Congress this question last week and was told that never before, when American soldiers

have been in harm's way, fighting and dying in a conflict Congress had voted to authorize, has Congress turned around and passed a nonbinding resolution such as this one, disapproving of a particular battlefield strategy.

I ask each of my colleagues to stop for a moment and consider the precedent that passage of this resolution would establish. Even during Vietnam, even after the Tet Offensive, even after the invasion of Cambodia, Congress did not take up a nonbinding resolution such as this one.

Past Congresses certainly debated wars. They argued heatedly about them. And they sometimes clashed directly with the executive branch, with the President, over their execution. But in so doing, they accepted the consequences of their convictions.

This resolution does no such thing. It is simply an expression of opinion. It does not pretend to have any substantive effect on policy on the ground in Iraq. But again, I ask my colleagues, what will this resolution say to our soldiers? What will it say to our allies? What will it say to our enemies?

We heard from General Petraeus during his confirmation hearing that war is a battle of wills. Our enemies believe they are winning in Iraq today. They believe they can outlast us, that sooner or later we will tire of this grinding conflict and go home and leave the field in that country open for them. That is the lesson Osama bin Laden has told us, in his writings and statements, he took from our retreats from Lebanon and Somalia in the 1980s and 1990s. It is a belief at the core of the insurgency in Iraq and at the core of the fanatical goals of radical Islam worldwide.

I fear this resolution before the Senate, by codifying our disunity, by disavowing the mission our troops are about to undertake, will confirm our enemies' beliefs that America has grown impatient and unable to fight the long fight to victory. This resolution also sends a terrible message to our allies. Of course, I agree that we must hold the Iraqi Government to account. That is exactly what the resolution Senator MCCAIN and I and others have offered would do. But I ask you, imagine for a moment that you are a Sunni or Shia politician in Baghdad who wants the violence to end, and ask yourself how the Warner-Levin resolution would affect your thinking, your calculations of risk, your willingness to stand against the forces of extremism. Will the resolution empower you or will it undermine you? Will it make you feel safer or will it make you feel you should hedge your bets, or go over to the extremists, or leave Iraq?

Finally, what is the message this resolution sends to our soldiers? I know that every Member of the Senate supports our troops but actions have consequences, often unintended.

I ask unanimous consent that I be given an additional moment to finish my statement. That would come from Senator MCCONNELL's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. When we send a message of irresolution, it does not support our troops. When we renounce their mission, it does not support our troops. We heard recently in the Senate Armed Services Committee from GEN Jack Keane, a former chief of staff of the U.S. Army, who said of a resolution like this one:

It's just not helpful . . . What the enemy sees is an erosion of the political and moral will of the American people . . .

Our soldiers are Americans first. They clearly understand there's a political process in this country that they clearly support . . . But at the end of the day, they are going to go out and do a tough mission, and I certainly would like to see them supported in that mission as opposed to declaring non-support. . . .

I agree. Everyone here knows the American people are frustrated about the lack of progress in Iraq. Everyone here shares that frustration. And as elected representatives of the people, everyone here feels pressure to give expression to that frustration. This is not a new challenge. It is one that every democracy in every long war has had to confront. Nearly a century and a half ago, an American President wrestled with just this problem. It was in the midst of a terrible war, a civil war in which hundreds of thousands of Americans were fighting and dying to secure the freedom of millions long and cruelly denied it.

"We here highly resolve," that was Lincoln's message at Gettysburg. It was a message of resolution.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional moment from the time of Senator MCCONNELL to finish the statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Lincoln said at Gettysburg: "We here highly resolve." It was a message of resolution, of steadfastness in the face of adversity, of hope over despair, and of confidence in the cause of freedom which is America's eternal cause. Today, in the depths of a terrible war, on the brink of a decisive battle for Baghdad, let us have a serious debate about where we stand and where we must go in Iraq. But that is not the debate this resolution of irresolution would bring.

The 60-vote requirement to close debate was put in place by our predecessors as a way to make it harder for the passions of a particular moment to sweep through the American people and across this Congress in a way that would do serious damage to our Nation in the long term. Because I believe this resolution, if passed, would have such an effect, I will respectfully oppose the motion for cloture.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I believe Senator HAGEL is—

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia 1 minute

to ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader has the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am happy to yield the floor, if the understanding is that the Senator from Michigan is next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is next for 10 minutes.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

My question to my good friend and colleague is as follows: This debate is well under way. The plans are being discussed. I just inquired at the desk, and the McCain resolution is not filed. Yet I understood you to say it had been filed. Could you help clarify for the Senate the position on that?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I would be happy to, briefly. The resolution Senator MCCAIN and I and others have has been prepared and I gather has been the subject of negotiation between Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL.

Mr. WARNER. But it is not a part of the record so—

Mr. LIEBERMAN. That is right. The debate going on now—

Mr. WARNER. I feel very strongly that the Senate should work its will on facts that are out in the open. I have filed my resolutions, one after the other, at the desk so all Senators could have the benefit. Is that a possibility, that we could have the benefit of this resolution?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. My dear friend, it is more than a possibility; it is a promise.

Mr. WARNER. And what time might the promise be executed?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. There are copies of it around now, and we will get you one. They were publicly distributed Thursday of last week.

Mr. WARNER. I will be glad to give you my copy, but I feel it is presumptuous of me to address it unless it is properly before the Senate.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank my friend. The difference, of course, is that ours is as nonbinding as yours, but ours is a statement of support to our troops and benchmarks to the Iraqis.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, clearly what is read is correct. But I assure you that I forcefully argue that ours is in support of the troops. There is no suggestion that one is less patriotic than the other, if I may say to my dear friend.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. One is not less patriotic than the other, but actions have consequences. As I said during my remarks, for the Senate to take this unprecedented action on a nonbinding resolution, to disavow, disapprove a mission that our troops are being asked to carry out right now cannot help their morale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I hope the Senate will be allowed to debate our policy in Iraq by proceeding to this

legislation this afternoon. Iraq is the single most important policy issue facing our country. It was a major issue in the November elections last fall. The American people have strong opinions about what is happening in Iraq. They want their elected officials to debate this issue, and we should do it. The debate should go forward. A filibuster is out of place on war and peace issues, on something of this magnitude. The debate is not about whether we want the United States to act to maximize chances of success in Iraq. We all want to maximize chances of success in Iraq. We all want to see a stable Iraq which enhances our own national security. But the President's course of action, which he has been on for 3½ years and which he has now proposed to continue on to deepen our involvement in Iraq, does not enhance our security. It does not maximize chances of success in Iraq.

The debate is about the best way to maximize chances of success in Iraq. Is the new strategy of the President, which puts over 21,000 more American troops in the middle of an Iraqi civil war, the best way to bring that about? That is what this debate is about. There actually seems to be an agreement among most observers that an Iraqi political settlement is the key to ending the violence in Iraq. The difference of opinion exists on whether Iraqi politicians need breathing space, as President Bush has said, to reach required political compromises or whether, as many of us believe, Iraqi politicians need to be pressured to make those compromises and that the addition of 21,000 more troops doesn't make a political compromise more likely; it just gets us in deeper in the middle of a civil conflict.

The bill we are hoping to proceed to today incorporates the modified Warner resolution verbatim, except for a minor change in order to make it a bill instead of a resolution. The reason for making it a bill instead of a resolution is simply to make it more amendable. Unlike a resolution, which is clumsy to amend, there is no intent to put this modified Warner language in the form of a bill for any other purpose. As a matter of fact, the majority leader has asked for unanimous consent to treat a resolution with Senator WARNER's language as amendable, as though it were a bill, to achieve the goal we are trying to achieve. This unanimous consent was objected to by the Republican leader.

The majority leader, Senator REID, has also told Senator MCCONNELL that we are more than willing to transform this bill into a resolution prior to final passage, if we can get to final passage, if a filibuster does not thwart our getting to final passage.

What does the modified Warner language do which is incorporated into this bill? It makes it clear the Congress disagrees with the President's plan to increase force levels and urges the President instead to consider all op-

tions and alternatives. This bill makes it clear that we will fund troops in the field. There is no difference between these two documents in that regard. Both our bill and the McCain resolution make it clear we want to fund the troops in the field. Our bill makes it clear that the responsibility for Iraq's internal security and for halting sectarian violence must rest primarily with the Government of Iraq and Iraqi security forces. It makes it clear that Iraqis must reach political settlements in order to achieve reconciliation, and the failure of the Iraqis to reach such settlements to create a truly unified government contributes to increasing violence in Iraq.

Our bill makes it clear that the primary objective of the overall United States strategy in Iraq should be to encourage Iraqi leaders to make political compromises that will foster reconciliation and establish a true unity government, ultimately leading to improvements in the security situation.

Adding American troops does not increase the probability of achieving the primary objective. Listen to what GEN John Abizaid said when he testified to Congress in November of last year:

I met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the Corps Commander, [and] General Dempsey. We all talked together. And I said to them, in your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq? And they all said no. And the reason is, because we want the Iraqis to do more. It's easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work.

Finally, General Abizaid said:

I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, [prevent the Iraqis] from taking more responsibility for their own future.

Besides making it less likely that the Iraqis will take more responsibility for their own future, adding more American troops is an attempt to reach a military solution to an inherently political problem.

The Prime Minister of Iraq himself stated last November:

The crisis is political, and the ones who can stop the cycle of aggravation and bloodletting of innocents are the [Iraqi] politicians.

Adding more American troops does not pressure Iraqi politicians to be Iraqi leaders and to make the political compromises essential for a political solution; it only allows them to continue what in the words of the National Intelligence Estimate is the "current winner-take-all attitude and sectarian animosities infecting the political scene."

The administration says this bill emboldens the enemy. Congressional debate over Iraq policy doesn't embolden the enemy. The enemy is already emboldened.

What emboldens the enemy is the almost 4 years' presence of Western troops in the middle of a Muslim country's capital, which causes over 70 percent of the residents of that country to oppose our presence.

What emboldens the enemy is the open-ended presence of Western troops, which serves as a magnet for extremists and gives a propaganda club to our enemies.

What emboldens the enemy is invading Iraq without the support of the international community.

What emboldens the enemy is lawlessness and looters ransacking public buildings and institutions in Iraq.

What emboldens the enemy is invading Iraq without a plan for the aftermath of the invasion.

What emboldens the enemy is increasing the number of American troops, which results in Iraqis taking less responsibility for providing security for all the citizens of Iraq.

What emboldens the enemy is the creation of Green Zones protecting Iraqi political leaders, in which they pursue a winner-take-all political approach.

Madam President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 15 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, we owe our troops everything. We owe them the best equipment we can provide. We owe them the best training. We owe their families the best support we can give them.

We also owe them our best thinking. I think it is an insult to the intelligence of our troops to suggest that debating the wisdom of deepening the military presence in Iraq somehow or other emboldens the enemy. Our troops depend upon us to give them what they deserve: support. And part of that support in a democracy is debating the policy which not only brought them there but which keeps them there and, if many of us are correct, will keep them there longer and with greater casualties. The best way to change course in Iraq is to adopt the modified Warner language.

It has been said that this is not as strong as withholding funds. We don't want to withhold funds from troops in the field. We want to change this policy. If you want to change the policy this administration is following, which relies on a military solution, a deepening military presence in Iraq, we hope you will vote for cloture on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Madam President, I will not speak to the specifics of the resolution or resolutions, but I am confident we will be allowed to debate this week. I say that because I know—and I have complete confidence in the two leaders—that they will, in fact, find an accommodation. They each understand how critically important this debate is for our country and for the world.

I have listened carefully this afternoon to my colleagues, and there will be more intense and engaged and enlightened debate this week. But I believe what we are about here—and we will be about this week—is something far more important than just constitutional responsibilities or resolutions. What we are about is finding a policy worthy of our young men and women and their families who go off to fight and die in a very difficult war. That is what we owe our troops. That is what we owe this country. That is what we owe the world.

It surely is not and cannot be a weakness for America, as seen in the eyes of the world, to openly debate the most critically important issue that any of us will ever debate; that is, war. That is the strength of America, not the weakness of America. The reason America has prospered for over 200 years is because the world has had confidence not in its power, trusted not its power, but trusted America's purpose.

In 1968, when I served with my brother and many others in Vietnam—and I believe I speak for most who were there then, and I have heard from a lot of Vietnam veterans about this debate—I believe that in 1968, the troops, the ones at the bottom doing the fighting and the dying, would have welcomed the Congress of the United States into a debate about Vietnam. They would have welcomed somebody paying attention rather than just going along.

No, Madam President, that is a strength of this country. And surely we have clear constitutional responsibilities. How could anyone argue differently? We have clear constitutional responsibilities here.

I heard my colleague from Connecticut talking about nonbinding resolutions. I don't doubt his staff's research, but I remind the Senator that over the last 12 years there have been a number of nonbinding resolutions debated on this floor—on Bosnia, Kosovo, Somalia, Haiti, and others. I remind some of my colleagues who do not believe it is in the interest of our country or our troops to talk about nonbinding resolutions, papier mache resolutions, senseless resolutions, that they actually voted for some of those resolutions over the last 12 years. I would be very happy to provide for the record a list of how everybody in this Chamber voted over the last 12 years, if they were here, on those resolutions. It might be very interesting and enlightening. Surely it is not because one political party controls the White House and the other does not. Surely it cannot be that.

The National Intelligence Estimate summary—unclassified portions—was made public on Friday. Those watching should have a clear understanding of what that document is and who produced that document. That document is an accumulation of the 16 intelligence agencies of this country. None that I am aware of has had the integrity of the institution they represent—

any of those 16—ever impugned on questions of quality of research—maybe other facets of intelligence but not the integrity of the intent of the product. The National Intelligence Estimate says that we are involved today, and have been, in Iraq in not just a sectarian conflict—a violent, vicious sectarian conflict—but an intrasectarian conflict. Is it not time and don't our troops and the American people expect the Congress, after 4 years, when things have gotten progressively worse, not better, to engage? And is it not our responsibility to address the issue of escalating our military involvement, putting American troops in the middle of a sectarian-intrasectarian war? Is that not our responsibility? Of course, it is our responsibility.

Madam President, I will have more to say as the debate goes forward this week. As I noted, I have every confidence in our two leaders that they will work out a resolution where we will have this debate because it is clearly in the interest of our country, clearly in the interest of our troops.

With that, I yield back my time and yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, before the Senator yields, I would like to associate myself with his remarks. I, too, have confidence in our leadership being able to work this out accordingly. No matter how strongly I feel about my resolution, I shall vote with our distinguished leader on this issue and hope he can reconcile the differences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I extend my gratitude to both the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Virginia for understanding the importance of having a full-fledged debate.

How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader has 5 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the Republican side of the aisle is ready for this debate. We are anxious to have it. There are different voices. We just heard from a couple of my distinguished colleagues who have a different view of this debate than I. What we are unified upon is a process that guarantees fairness for the consideration of what is clearly and unambiguously the most significant issue in the country at this moment.

The majority leader and I have been working in good faith on an agreement that provides for a structured debate on the various proposals and votes on each. The other side said we turned down three compromises but, frankly, that is not the full story.

The majority leader said he would agree to a consent that would allow votes on the McCain proposal and the Warner proposal. He also mentioned that he would agree to a 60-vote threshold on each of those. All we are asking for is the same agreement on

the Gregg resolution. Now, in fact, there was demand among Republican Senators for additional alternatives. We were able to pair those down to two.

Why 60 votes? Let me remind all of our colleagues—and certainly the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia doesn't need to be reminded of that, having been here 29 years—that one single Senator can insist that a matter be subject to 60 votes. One single Senator. There are many Senators on this side of the aisle who would insist upon that. So it is a statement of the obvious that matters of consequence in the Senate over the years have developed in the following way: They are all subject to a 60-vote threshold. To suggest that is anything extraordinary really defies our experience here. It is ordinary, not extraordinary, for matters of great controversy—and even, in this day and age, matters of only a little controversy—to be subject to a 60-vote threshold.

Our good friends on the other side of the aisle—and this was an issue the Senator from Virginia was very much involved with in the last Congress—were seeking to establish in one of the last areas where 60 votes was not customarily required—the confirmation of judges—that we should start requiring it there as well. That would leave virtually nothing the Senate would consider, except the budget resolution, not being subject to a 60-vote threshold.

So what we are asking for on the Republican side is not at all extraordinary. The term “filibuster” has become a pejorative term for suggesting that one wants to stop something. Let me repeat, as I have said to the distinguished majority leader, to the Senator from Virginia, and to the Senator from Nebraska, we are not trying to stop this debate. We are trying to structure it in a way that is fair to the competing voices in the Republican conference who will band together shortly in a significant enough number to insist on a fair process.

So that is what this is about, Madam President. I have indicated to the Democratic leader—and I certainly wouldn't want to surprise him—that I intended to propound a unanimous consent request that would be acceptable to our side, and I will be happy to do that now, having given notice to the majority leader that I would do so.

But before doing that, let me say one more time, there is not a single Republican Senator seeking to avoid this debate. We have just heard from two voices that are in the minority in our conference—the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Nebraska—who don't share my view, who nevertheless will vote against cloture shortly to make the point that this Republican minority insists upon fair treatment on this important debate.

Therefore, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time determined by the majority leader, after

consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed en bloc to the following concurrent resolutions under the following agreement:

S. Con. Res. 7, the Warner resolution which is to be discharged from the Foreign Relations Committee; McCain-Lieberman-Graham, regarding benchmarks; Gregg related to funding.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be a total of 10 hours—and I will be happy to pick whatever number might be agreeable to the majority leader—of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; provided further, that no amendments be in order to any of the measures; further, that after the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to three consecutive votes on the adoption of the concurrent resolutions in the following order, with no intervening action or debate: first, McCain-Lieberman-Graham; second, Gregg; third, S. Con. Res. 7. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that any resolution that does not achieve 60 votes in the affirmative, the vote on adoption be vitiated and the concurrent resolution be returned to its previous status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the vast, vast, vast majority of legislation passed out of this Senate is done by a simple majority. That is a fact. All one has to do is look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So with this new direction of the minority, it is very clear what is happening. They are trying to avoid debate on this matter. They want a new set of rules.

We have offered them votes, up-or-down votes on McCain, Warner, Gregg, and they turned that down. I said: OK, fine, we will have 60-vote margins on McCain, Warner. They turned that down. So I object, Madam President, and I will continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is also very interesting—and I have the greatest respect for my friend from Virginia and my friend from Nebraska—but with all due respect to them, how could they vote against a motion to proceed? How could they vote against a motion to proceed saying let the two leaders work this out? What more could we give them than what they asked for last week? But now they want to throw in the Gregg amendment with a 60-vote margin.

Earlier today, the minority leader said: This vote is “about getting fair treatment for the minority here in the Senate.” He was half right. This vote is about fairness but has little to do with being fair to the minority. The vote is about being fair to 132,000 troops already in Iraq by making sure they have the strategy they need to complete their mission so they can come home.

This vote is about being fair to the 48,000 American men and women who would be sent to Iraq should President Bush be permitted to escalate this war.

This vote is about being fair to the bipartisan majority of Senators who seek to voice their opposition to the President's plan to escalate the war.

This vote is about being fair to the American people and the millions of voters who chose a new direction last November.

As Senators, we owe it to our troops and our people to have a real debate about the way forward in Iraq. For 4 years, this body, under the control of the Republicans, sat silent on the most pressing issue facing our country—Iraq. As thousands of our soldiers were killed and tens of thousands wounded, the Senate, directed by the Republicans, sat silent, no debate on Iraq. As hundreds of billions of dollars were spent, the Senate sat silent. Republicans were in charge—no debate. They said no.

As Iraq fell into chaos and civil war, it became increasingly clear that the President's plan was flawed and failing. The Senate sat silent. The Republicans who were in control of the Senate said: No, no debate on Iraq.

As Senators and Americans, we cannot permit the silence to continue. This Democratic majority will not allow it to continue.

The administration's failures have dug us into a deep hole in Iraq—we all know that—and we have an obligation to find a way out. Our troops, most of all, need our help. They need a policy that is as worthy as their heroic sacrifice. They need a legislative branch that will finally exercise its constitutional responsibilities.

Madam President, I say to my friend from Connecticut, I wasn't able to hear all of his speech, but I did hear this that caused me to take note: He said words to the effect: What are the Shia politicians going to think? What are the Sunni politicians going to think if, in fact, Warner passed? I wonder what the Sunni politicians thought, and I wonder what the Shia politicians thought when the Iraqi Prime Minister, duly elected, told the President of the United States that he wanted American troops out of Baghdad. So let's not direct this to Senator WARNER.

A “no” vote on the motion to proceed is a green light to George Bush to continue down the same failed course of almost 4 years.

A “no” vote is an endorsement of escalation, sending 48,000 more troops to Iraq and spending at least an extra \$27 billion—\$27 billion extra—when this war has already cost almost a half a trillion dollars.

A “no” vote is a vote in support of this President continuing the same policy of failure in Iraq.

We have been told by our intelligence experts that the war is not going to be won by the military; it is only going to be won politically. That is what the

Iraq Study Group said. That is what all people say, with rare exception. Those are the people holding hands with the President.

We must heed the results of the November elections and the wishes of the American people. We must change course, and this change starts with this next vote.

This side—Democrats—have offered the minority everything they have asked for. Remember: Vote on Warner, vote on McCain; you want a simple majority; you want a supermajority; we will go along with that. We have been fair to them. Now the Senate must be fair to our troops, their families, and the American people. We must proceed with a debate about Iraq and send a clear message to President Bush that escalation is not the answer.

Some say let the leaders work it out. Part of this stall has been a stall for obvious reasons. If not tonight, tomorrow? I must file a motion to invoke cloture on the continuing resolution because the Republicans said they are going to filibuster it. I have gotten letters to that effect. We should have been debating the Warner, McCain resolutions today, but they have not allowed us. They wouldn't allow us to proceed on this matter.

I am telling everyone within the sound of my voice, a decision will have to be made whether to go further than tonight, but the time is very tenuous—very tenuous. If they stop us from going forward on this debate, this does not end the debate on Iraq. It may end the debate for a few days or a few weeks, but, remember, we have the 9/11 Commission recommendations coming and that is open to amendment and I can guarantee everybody there will be Iraq amendments involved in that debate.

The supplemental bill is coming. This is to fund the war in Iraq basically more than \$100 billion. I think there will probably very likely be a number of amendments dealing with Iraq.

They can run, but they can't hide. We are going to debate Iraq, and they may have gotten all their folks to vote against the motion to proceed, they may stop us temporarily from debating the escalation, but they are not going to stop us from debating Iraq.

We have lost 3,100 soldiers, sailors, and marines. They are dead, Madam President. We don't know the exact number of how many have been wounded—24,000, 25,000.

We are not going to allow the situation in Iraq to continue. It is wrong. There can be no military solution. The President has been told that. I think it speaks volumes when he meets with the Iraqi Prime Minister who is elected, and the Iraqi Prime Minister says: Mr. President of the United States, get all American soldiers out of Baghdad.

That's what he said. I think it speaks volumes when military commanders say that it is not the way to go. We know what Casey said. His tune has

changed a little bit since he was relieved of duty over there.

The families of the 3,100 soldiers who have been killed, the families of the 24,000, 25,000 who have been wounded demand we go forward with this debate.

We are going to start voting momentarily, and remember what the vote is. The vote is whether we can proceed to debate the escalation of the war in Iraq. And the Republicans have told everybody they are all going to vote no. If they think this can pop up real easily again, I think they may have another thing coming.

I repeat, the Republicans left town and left the Government without adequate resources to go ahead and complete funding of the Federal Government for this year. We have to take up the work they did not complete. They funded the Government until February 15, and now it is up to us to make sure the Government continues to run.

If they want to pull a Newt Gingrich and close down the Government, that is their responsibility. But I believe we should move forward and make sure the Government is funded, and there is not a lot of time for Iraq. That is a sad commentary on the situation because we lost days as a result of these parliamentary delays.

I ask unanimous consent that if we get to third reading of S. 470 it then be turned into a concurrent resolution and passage occur on the concurrent resolution and not S. 470. Before hearing how anybody feels about this, I said last week that we would be happy to consider this bill as a resolution. Everybody heard me say that. The American people heard me say that. So anybody who tries to hide under a procedural vote because this is a bill and not a resolution is not being fair because simply I have stated—and I know that everyone in this Chamber heard me say this, and I have said it many times—I ask unanimous consent that if we get to third reading of S. 470, that it be turned into a concurrent resolution and that passage occur on the concurrent resolution and not S. 470.

I add another unanimous consent request to this. I am willing to change it to a concurrent resolution right now, as I was willing to do last week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, this is essentially the same unanimous consent request propounded last Thursday night. This matter ought to be dealt with as a concurrent resolution. It is clear the other side does not want to vote on the Gregg amendment. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, S. 470, Bipartisan Iraq legislation.

Carl Levin, Joe Biden, Ken Salazar, Harry Reid, Pat Leahy, Sherrod Brown, Patty Murray, Robert Menendez, John F. Kerry, Barbara Mikulski, Dick Durbin, Jack Reed, Tom Harkin, Dianne Feinstein, Bill Nelson, H.R. Clinton, Herb Kohl, Ben Nelson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 470, a bill to express the sense of the Congress on Iraq, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Dorgan	Murray
Baucus	Durbin	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Feinstein	Obama
Bingaman	Harkin	Pryor
Boxer	Inouye	Reed
Brown	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerry	Salazar
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cardin	Kohl	Schumer
Carper	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Clinton	Levin	Webb
Coleman	Lincoln	Webb
Collins	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Conrad	Menendez	Wyden
Dodd	Mikulski	

NAYS—47

Alexander	Domenici	Murkowski
Allard	Ensign	Reid
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Graham	Sessions
Brownback	Grassley	Shelby
Bunning	Gregg	Smith
Burr	Hagel	Snowe
Chambliss	Hatch	Specter
Coburn	Hutchison	Stevens
Cochran	Inhofe	Sununu
Corker	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lieberman	Vitter
Crapo	Lott	Voinovich
DeMint	Lugar	Warner
Dole	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—4

Johnson	Martinez
Landrieu	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider that vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Speaking as in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

TAX GAP AND THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak about two issues that have been much in the news lately: the tax gap and the minimum wage bill. We had on the front page of the Times today the discussion about the tax gap. In addition, with the release of the President's budget today, the administration has provided Congress substantive proposals to deal with the tax gap. It is now Congress's responsibility to consider these proposals, review them, and hear from the public and also see what more is possible in terms of addressing the tax gap. But the good news is we have already taken steps in this Congress to deal with the tax gap. We have very important tax reforms and tax gap measures included in the minimum wage bill. So Congress is effectively killing two birds with one stone.

First, we are providing needed tax relief for small businesses that could be harmed by the increase in the minimum wage—and I voted for an increase in the minimum wage. Second, in the minimum wage bill we are going after the tax gap and those who engage in the tax scams.

Two things: No. 1, we are dealing with efforts to help small business and, No. 2, we are at the very same time bringing more money into the Federal Treasury by closing tax scams and reducing the tax gap.

I would say, as a sidenote to my colleagues, particularly the new leaders on the Budget Committee, that these tax provisions are only the latest example of the Finance Committee producing additional revenues by changes in the Tax Code. Unfortunately, I feel as though I need to put on a Sherlock Holmes hat and hire a bloodhound to go out and try to find any savings that the Budget Committee makes and had enacted into law when it comes to the spending side of the ledger. We have more than done our job on the tax side. I say it is time for the Budget Committee to deliver savings on the spending side.

But let me turn back to the tax gap and turn back to the minimum wage bill. I am very pleased that in working with Senator BAUCUS we have, as part of the tax provisions contained in the

minimum wage package, a new provision—a number of provisions, in fact—that will go after those engaged in tax shelters and tax scams and take steps, then, in the process, to address the tax gap—in other words, money that is owed but not paid. I would like to highlight just a few of these provisions that are in the minimum wage bill that are closing the tax gap and shutting down tax scams.

We shut down the SILO scheme. That is an acronym. U.S. corporations cut their tax bills by purchasing and leasing back overseas government facilities such as sewer plants and subways in the country of Germany. We take additional steps to go after corporations that move to the Bahamas and have just a mailbox, not any people, and use the gimmick to cut their taxes. I can't tell you how many times I have heard speeches about that issue from Senators on the other side of the aisle. We can end the talking and we can start doing something about it with these very provisions contained in the minimum wage bill if we do not let succeed people who are talking about separating the tax provisions of the wage bill just to get a minimum wage bill passed.

We also tightened the rules on individuals who expatriate to avoid taxes legally owed in the United States—and we have that happen.

We end the fast and loose ways that corporations account for fines and penalties, so if a corporation gets a penalty for, let's say, polluting the environment, they do not get to deduct that from their income tax. We also increase penalties for those who underpay taxes due to fraud. I think everybody would agree with that. We double the fines and the penalties for those who use offshore financial arrangements to avoid taxes. The Finance Committee views that as a growing problem and a major reason that there is such a tax gap. We expand and improve the whistleblower program which will provide the Internal Revenue Service a roadmap for corporate tax fraud.

We modify the collection due process rules to protect the tax protesters from abusing the system. This is something that the administration proposed in its budget today to help deal with the tax gap.

This collection due process provision contained in the minimum wage bill only emphasizes my point that we can start dealing with a tax gap today, right now.

And then a final provision I will make reference to is one provision that closes a loophole in section 162(m), the \$1 million limitation for corporate executives. The provisions provide that a CEO can't avoid the effects of 162(m) by not being on the job at the end of the year.

Mr. President, forests have been sacrificed to print the speeches that politicians make decrying excessive CEO pay. Yes, we have a provision in the minimum wage bill that tightens the

deduction that can be taken for higher CEO pay.

So I get down to the basics, and I get down to the basics because I have been hearing some rumors from Senators—but more importantly from the leadership of the other body—that in order to get a minimum wage bill passed, we ought to drop the tax provisions and pass the minimum wage bill. But I have always been hearing over the years from those people who are saying: We need to do something about the tax gap; we need to do something about the tax scams; we need to do something about people going offshore to avoid the payment of taxes, and on and on. So I have to ask the Democratic leadership if they are going to put the provisions I am talking about—closing the tax gap, closing down the tax scams—if they want to put those provisions in the trash can. If they do, I would also like to put into the trash all the speeches made on the other side then about CEO pay.

I say this because the time for speeches is over. We can take steps right now with the tax provisions in the minimum wage bill to deal with the tax gap and CEO pay. I have listed these provisions, and as my colleagues know, while many of them are good common sense, these provisions are also not at all popular downtown on K Street or up the eastern coast on Wall Street.

While the debate has focused on the tax breaks for small business in the minimum wage bill—and those are important because they are helping small business overcome some negative impact of the minimum wage increase—it is also critical we pass a much-needed tax gap and anti-abuse provisions contained in the minimum wage bill and pass them now. Delaying these reforms as some would argue—putting them on another tax bill—rewards tax cheats. These reforms are often date and time sensitive. Delay only benefits those who are playing fast and loose with our tax laws.

I can't believe the House Democratic leadership wants the first action they take in the area of taxes to drop these reform provisions—these provisions that would close the tax gap—and signal to the tax cheats that the door is wide open.

Senator BAUCUS and I, working together over the years, have passed into law a good many reforms, and we have shut down a number of tax scams. However, we have been, at times, stymied in the other body—not by Democrats but by Republicans.

We heard a lot of commentary during the elections and afterwards how it was no longer going to be business as usual. My hope is that given the rhetoric of the new House leadership, we could finally pass these anti-abuse tax reforms in the minimum wage bill. I worry, though, that with folks talking about stripping the tax provisions from the minimum wage bill, the House leadership may be singing a new song. But

the results are the same. The House Democratic leadership needs to understand that kowtowing to K Street is not a new direction that was promised by a new majority in the last election. They can show it is not business as usual, as they were condemning Republicans of doing. They can show that by passing all the tax provisions contained in the Senate minimum wage bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

U.S. STRATEGY IN IRAQ

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise this evening being greatly disturbed by what happened on the floor of the Senate, after a tremendous amount of good-faith effort and very hard work by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, bringing together a resolution to offer to this body for a debate, for a full debate on the question of escalating the war in Iraq. What we have seen from the minority is a filibuster that has stopped us from even proceeding—from even proceeding to be able to take up the resolution.

Our majority leader offered to take up other resolutions, some contradicting the one that we wished to have brought forward, to have equally debated resolutions, the same amount of time, the same amount of votes that are needed in order to be able to bring forward the resolutions and possibly pass them.

Every effort by the majority leader was turned down. Every time he brought up a possible solution to be able to bring forward these resolutions and have a full debate, which the American people are demanding that we do, he was told “no.” No, no, no. So we are now in a situation where the minority has voted down the ability for us to even go to a resolution or multiple resolutions dealing with the issue of Iraq, which we are all so deeply concerned about.

Right now it is after midnight in Baghdad, and we have over 130,000 American troops who are settled in for another long night half a world away from home. They are living, working, fighting in the most difficult conditions anyone can imagine. They are patrolling crowded streets. They are standing guard on lonely posts. They are reaching out to Iraqi citizens and putting themselves constantly in harm’s way to protect their fellow soldiers. They are there because their Government called them. They come from every corner of this great Nation. They represent every color, creed, religion, and political voice in this country.

I have been to Iraq—many of us have—and I have talked to our men and women in the field and they are the best this country has to offer. For our entire history, they have answered when called. They have gone where we sent them. They have fought when we

have asked them to do so. They have dedicated their lives to preparing for wars they did not want, and when asked, they have executed their training with pride, bravery, and an unwavering spirit.

We are blessed this evening to sleep under the blanket of freedom they provide. And no one—no one in this Chamber—is questioning the job they are doing. We are all patriots in this debate—all of us—with differing views, strongly held views about the best way to move forward. We are all patriots.

I have listened intently over the past weeks, and I have heard colleagues and representatives of the administration state time and again that those of us questioning the President are somehow undermining the morale of our troops. I find that insulting, not only to me and to my colleagues who care deeply about this and who have worked together in a bipartisan way to bring forward this resolution but to our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, and marines. Open and honest debate about the execution of this war is not only what our armed services expect, it is what they deserve. Our citizen soldiers demand our best, and our best is not idle silence. Our best is not a filibuster that stops a resolution from even coming to the floor so that we can have an open, honest debate about it. Our citizen soldiers are on the frontlines. In this Chamber, we use words, but those words have real-world consequences, and no one lives those consequences more than our troops on the ground. Debate in a democracy does not undermine the morale or the will of our armed services. The lack of a clear, measurable, and achievable mission does undermine what they are doing. That is what we are all wanting to see happen. That is what we want to see developed for them.

They need to know that their leaders have based their orders on reason, not on wishful thinking and on a misguided adherence to a failed strategy. They need to know that their leaders have sensibly considered all of the options available and that those considerations are grounded in fact, not in rhetoric or posturing.

On October 11, 2002, 23 of us in the Senate cast a lonely vote against this White House effort to go to war because the evidence was not clear enough—it just wasn’t there—to warrant going to war. I cast that vote because I believed that the pretense for war was based not in definable evidence but on predetermined conclusions. War is a tool of last resort, a decision that should be made with great trepidation when our country is at risk and other options have been exhausted.

From day one, the reasoning for this war has been unclear and inconsistent, from the initial lack of preparedness for securing Baghdad to the most recent call for escalation. We have seen a strategy based on the best-case scenario calculations of politicians, not on the wholly realistic conclusions of ca-

reer military officers. Mistakes have been made at every turn, and 4 years and over 3,000 American lives later and hundreds of thousands of lost lives and injuries of Iraqis, we are still paying the price.

Some have insisted this resolution is a ploy to embarrass the President. This is clearly not our goal. This is not a discussion about politics. It is a debate about policy. Any soldier will tell you there are no politics in a foxhole. The American people, Republicans and Democrats, are asking us to look long and hard at what we are doing in Iraq. We were not elected to stand silently by while our fellow citizens demand answers.

We can’t even have a full debate because of the vote that happened. The American people are asking us not only to debate but to come to the right answers, the responsible answers for the direction and strategy in Iraq. Our soldiers deserve that, and we have in front of us a resolution that we couldn’t even get enough votes to bring up to discuss, to debate it fully and have a vote. I believe the simple fact is very clear that escalation is not the answer, and I want the opportunity to vote on that, to say that on behalf of the people of Michigan. Putting more Americans in harm’s way will not bring our men and women home any sooner. Why would we go further down the path that has led us to this point? Why would we repeat our previous mistakes and call it a new strategy?

A free and stable Iraq can only be secured by the Iraqis. They must embrace responsibility for their collective future and decide that living and dying at the hands of sectarian violence is not the future they want for their children and their grandchildren. We must support their efforts—and I do—but we cannot substitute American troops for Iraqi resolve. With the freedom of self-determination comes the responsibility of collective security.

We must continue to train our friends in Iraq. We must equip them and provide sensible military support based on the advice of our generals and military experts. We must lead them by example, by embracing the realities of our own democratic process as we attempt to collectively solve the challenges in the war in Iraq. How can we be talking to them about the democratic process when that process is stopped right here in the Senate in the ability to openly debate and vote on the resolution?

I stand in support of the Warner-Levin resolution and to say that escalation is a grave mistake. I am certain when judged by our fellow Americans, the votes that many Members will cast, if we have the opportunity to do so, to say “enough is enough” to this White House will be greeted with sober support.

With heaviness in my heart, I am also sadly confident that when judged by history, those who have questioned the reasoning and the execution of this war will have our concerns justified.

We can't change how we got here. We can't change the fact we are in Iraq. That chapter of history is written, set in stone, and paid for with the lives of Americans and Iraqis, and the lives of many other individuals around the world. However, we can learn from the path we have walked. We have the ability to reassess and to change course, to get it right, to put forward our collective best wisdom from everyone who has been involved. On behalf of our soldiers, they deserve that. They deserve a full debate in the Senate, to be able to state our positions on policy, on policy that right now at this moment they are carrying out in Iraq. They deserve the very best debate and very best decisions.

That is what this is about. That is what we were hoping to get tonight, the opportunity to go forward, to work together in a bipartisan way to put forward a statement that says we believe there is a better way, a better strategy than what the President has begun to execute.

I hope we will have an opportunity to vote on this resolution. I welcome other resolutions that colleagues have put forward in good faith. I may not agree with them—and that is all right; that is how the process works—but they deserve debate just as our resolutions deserve debate.

In Iraq, we are talking about their setting up a democracy, the ability to fully debate and participate in their government. We need to show by example that we are not afraid of debate, of involvement, we are not afraid to stand and say what we think and put our own vote and opinions on the line on something so critical to the future of our country, most particularly to our men and women in the armed services and their families, and, frankly, to the world.

We need the opportunity to vote. We need the opportunity to debate. The American people are calling on the Senate to do nothing less. Tonight was not an example of our listening.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, in my home State of Vermont and all across this country, the American people are deeply concerned about the war in Iraq. They want real debate here in Washington on this issue and, more importantly, they want real action.

Frankly, I have a hard time understanding why some of my colleagues, regardless of what their position on the war might be, would try to prevent a vote on what is at best a very modest proposal that was brought forth this afternoon. If you like the Warner bill,

you should vote for it. If you do not like it, you should vote against it. But in fairness to the American people, we should have a serious debate and a vote on this issue.

Let me be very clear in giving you my perspective on this war. In my view, President Bush's war in Iraq has been a disaster. It is a war we were misled into and a war many of us believed we never should have gotten into in the first place.

This is a war which the administration was unprepared to fight. The administration has shown little understanding of the enemy or the historical context or the cultural context in which we found ourselves. Who will forget President Bush declaring "mission accomplished" aboard the aircraft carrier Abraham Lincoln when, in fact, the mission had barely begun? Who will forget Vice President CHENEY telling us that the insurgency was in its "last throes," just before some of the bloodiest months of the war took place? Who will ever forget those Bush advisers who predicted that the war would be a cakewalk—nothing to worry about—and that we would be greeted in Iraq as liberators?

This war in Iraq has come at a very, very high price in so many ways. This is a war which has cost us terribly in American blood. As of today, we have lost some 3,100 brave American soldiers, twenty-three thousand more have been wounded, and tens of thousands will come home with post-traumatic stress disorder.

This is a war which, with the President's proposed increase, will cost us some \$500 billion, with the price tag going up by \$8 billion every single month. This cost is going to add to the huge national debt we are already leaving to our children and grandchildren. And it is going to make it more difficult for us to fund health care, education, environmental protection, affordable housing, childcare, and the pressing needs of the middle class and working families of our country, not to mention the needs of our veterans, whose numbers are rapidly increasing as a result of this war.

This is a war which has caused unimaginable horror for the people of Iraq. People who had suffered so long under the brutality of the Saddam Hussein dictatorship are suffering even more today. There are estimates that hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have been killed or wounded and almost 2 million have been forced to flee their country—some 8 percent of their population.

While civil war tears neighborhoods apart, children are without schools, and the Iraqi people lack electricity, health care, and other basic necessities of life. The doctors and nurses, teachers and administrators who have provided the professional infrastructure for the people of Iraq are now long gone.

This is a war which has lowered our standing in the international commu-

nity to an all-time low in our lifetimes, with leaders in democratic countries hesitant to work with us because of the lack of respect their citizens have for our President. Long-time friends and allies are simply wondering what is going on in the United States today. This is a war which has stretched our active-duty military to the breaking point, as well as our National Guard and Reserve forces. Morale in the military is low, and this war will have lasting impacts on the future recruitment, retention, and readiness of our Nation's military. This is a war which has in many respects lowered our capability to effectively fight the very serious threats of international terrorism and Islamic extremism.

Five years after the horrific attacks of 9/11, Osama bin Laden remains free. Using the presence of United States troops in Iraq as their rallying call, al-Qaida's strength around the world continues to grow and the situation in Afghanistan is currently becoming more and more difficult.

Tragically, this administration has refused to listen to the American people who, in this last election, made it very clear that they want a new direction in Iraq, and they want this war wound down, not escalated.

This administration has refused to listen to the thoughtful suggestions of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, which included two former Secretaries of State, including President Bush's own father's Secretary of State, as well as a former Presidential chief of staff and a former Secretary of Defense, that it was time for a change in direction. This administration has refused to listen to the advice of our military leaders in Iraq who told us that increasing troops from the United States would make it easier for the Iraqi Government and military to avoid their political and military responsibilities.

This administration has refused to listen to the Iraqi people who, according to a number of polls, have told us very strongly that they believe, in the midst of all of the horror and turmoil and violence within their country, that they would be safer and more secure if our troops left their country.

In fact, this administration has tragically refused to listen to almost anybody except that same shrinking inner circle, led by the Vice President, who has consistently been wrong on this issue from day one.

As most everybody understands and as the recent National Intelligence Estimate has confirmed, the situation today in Iraq is extremely dire. The sad truth is there are now no good options before us; there are simply less bad options. In Iraq today, according to Secretary of Defense Bob Gates, there are now at least four separate wars being fought, wars that our soldiers who have fought with incredible bravery and skill find themselves in the middle of.

Let me quote Secretary Gates, who has recently stated:

I believe there are essentially four wars going on in Iraq. One is Shia on Shia, principally in the south; the second is sectarian conflict, principally in Baghdad but not solely. Third is the insurgency, and fourth is Al Qaeda.

The reality today, as described by the Secretary of Defense, has nothing to do with why President Bush got us into this war in the first place. In March of 2002, he told us Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and that they were poised to use those weapons against us. That was not true and certainly has no relevance to the war today. In 2002, the President told us Iraq was somehow linked to al-Qaida and bore some responsibility for the horrific 9/11 attack against our country. That also turned out not to be true and has no relevance to the situation we find ourselves in today.

In the 2006 elections, the American people, in a loud and unmistakable voice, told us they no longer had confidence in the Bush administration's handling of the war in Iraq. In my view, they told us they wanted Congress to begin asserting its constitutional authority over this war, and they wanted us to rein in the administration. Most importantly, they told us they wanted us to begin the process of bringing our troops home as soon as possible. And as a Vermont Senator, that is exactly the effort I intend to make.

In my view, the Warner resolution is far too weak. It is a baby step forward. Whether it is passed or not, it must be followed with much stronger legislation, legislation that has real teeth. Instead of just voicing our disapproval of President Bush's escalation of the war with a nonbinding resolution, we should now be considering legislation that provides for the safe and orderly redeployment of virtually all of our troops out of Iraq within the next year, even as we continue to give support to the Iraq Government and their military for the purpose of helping them accept their political and military responsibilities. That is the legislation we should be debating. That is the legislation we should be passing.

How can we accomplish this withdrawal and redeployment? Regardless of what happens with the nonbinding Warner bill, in the very near future we must bring forth legislation on to the floor of the Senate that would prohibit the use of funds for an escalation of United States military forces without a specific new authorization from the Congress. Secondly, we must consider legislation to require a schedule for the return home of a majority of American forces and the redeployment of the rest of the American forces from Iraq to other places. Finally, we must vote against any additional funding to increase troop levels. In addition, we must set conditions in any future funding bill so that the President is obliged to begin winding down this war.

We are mired in a war that has gone on longer than American involvement

in either the First World War or the Second World War. We will spend more money on this war in real dollars than we spent on either the Korean war or the war in Vietnam. Our standing in the international community has declined, and our ability to combat international terrorism has been seriously compromised. It is time to say no to this ill-conceived escalation. It is time to deploy our troops out of harm's way. It is time to end this war.

HONORING CHARLES H. RAMSEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Charles H. Ramsey, who retired as chief of the Metropolitan Police Department at the end of December.

A Chicago, IL, native, Chief Ramsey began his career in law enforcement with the Chicago Police Department in 1968. Over the course of nearly three decades, Ramsey proved himself a dedicated and capable member of the force. He was promoted to Deputy Superintendent of the Bureau of Staff Services in 1994. The position brought with it many new responsibilities and put him in charge of the Department's education and training programs, an area in which Charles Ramsey excelled.

During his tenure with the CPD, Chief Ramsey played an instrumental role in the creation and implementation of the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy, the city's innovative model of community policing. CAPS was designed to help police officers better understand the communities they were patrolling, rendering them more effective in preventing crime.

Chief Ramsey comanaged the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy program, which promoted the cooperation of police, community, and city services. The training program to support the CAPS operation model provided guidelines for working with city agencies, and encouraging residents to become involved in their neighborhoods and communities through local meetings with law enforcement officials.

Chief Ramsey brought many of the strategies he piloted in Chicago to Washington when he was appointed chief of the Metropolitan Police Department in April of 1998. Chief Ramsey has said that when he came to the MPDC he found "outstanding people who were frustrated by antiquated technology, vehicles and equipment and perhaps most of all, an overall sense of organizational pride and purpose that needed to be restored." Chief Ramsey made it his goal, over the next 8½ years not only to update the Department's resources, but to restore the Department's sense of pride and to build public confidence in the police.

Under his leadership, the Metropolitan Police Department saw a shift in strategic vision, with a new emphasis on community policing and crime prevention. Chief Ramsey created a system of Regional Operations Commands,

designed to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy and enhance accountability. In eight and a half years, the Department has achieved much success. The crime rate in the District of Columbia is close to 40 percent lower than when Chief Ramsey joined the force. Meanwhile, the department received acclaim for its handling of a number of major events, including the 1999 NATO 50th Anniversary summit and the 2000 protests against the International Monetary Fund and World Bank Group.

Throughout his career, Chief Ramsey has received numerous accolades and been presented with many honors. He received the Gary P. Hayes Award from the Police Executive Research Forum, the 2001 Robert Lamb Humanitarian Award from the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives and the 2001 Civil Rights Award from the International Association of Chiefs of Police. But Chief Ramsey is sure to be remembered for an unlikely partnership that developed shortly after he arrived in Washington.

It began, when Chief Ramsey visited the United States Holocaust Museum at the invitation of the Anti-Defamation League. Following his visit, he considered the ways in which his Department could learn from the history of the Holocaust, in particular the vital role law enforcement must play in protecting civil liberties. Chief Ramsey enlisted the help of the Museum and the ADL in drafting a curricula and training program for his officers. In 1999, "Law Enforcement and Society: Lessons from the Holocaust" was introduced. Since its inception "Law Enforcement and Society" has been used by more than a dozen other departments and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In 2001, the Anti-Defamation League recognized Chief Ramsey's efforts, presenting him with the Sigmund Livingston Award and Chief Ramsey was honored by the Holocaust Museum in 2005.

I congratulate Chief Charles Ramsey on his many accomplishments throughout his long and distinguished career. I thank him for his leadership in the Metropolitan Police Department and his commitment to public service. I wish him and his family the very best in the years to come.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to remind all Senate Committee chairmen that paragraph 2 of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires each Senate committee to adopt rules to govern its procedures. Under this rule, committee rules may not be inconsistent with the Rules of the Senate and must be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1, 2007.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pursuant to paragraph 2 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Rules and Administration, adopted on January 31, 2007, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE—UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

TITLE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The regular meeting dates of the Committee shall be the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month, at 10 a.m. in room SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building. Additional meetings of the Committee may be called by the Chairman as she may deem necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the Members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings:

A. will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

B. will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

C. will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

D. will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

E. will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if:

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

F. may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulations. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all Members of the committee at least a week in advance. In addition, the committee staff will telephone or e-

mail reminders of committee meetings to all Members of the committee or to the appropriate assistants in their offices.

4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of legislative business and committee business will normally be sent to all Members of the committee and released to the public at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any Member of the committee from discussing appropriate non-agenda topics.

5. After the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member, speaking order shall be based on order of arrival, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

6. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the chairman may direct, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member waive such requirement for good cause.

7. In general, testimony will be restricted to 5 minutes for each witness. The time may be extended by the Chairman, upon the Chair's own direction or at the request of a Member. Each round of questions by Members will also be limited to 5 minutes.

TITLE II—QUORUMS

1. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, a majority of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of legislative measures.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, one-third of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, including action on amendments to measures prior to voting to report the measure to the Senate.

3. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony under oath and 1 Member of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony not under oath; provided, however, that in either instance, once a quorum is established, any one Member can continue to take such testimony.

4. Under no circumstances may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

TITLE III—VOTING

1. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

2. If a third of the Members present so demand a roll call vote instead of a voice vote, a record vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

3. The results of roll call votes taken in any meeting upon any measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to each such measure and amendment by each Member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

4. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a Member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee Member has been in-

formed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a) (3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS

1. Provided at least five business days' notice of the agenda is given, and the text of the proposed bill or resolution has been made available at least five business calendar days in advance, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless such amendment has been delivered to the office of the Committee and circulated via e-mail to each of the offices by at least 5:00 PM the day prior to the scheduled start of the meeting.

2. In the event the Chairman introduces a substitute amendment or a Chairman's mark, the requirements set forth in Paragraph 1 of this Title shall be considered waived unless such substitute amendment or Chairman's mark has been made available at least five business days in advance of the scheduled meeting.

3. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Member to offer a motion to strike a single section of any bill, resolution, or amendment under consideration.

4. This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

TITLE V—DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

1. The Chairman is authorized to sign herself or by delegation all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide in the committee's behalf all routine business.

2. The Chairman is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

3. The Chairman is authorized to issue, in behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

TITLE VI—DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, acting jointly, are authorized to approve on behalf of the committee any rule or regulation for which the committee's approval is required, provided advance notice of their intention to do so is given to Members of the committee.

GANG ABATEMENT AND PREVENTION ACT

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Gang Abatement and Prevention Act, introduced by Senator FEINSTEIN. Before discussing the details of this bill, I want to state how pleased I am that it has such broad bipartisan support. With 13 sponsors, 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans, I am hopeful that this bill can move quickly through Congress.

Gang-related violence is on the rise, in Colorado and throughout the Nation. Just by way of example: according to the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, Denver is home to roughly 12,470 gang members, who are affiliated with 110 gangs. Nationwide, there are roughly 730,000 gang members. Since 1999 the number of crimes investigated by the Denver gang unit has risen 35 percent; gang members were responsible for fully 35 percent of Denver's firearm-related homicides;

As these statistics show, gang violence is still a serious problem—and we in Congress have an obligation to respond. This bill is a good first-step, because it focuses on four key pillars of effective law enforcement policy: prevention; investigation and prosecution; firm and just penalties; and effective law enforcement training.

On prevention, the bill would authorize \$250 million for intervention programs focused on at-risk youth. These funds would be administered through a new High Intensity Interstate Gang Activity Area program, or HIGAA, which would be designed to facilitate cooperation between Federal, State, and local law enforcement in identifying, targeting, and eliminating violent gangs.

I have firsthand experience with the effectiveness of multijurisdictional law enforcement efforts: the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program, and the various local multijurisdictional drug task forces in Colorado, have successfully leveraged Federal, State, and local resources to fight crime. I support applying this model to the fight against gangs.

On the investigation and prosecution front, I am pleased that the bill would increase funding for the Justice Department, Federal prosecutors, and FBI agents to coordinate Federal enforcement against violent gangs.

In regards to penalties for gang-related activity, this bill takes a sensible approach. It would replace the current sentencing enhancement for gang-related conduct with a new Federal antigang law that directly criminalizes gang crimes—and related conspiracies and attempts to commit crimes in furtherance of a criminal gang. The bill would also create new Federal offenses prohibiting the recruitment of minors into a criminal gang.

Finally, the bill would authorize \$3-\$5 million per year for the creation of a national gang violence prevention training center and clearinghouse, which would assist local law enforcement with training and the implementation of effective gang violence prevention models. Since my time as attorney general, I have been acutely aware of the importance of effective law enforcement training—and I am pleased that this bill contains provisions which would directly address this important issue.

This is a sensible, comprehensive bill. By focusing on prevention, investigation, prosecution, punishment, and training, I am hopeful that it will give our law enforcement agencies—Federal, State, and local—the resources they need to effectively fight the growth of gangs and gang activity.

PASSAGE OF FAIR MINIMUM WAGE ACT OF 2007

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this momentous achievement that helps so many millions of Americans would not have been possible without the dedication and hard work of our staff.

Of my own staff, I want to give a special thank you to Lauren McGarity for her strong commitment, her deep knowledge, and her hard work on this issue over many months. Lauren, you have really made a difference.

I thank Portia Wu for her help and leadership and especially her able work over the past 2 weeks in handling the many amendments to this legislation.

Thanks also to Missy Rohrbach for helping us manage the floor schedule and for all she does so well.

Thanks, too, to Jonathan McCracken, Jeff Teitz, Dave Ryan, Esther Olavarria, and Laura Capps.

As always, I am grateful also for the leadership of Michael Myers, who has been with me for many years as staff director of our HELP Committee.

But above all my special thanks go to Holly Fechner, my chief labor counsel. This momentous vote is a tribute to her—to her skill, professionalism, and deep dedication to those who are the backbone of this country. Working men and women in America could not have a better friend and champion. Holly is a true leader, and we all owe her a great debt today.

I commend Senator ENZI's staff, too. Katherine McGuire, Ilyse Schuman, Brian Hayes, Kyle Hicks, and Greg Dean. They are real professionals. It is a pleasure to work with them, and I thank them for their courtesies.

Thanks, too, to Senator BAUCUS' able staff for making this victory possible—Russ Sullivan, Pat Heck, and Bill Dauster.

And special thanks for the able leadership of Senator REID's staff, especially Darrel Thompson and Bob Greenawalt. And, of course, Marty Paone, Lula Davis, Tim Mitchell, and Trish Engle as well.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KENNEDY CENTER MILLENNIUM STAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this weekend marked the 10th anniversary of the Kennedy Center's Millennium Stage, a remarkable milestone for the center and its special commitment to reach out to the community and expand opportunities for citizens and visitors to enjoy exceptional performances.

At 6 p.m. every evening, 7 days a week, the center presents a free concert with live performers on the Millennium Stage. Former chairman of the board Jim Johnson conceived the idea and guided the center through its early performances. Ever since, a remarkable series of talented musical artists and performing artists have been a part of this effort, from classical to rock and roll, from Sweet Honey in the Rock, KC and the Sunshine Band, to Norah Jones.

More than 3 million people have enjoyed these free performances at the center, and countless more have enjoyed them on the Web casts. It is a wonderful tradition in the Nation's

Capital, and I know that there will be many more brilliant performances in the years ahead.

I urge my colleagues to let their constituents know about these exciting performance opportunities. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from today's Washington Post and an article from the Washington Post on February 2 about the Millennium Stage anniversary be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 2007]
CONCERTED EFFORT—AN ANNIVERSARY AT THE
KENNEDY CENTER

Walk into the Kennedy Center around 6 on any given night, and, for only the price of your time, you might hear the National Symphony Orchestra interpreting Mussorgsky, the Joffrey Ballet executing a pas de deux or the Shakespeare Theatre Company soliloquizing from "Twelfth Night." If those offerings are too elevated for you, the Kennedy Center's programmers also attract a range of artists with alternative styles, from folk musician Pete Seeger to punk legend Patti Smith to vocalist and recent Grammy winner Norah Jones.

Tonight's performance will be especially memorable. Ten years ago today, the Kennedy Center held its first free performance on its Millennium Stage, and every night since, tourists and locals alike—more than 3 million so far, by the Kennedy Center's reckoning—have had the opportunity to enjoy world-class performing arts, no expensive tickets required. That's 41,000 artists from all 50 states and 50 countries to date. At a time when metropolitan performing arts centers around the country are coming up short on cash, it is refreshing to see Washington's center prioritize free, consistent and quality performances accessible to the general public. The Kennedy Center's administrators should be proud of this milestone.

Equally impressive is the Millennium Stage's nightly turnout, which programmers estimate at about 350 on average. And crowds at bigger shows range from 500 to several thousand, according to the Kennedy Center's Garth Ross, who credits extensive community outreach for the success of the Millennium Stage. It's what Kennedy Center President Michael Kaiser calls great art well-marketed.

Tonight's anniversary concert promises to be particularly memorable. The National Symphony Orchestra, the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theater and rocker Sufjan Stevens will perform. Tickets for those capacity-filling acts are already gone. But you can watch them on video screens in the Grand Foyer, catch the webcast on the Kennedy Center's Web site or show up any other day of the year to experience more free, live art.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 2007]

THE KENNEDY CENTER'S OPEN INVITATION

(By Richard Harrington)

With apologies to Joni Mitchell, people have been playing real good for free for the past decade on the Kennedy Center's Millennium Stage. And though nobody stopped to hear Mitchell's street clarinetist, that hasn't been a problem at the Millennium Stage since guitarist Charlie Byrd and pianist Billy Taylor christened it in March 1997 in front of a couple of thousand well-heeled Washingtonians.

Ten years and more than 3 million visitors later, the Millennium Stage remains without equal: the only cultural institution in the

world to offer free performances of jazz, classical, dance, folk and more 24-7-365. And if you can't make it there, you can watch it anywhere. Since April 1, 1999, almost all Millennium Stage performances have been streamed live on the Internet.

In the early days, when the concept of a free-concert-a-day was still catching on, a little-known artist might attract a small crowd; on rare occasions, a choir might even outnumber the audience.

But crowds numbering in the hundreds have long become the norm in the Kennedy Center's Grand Foyer, where folding chairs are set up to hold several hundred people, with an equal number sitting on the carpeted stairs leading to either the Concert Hall or the Eisenhower Theater.

The Grand Foyer lives up to its name. It's one of the world's largest rooms—someone came up with the fact that were the Washington Monument laid horizontally inside, it would fit with 75 feet to spare—and can accommodate about 4,500 people. But more than 6,000 showed up in 2003 to see Colombian superstar Juanes perform. Seating for the 6 p.m. concerts begins about 5:30 p.m., and for that concert, queues stretched from Hall of Nations and Hall of States all the way around the building. As people entered the Grand Foyer, they could look through the huge glass wall and observe the River Terrace line moving as well—a gigantic, festive snake.

Whatever the program, the setting is splendid, particularly before daylight saving time kicks in. At sunset, light streams through the glass wall facing the Potomac, through landscaped willow trees on the River Terrace, a great location for before- or after-performance strolls. The terrace overlooks Theodore Roosevelt Island and the Georgetown waterfront, and you can watch boats floating downriver or the endless chain of planes approaching Reagan National Airport. (The latter can be disconcerting for first-timers; planes seem to be heading directly at the Kennedy Center before banking left for a landing.)

According to Garth Ross, director of the Kennedy Center's Performing Arts for Everyone initiative, the Millennium Stage sometimes makes use of the center's other venues, as when the Concert Hall hosts the National Symphony Orchestra's free performances because "it's the only place we can accommodate them." Last year's inaugural country music festival concluded with 4,000 people crowding the South Plaza for a Western swing dance by Asleep at the Wheel.

But nothing has ever been as complicated as Monday's 10th anniversary celebration of the Millennium Stage, with the center's three major halls offering free performances by the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theater in the Eisenhower Theater, the NSO in the Concert Hall and indie rock icon Sufjan Stevens and members of the Kennedy Center Opera House Orchestra in the Opera House. The U.S. Navy jazz ensemble, the Commodores, kicks things off at the regular Millennium Stage. Tickets for the three shows were distributed last week, but you won't need a ticket for the Grand Foyer, where all the performances will be projected on large screens.

Ross calls Monday's celebration "an endeavor to be all things to all people in one night in a way that's representative of the scope of our commitment and what we've represented artistically over all these years. We're going to be welcoming audiences into our three largest theaters, hopefully cementing the notion that Millennium Stage is a concept first, and not only a venue, but also knowing that the experience of being in those theaters is part of the Kennedy Center experience."

It's the culmination of a decade-long effort to bring the performing arts to the widest possible audience, to reduce the venue's elitist image and to open its doors to younger, more economically and racially diverse audiences that might not otherwise venture near the marble-and-glass edifice.

"It certainly feels to me that it has a much, much broader constituency now than 10 years ago," says James A. Johnson, chairman emeritus of the Kennedy Center and the man most responsible for the Millennium Stage, figuratively and literally. Johnson and his wife, Maxine Isaacs, were founding donors to the Millennium Stage Endowment Fund (to the tune of \$1 million the first year), and he continues to attract donors to cover the Millennium Stage's annual \$1.5 million budget, including current sponsors Target and the Fannie Mae Foundation.

Johnson was chief executive of Fannie Mae before he began his tenure as the Kennedy Center's fourth chairman in 1996, and there is a link between his old job and the Performing Arts for Everyone initiative he introduced that year. A populist approach, Johnson says, "was very much central to my mind. At Fannie Mae, I had tried to be a leader in diversity, in outreach to the community, particularly the minority community. The phrase we used to use is we've got to be unmistakably clear that this institution is not focused on 'white people in black tie.'"

Johnson notes extensive outreach to Washington's diplomatic enclaves and diverse ethnic communities and to schools. "We can't say we're doing our jobs with an appropriate memorial to John F. Kennedy unless it is clearly for everyone, and clearly welcoming to everybody, and we take down the barrier of cost so we don't have an invisible barrier to coming to the institution."

And, Johnson adds, the Millennium Stage was never just an experiment. "We always saw it as an essential, core commitment of the institution, to reach out to the city, to the international community, to people visiting Washington from around the country. It's essential that the program be diverse; it's also essential that nobody need to plan or arrange to do it."

There is, after all, a Washington tradition of free access: The Smithsonian Institution's many museums don't charge admission; neither does the National Gallery of Art.

"But museums don't change their collection every day," Johnson says, adding that the Millennium Stage concept "was at a level of ambition that was substantial: Every single day of the year, there will be a quality performance in the Grand Foyer at 6 o'clock; no ticket required, nor reservation required. Everyone's welcome."

Such ambition was in keeping with the national cultural center chartered by Congress in 1958 under President Dwight D. Eisenhower and envisioned by President John F. Kennedy as a place belonging to every American. Since its opening in 1971, it has become the nation's busiest arts facility, presenting more than 3,300 performances a year, and became home to the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera and the Washington Ballet.

The Kennedy Center is also a major destination for tourists: Three million people visit the center each year, and 1.2 million stay for paid performances.

Although many cultural institutions offer free performances in some fashion, only London's National Theatre approaches the Kennedy Center, offering free pre-performance concerts in its Djanogly Concert Pitch Monday through Saturday and at lunchtime Saturdays. Those concerts predate the Millennium Stage but are mostly chamber classical and jazz. In 1998, Christopher Hogg, chairman

of Reuters and the National Theatre, sent a note to Johnson thanking the Kennedy Center and Millennium Stage for pointing the way to "doing what's new and innovative with free programming."

Hogg was acknowledging the broad spectrum of performing arts offered, from chamber music and jazz to folk, comedy, country and bluegrass, and loads of dance and theater both homegrown and international. Ross notes the "increased presence of American roots and traditional music and world roots and traditional music, areas of strength that weren't areas the center already had a strong demonstrated commitment to."

"It's performing arts for everyone, but not at the same time," Ross says. "Avant-garde jazz or new classical or really traditional folk, from one show to the next, and one audience to the next, it's not everyone's cup of tea, and that's, in fact, our intent. That allows us to be many things to many people, whereas, as an institution, we have more of [a defined] vision of what we are. Millennium Stage can supplement that in a sort of micro-approach."

Take the Conservatory Project, which presents young artists in classical music, jazz, musical theater and opera from 14 leading undergraduate and graduate conservatories, colleges and universities, including the Juilliard School, Berklee College of Music, New England Conservatory of Music and Baltimore's Peabody Conservatory of Music. Two weeklong celebrations in February and May will feature top young artists making their debuts in the Terrace Theater; many others will appear in the Grand Foyer. As part of the 2005 Festival of China, 100 pianists performed together on the South Plaza; 96 of them were conservatory students.

"Our commitment to presenting students is tied in to our commitment to arts and education and the role that a national arts organization, can, should and, in this case, does play in that," says Ross, adding that it doesn't hurt for people to be able to say they've performed at the Kennedy Center. Although the focus is on a mix of graduate, undergraduate and postgraduate students, Millennium Stage also works with top public school arts programs across the country and a dozen regional school districts during March's Music in Our Schools programs.

Ross says the Millennium Stage is also a platform for partnerships with embassies and presenting organizations that "highlight Washington's role in the cultural fabric of America and the world." That has allowed for performances by such great artists as Juanes, Senegal's Youssou N'Dour and Nigeria's King Sunny Ade, France's Les Nubiens and the Congolese ensemble Konono No. 1.

Roland Celette, cultural attache at the Embassy of France, says the Millennium Stage has presented a wide variety of French performers—"from very classical music and contemporary dance to folk music, jazz and a cappella ensembles"—as part of, and apart from, the 2004 Festival of France. Celette says the French Embassy invites groups "that are not so famous but are very good, so it's a good way for them to get through. . . . Of course, it's very nice for them to have on their resumé an appearance at the Kennedy Center—it has a big prestige—and they very much appreciate that everything is recorded and put on the Web site."

Other partners include the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress, which annually presents "Homegrown: The Music of America" at the library and the Millennium Stage, and the Smithsonian's annual Folklife Festival. There is some theater and storytelling and a good amount of dance. Much of the latter comes via international programming, but the Millennium Stage commissions three new modern dance works every year.

According to Ross, a father of two, Millennium Stage events are perfect starter concerts. "Since there are no tickets involved, they offer families flexibility because they do not have to commit to a performance ahead of time. It's at a family-friendly hour, and the hour [length] is family-friendly. The [6 p.m. start] was not instituted specifically for families but around the start times of [regular] performances, usually 7:30 or later, but it's a big reason it has been so attractive to families. And it's real performing arts in a real environment." And should anyone get restless—that applies to kids and parents—they can take a walk on the River Terrace and come back.

A Millennium Stage audience can swell to several thousand for well-known artists such as Patti Smith, Frank Sinatra Jr. or Los Lobos. Certain annual events draw huge crowds, such as the Merry Tuba Christmas concert (which can feature as many as 100 tubas) and the All-Star Christmas Day Jazz Jam, now dedicated to Keter Betts, the genial bassist who hosted the concert and helped turn it into a Washington tradition that draws overflow crowds every year. Those crowds can be quite active—whether led in rousing scat song by Bobby McFerrin, 250 hand drummers loudly supporting the Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra or the summer parties that set feet flying to all sorts of dance rhythms.

Washington jazz drummer and vibraphonist Chuck Redd has a long history with the Millennium Stage: He played its opening night with Billy Taylor and Charlie Byrd and has performed there more than two dozen times with his own group, as a guest artist with others and as part of the Christmas Day jams.

"I always enjoy it," Redd says. "It's been one of the best things about the arts scene in Washington for many years, and they're very receptive to booking local and regional musicians." Redd points out that people going to the Kennedy Center for an opera or dance performance may be exposed to a jazz concert for the first time, "so it's been absolutely wonderful for the [jazz] community."

For far-flung family, too: Redd's 15-year-old son, Charlie, a guitarist, has been a guest with dad in recent years, "and all our relatives and friends around the country can watch" on the Internet. Also able to watch are club owners and concert presenters, Redd says, adding that archived Internet performances serve as "an instant demo video around the country. Also, the sound is always excellent, and it's rare you get that in what's not actually a concert hall. I hope we celebrate the 40th anniversary some day." (Redd will play the Millennium Stage on Wednesday, supporting guitarists Steve Abshire and Vince Lewis.)

The Millennium Stage's reputation is so good that some people come without knowing, or caring, what's going to be on stage. In fact, some years back, a major snowstorm prevented the scheduled artists from getting to the Kennedy Center. Ross managed to track down a pianist living in Foggy Bottom, and the show went on—with 200 people somehow getting through to provide the audience. That's loyalty.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. S.B. WOO

• Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I wish to acknowledge and commend the efforts of Dr. Shien Biau "S.B." Woo.

Dr. Woo was born in 1937 in Shanghai, China. On October 1, 1949, Mao Zedong

and the Communist Party took control and established the People's Republic of China. After living under communist rule for nearly 6 years, S.B. Woo and his parents came to the United States in 1955 to begin a new life in America.

S.B. Woo took full advantage of this opportunity and earned bachelor of science degrees in mathematics and physics from Georgetown College in Kentucky.

In 1963, S.B. married his wife, Katy, a gifted and accomplished person in her own right. The Woos have been married for nearly 44 years and they have two children, Chi I. and Chi Lan.

S.B. Woo continued his academic career by attaining his Ph.D. in physics from Washington University in St. Louis in 1964. Two years later, he joined the faculty at the University of Delaware, where he became a professor of physics and astronomy.

Dr. Woo has authored numerous scholarly works in the cutting-edge field of physics, with such titles as "Role of Core Size in the Photoelectron Spectrum of Ions with Multiple Detachment Orbitals" and "Zero Core Contribution Calculation of Photodetachment Cross Sections and Photoelectron Spectra of Transition Metal Anions." Now, I'm not exactly sure what these texts are about, but I am sure that S.B. could not only explain them, but that he could explain them in such a way that we would all understand.

In 2002, Dr. Woo retired from teaching, capping a nearly 36-year career at the University of Delaware. He is still rightfully considered by many to be one of the leading experts in the field of physics in our Nation.

While his academic prowess is to be admired, Dr. Woo's greatest contribution has been his steadfast commitment to advancing the cause of Asian Americans in Delaware and across America.

Dr. Woo became the first Asian American to serve in statewide office in Delaware when he was elected lieutenant governor in 1984. With this victory, Dr. Woo became the highest ranking Chinese-American public office holder in the Nation.

Dr. Woo's experience as an immigrant from China gave him a firsthand view of what it is like to come to a new land and begin to build a new life from scratch. While many people would have been satisfied with the success that Dr. Woo found in his chosen fields of physics and politics, he continues his work to improve the way of life for his fellow Asian Americans.

He has worked tirelessly to bring people into the political fold, working to increase voter turnout by reaching out to Asian Americans across the country and encouraging them to become active in the political process.

Today, he also serves as a trustee of the University of Delaware; an Institute Fellow at the Institute of Politics, the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; and as the Na-

tional President of the Organization of Chinese Americans.

I honor and commend my good friend Dr. S.B. Woo for his continued service to the State of Delaware and to Asian Americans across this great country. He is a remarkable yet humble man who has overcome many obstacles to reach the top of his chosen fields, and he continues to this day work to improve the lives of others. I consider it a privilege to know S.B. and Katy Woo and to be able to stand here today to speak on their behalf in the Senate.●

RECOGNITION OF ROBERT CRAWFORD

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment today to honor the distinguished civil service career of a particularly remarkable Iowan. Mr. Robert "Bob" Crawford will be retiring shortly from his civilian service to the Department of the Army and in doing so will leave behind a legacy of exceptional support and dedication to his work and to his country.

Over the years, Bob Crawford has amassed a series of professional accomplishments that are truly outstanding. His commitment to his work has earned him a Commander's Award for Civilian Service and he has twice been awarded the Superior Civilian Service Award. Bob's hard work, honesty, and leadership have become defining characteristics of his career and he has earned the respect of his colleagues and peers for his many years of expertise.

Bob Crawford currently works as the Deputy to the commander for the U.S. Army Joint Munitions Command, JMC, where he is entrusted to maintain the development and production of the ammunition supply for our brave service men and women overseas. Before serving in this capacity, Bob worked in a number of different roles within the ammunition production industry, ranging from a production engineer, to a production director, to a deputy for operations, and finally to his current position. While his responsibilities have shifted and grown over the years, Bob Crawford's commitment to the values of the Department of the Army has remained as steadfast and unwavering as ever.

As early as his time at the University of Illinois and then at St. Ambrose University, Bob has been distinguishing himself within his field and I am glad to be able to congratulate him and honor his magnificent career as it now comes to a close. I wish Bob and his wife Sharon and their children in Bettendorf, IA, the very best of luck for the future and I thank him for his 25 years of public service.●

TRIBUTE TO HERMAN COLEMAN

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the life of Mr. Herman Coleman. Herman was an outstanding and dedicated public servant whose influence, knowledge and achievements were widely

known and highly regarded. Over the course of more than 30 years, Herman held several important positions within the State of Michigan, on the national level and in the private sector. His efforts have made a broad impact.

Herman began his career with the Michigan Education Association, where he would ultimately become the Association's first African-American executive director/ chief administrator. Among other achievements, Herman was an integral part of statewide deliberations regarding the desegregation of Michigan's school districts.

His successful tenure with the MEA led to his appointment as Assistant to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education. As Assistant Secretary, Herman drafted Executive Order No. 12232, which provided the framework for increased Federal assistance to historically Black colleges and universities. This order remains in effect today. Herman would continue his efforts to improve and reform education policy after leaving the U.S. Department of Education.

In 1985, Herman was appointed by Governor Blanchard as the first African-American chief executive officer of the State of Michigan Insurance Department. After a successful tenure with the department, Herman sought to make his mark in the private sector as vice president of corporate relations for AAA Michigan, where he oversaw AAA's community relations and governmental affairs departments. Herman then moved to the health care arena as a consultant for the Potomac Group Consultants, and, in 1994, began service as both partner/marketing director and managing partner of the Insured Vehicle Identification Network, IVIN.

Herman Coleman's strong leadership and pioneering efforts throughout his lifetime are evidenced by his many achievements and by the many awards and honors bestowed upon him. His legacy will reverberate for many years. I know my colleagues in the Senate join me in honoring the life of Mr. Herman Coleman and in offering the most sincere condolences to his daughters, Hope and Heather, the rest of his family and to his many colleagues and friends. He will truly be missed.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

The following messages from the President of the United States were transmitted to the Senate by one of his secretaries:

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE INTERDICTION OF AIRCRAFT ENGAGED IN ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING—PM 3

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with the authorities relating to official immunity in the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking (Public Law 107-108, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2291-4), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, I am providing a report prepared by my Administration. This report includes matters relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 2007.

REPORT RELATIVE TO BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE CONFLICT IN COTE D'IVOIRE—PM 4

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire are to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2007.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and attacks against international peacekeeping forces leading to fatalities. This situation poses a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 2007.

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—PM 5

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United

States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on the Budget; and Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

America is a country of opportunity. Throughout our history, we have overcome great challenges by drawing on the strength, creativity, and resolve of the American people. We have adapted to change—while maintaining our commitment to freedom and an open economy.

Our economy is strong and growing. Federal revenues are robust, and we have made significant progress in reducing the deficit. The Budget I am presenting achieves balance by 2012. My formula for a balanced budget reflects the priorities of our country at this moment in its history: protecting the homeland and fighting terrorism, keeping the economy strong with low taxes, and keeping spending under control while making Federal programs more effective.

As Commander in Chief, my highest priority is the security of our Nation. My Budget invests substantial resources to fight the Global War on Terror, and ensure our homeland is protected from those who would do us harm. We will transform our military to meet the new threats of the 21st Century and provide the brave men and women on the front lines with the resources they need to be successful in this decisive ideological struggle. The Budget will support a new strategy in Iraq that demands more from Iraq's elected government, and gives American forces in Iraq the reinforcements they need to complete their mission. And it will continue to provide the tools necessary to keep America safe by detecting, disrupting, and dismantling terrorist plots.

The U.S. economy is strong. Since August 2003, 7.2 million jobs have been created. Unemployment is low. Wages are growing. Productivity is strong. Inflation and interest rates are low. And we have seen tremendous progress despite a series of challenges, including recession, the terrorist attacks of 2001, corporate scandals, the costliest natural disaster in our Nation's history, energy price spikes, and a temporary slowdown in the housing sector. The resilience of our economy is a tribute to America's workers and entrepreneurs. And well-timed, pro-growth tax policies helped create the right climate for innovation and entrepreneurship.

The Federal deficit is declining and on a path to elimination. Last year, we successfully met our goal of cutting the deficit in half, three years ahead of schedule. This occurred because tax relief helped the economy to recover and grow, resulting in record-high revenues while we restrained non-security discretionary spending. With continued strong economic growth and spending discipline, we are now positioned to

balance the budget by 2012, while providing for our national security and making tax relief permanent.

My Budget proposes to keep non-security discretionary spending below inflation for the next five years. My Budget also reforms projects and spending that don't get the job done. We need lawmakers' support to help us accomplish this goal—including reforms that will improve the Congressional budget process.

To bolster public confidence in the Government's ability to manage taxpayers' money successfully, Congress should adopt earmark reform. The earmark process should be made more transparent, ending the practice of concealing earmarks in so-called report language never included in legislation. The number and cost of earmarks should be cut by at least half by the end of this session. I have also called on Congress to adopt the legislative line-item veto, which gives the Legislative and Executive Branches a tool to help eliminate wasteful spending. These common-sense reforms will help prevent billions of taxpayers' dollars from being spent on unnecessary and unjustified projects.

To keep this economy strong we must take on the challenge of entitlements. Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are commitments of conscience, and so it is our duty to keep them permanently sound. If we do not address this challenge, we will one day leave our children with three bad options: huge tax increases, huge deficits, or huge and immediate cuts in benefits.

In the short term, my Budget works to slow the rate of growth of these programs, saving \$96 billion over five years. This Administration is also actively working with Congress to comprehensively reform and improve these vital programs so they will be strong for the next generations of Americans.

I am optimistic about the future of our country. We are an entrepreneurial and hard-working Nation. And while we face great challenges, we enjoy great opportunities. This Budget reflects our highest priorities while reducing the deficit and achieving a balanced budget by 2012. I am confident that this approach will help make our country more secure and more prosperous.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 2007.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following measure was discharged from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and referred as indicated:

S. 153. A bill to provide for the monitoring of the long-term medical health of firefighters who responded to emergencies in certain disaster areas and for the treatment of such firefighters; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-580. A communication from the General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the HOPE VI program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-581. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska natural gas pipeline and describing any issue impeding that progress; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-582. A communication from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Corrections and Updates to Technical Guidelines for Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Reporting" (RIN1901-AB23) received on January 31, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-583. A communication from the Acting Officer, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Texas Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan" (Docket No. TX-056-FOR) received on February 1, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-584. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report relative to a document recently issued by the Agency related to its regulatory programs; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-585. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "North Dakota State University v. United States, 255 F.3d 599 (8th Cir. 2001), nonacq., 2001-2 C.B. xv" (Action on Decision: AOD 2007-6) received on January 31, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-586. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice on Closing Agreements for Certain Life Insurance and Annuity Contracts that Fail to Meet the Requirements of Sections 817(h), 7702 and 7702A" (Notice 2007-15) received on January 31, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-587. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Rev. Proc. 2001-42" (Rev. Proc. 2007-19) received on January 31, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-588. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Diversification of Investments in Certain Defined Contribution Plans—Section 901 of Pension Protection Act" (Notice 2006-107) received on January 31, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-589. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs,

Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the actions of departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation from January 1 to December 31, 2005; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-590. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program Report for Fiscal Year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-591. A communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. 488. A bill to revise the boundary of the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 489. A bill to improve efficiency in the Federal Government through the use of green buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 490. A bill to provide for the return of the Fresnel Lens to the lantern room atop Presque Isle Light Station Lighthouse, Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. COBURN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. DOLE, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 69. A resolution recognizing the African-American spiritual as a national treasure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. Res. 70. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Commander of Multinational Forces-Iraq and all United States personnel under his command should receive from Congress the full support necessary to carry out the United States mission in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. Res. 71. A resolution expressing support for the Transitional Federal Government of the Somali Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 5

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Washington

(Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) were added as cosponsors of S. 5, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research.

S. 65

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to modify the age-60 standard for certain pilots and for other purposes.

S. 67

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) were added as cosponsors of S. 67, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

S. 93

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 93, a bill to authorize NTIA to borrow against anticipated receipts of the Digital Television and Public Safety Fund to initiate migration to a national IP-enabled emergency network capable of receiving and responding to all citizen activated emergency communications.

S. 214

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys.

S. 261

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.

S. 291

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 291, a bill to establish a digital and wireless network technology program, and for other purposes.

S. 311

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, supra.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, supra.

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, supra.

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, supra.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to establish an Indian youth telemental health demonstration project.

S. 340

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 340, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States and for other purposes.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State.

S. 402

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 402, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified timber gains.

S. 415

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 415, a bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to prevent the use of the legal system in a manner that extorts money from State and local governments, and the Federal Government, and inhibits such governments' constitutional actions under the first, tenth, and fourteenth amendments.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to require convicted sex offenders to register online identifiers, and for other purposes.

S. 433

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to state United States policy for Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of

military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation.

S. 448

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 448, a bill to prohibit the use of funds to continue deployment of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq beyond six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 465

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 465, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act and title III of the Public Health Service Act to improve access to information about individuals' health care options and legal rights for care near the end of life, to promote advance care planning and decision-making so that individuals' wishes are known should they become unable to speak for themselves, to engage health care providers in disseminating information about and assisting in the preparation of advance directives, which include living wills and durable powers of attorney for health care, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on Iraq.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 7, supra.

S. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 18, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding designation of the month of November as "National Military Family Month".

AMENDMENT NO. 97

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 97 intended to be proposed to S. 294, a bill to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 489. A bill to improve efficiency in the Federal Government through the use of green buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President. I rise to introduce the Green Buildings Act of 2007. This bill is intended to continue the hard work of our former colleague

from Vermont, Senator Jim Jeffords, and would place an emphasis on energy efficient and healthy building environments.

In the opening weeks of this 110th Congress we have seen a significant focus on the future energy security and environmental health of our Nation and indeed the world. Much attention has been paid to the issue of global climate change and it is my firm belief that not only are the energy and environmental challenges that we face today varied, but that our solutions must be multi-faceted. In order to meet the rising demands of a growing world population and its expanding economies, we need to address the way we create energy, conserve energy, and preserve the environment.

Green Buildings are structures that are designed and built with energy-efficient and renewable materials to conserve energy and environmental resources. These buildings last longer, use less energy, and promote a healthier environment for those who may work or live in them. Green buildings have reduced electricity, heating, and cooling requirements; use less water; and may even use renewable sources of water and electricity. Recent volatility in energy costs and constraints on the electricity grid in much of the U.S. have led developers to explore the potential economic benefits of these efficient buildings as well. It is my belief that green buildings will become a significant contributor to America's energy conservation efforts and that is why I am introducing this bill today.

The proposal I offer today is one small step in the right direction and draws upon a bill approved by the Environment and Public Works Committee in 2006. The federal government is already setting an example in energy efficiency under the leadership of the White House and Department of Energy. This bill will take the next step and create an office within the General Services Administration (GSA) to oversee green building initiatives within the Federal Government and provide support for information to State and local governments as well as the private sector. With almost 9,000 buildings and 340 million square feet of space, the GSA has the experience and expertise to manage this effort for the Federal Government. The Office of Green Buildings at the GSA will be advised by a Green Buildings Council to be comprised of Federal, State, local, and private sector participants to establish guidelines and create resources for public and private builders across the country. It is my hope that the use of green buildings in the Federal real estate portfolio will contribute to increased health of the public, productivity of work, and conservation of energy.

While some portions of the private sector have caught on to the many benefits of green or "sustainable design," this bill's establishment of grants

through the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) to assist school systems in their school construction efforts will bring these benefits to the places our children spend so much of their time and the facilities that consume a significant amount of energy in our communities. In addition to grants to school systems, the bill would create an indoor air quality program for Federal buildings, encourage incentives for Federal agencies, and authorize research and demonstration projects in each of the four climatic regions of the United States. The bill is modest in scope, authorizing \$50 million over 5 years to begin this most important effort in the Federal Government.

I know many of you share in my desire to advance our Nation's conservation agenda. Indeed, many have supported the efforts of our recently retired colleague from Vermont and have your own ideas. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and on the Environment and Public Works Committee as we move this proposal forward. Green Buildings will be a significant part of our country's energy and environmental future and this bill will help us in that effort.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 490. A bill to provide for the return of the Fresnel Lens to the lantern room atop Presque Isle Light Station Lighthouse, Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Lester Nichols Presque Isle Light Station Act of 2007.

The Presque Isle Light Station Act requires the return of the historic third order Fresnel lens to the lighthouse in Presque Isle, MI. The lens was removed four years ago for restoration work, but now it is time to replace it and preserve the historic integrity of the beautiful Presque Isle lighthouse.

Michigan has more lighthouses than any other State. Not only are these historic structures symbolic of our maritime heritage, they are the heart of Michigan's coastal communities. Lighthouses are a key part of the tourist economy of many small Michigan towns, and the historic character of our lighthouses brings tourists from all over the country. So it is imperative that we protect, restore, and preserve the Presque Isle lighthouse and all of Michigan's 120 lighthouses.

I am pleased to introduce this legislation with Senator LEVIN. In the House of Representatives, Congressman STUPAK is the sponsor of a companion bill. So the Michigan delegation is united in our resolve to restore the Fresnel lens to the Presque Isle lighthouse for the enjoyment and education of future generations.

Finally, I want to say a word about the man for whom we have named this bill: Lester Nichols. Without Les Nichols' dedication we would never have

been able to restore Presque Isle's Fresnel lens. Last fall, Les lost his courageous battle against cancer. He was a pillar of his community. He was passionate about the Presque Isle lighthouse and he will be truly missed. Naming this bill for him is the least we can do to show our gratitude for all of his work. And I hope that we will soon be able to put the Fresnel lens back in the lighthouse and give Les the victory that he so wanted to see.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 69—RECOGNIZING THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN SPIRITUAL AS A NATIONAL TREASURE

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. COBURN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. DOLE, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 69

Whereas since slavery was introduced into the European colonies in 1619, enslaved Africans remained in bondage until the United States ratified the 13th amendment to the Constitution in 1865;

Whereas during that period in the history of the United States, the first expression of a unique American music was created by enslaved African-Americans who—

(1) used their knowledge of the English language and the Christian religious faith, as it had been taught to them in the New World; and

(2) stealthily wove within the music their experience of coping with human servitude and their strong desire to be free;

Whereas as a method of survival, enslaved African-Americans who were forbidden to speak their native languages, play musical instruments they had used in Africa, or practice their traditional religious beliefs, relied on their strong African oral tradition of songs, stories, proverbs, and historical accounts to create an original genre of music, now known as spirituals;

Whereas Calvin Earl, a noted performer of, and educator on, African-American spirituals, remarked that the Christian lyrics became a metaphor for freedom from slavery, a secret way for slaves to "communicate with each other, teach their children, record their history, and heal their pain";

Whereas the New Jersey Historical Commission found that "some of those daring and artful runaway slaves who entered New Jersey by way of the Underground Railroad no doubt sang the words of old Negro spirituals like 'Steal Away' before embarking on their perilous journey north";

Whereas African-American spirituals spread all over the United States, and the songs we know of today may represent only a small portion of the total number of spirituals that once existed;

Whereas Frederick Douglass, a fugitive slave who would become one of the leading abolitionists in the United States, remarked that spirituals "told a tale of woe which was then altogether beyond my feeble comprehension; they were tones loud, long, and deep; they breathed the prayer and complaint of souls boiling over with the bitterest

anguish. Every tone was a testimony against slavery and a prayer to God for deliverance from chains.”; and

Whereas section 2(a)(1) of the American Folklife Preservation Act (20 U.S.C. 2101(a)(1)) states that “the diversity inherent in American folklife has contributed greatly to the cultural richness of the Nation and has fostered a sense of individuality and identity among the American people”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that African-American spirituals are a poignant and powerful genre of music that have become one of the most significant segments of American music in existence;

(2) expresses the deepest gratitude, recognition, and honor to the former enslaved Africans in the United States for their gifts to the Nation, including their original music and oral history; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to reflect on the important contribution of African-American spirituals to United States history and to recognize the African-American spiritual as a national treasure.

SENATE RESOLUTION 70—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE COMMANDER OF MULTINATIONAL FORCES-IRAQ AND ALL UNITED STATES PERSONNEL UNDER HIS COMMAND SHOULD RECEIVE FROM CONGRESS THE FULL SUPPORT NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT THE UNITED STATES MISSION IN IRAQ

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 70

Whereas more than 137,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States are currently serving in Iraq, like thousands of others since March 2003, with the bravery and professionalism consistent with the finest traditions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and deserve the support of all Americans;

Whereas past mistakes in United States strategy, aggression by various groups that reject peace, and other difficulties have contributed to a dire security situation in Iraq characterized by insurgent activity and sectarian violence;

Whereas a failed state in Iraq would present a threat to regional and world peace, and the long-term security interests of the United States are best served by an Iraq that can sustain, govern, and defend itself;

Whereas no amount of additional United States forces in Iraq can effect this outcome in Iraq unless the people and Government of Iraq take difficult political steps toward reconciliation;

Whereas the establishment of a basic level of security in Baghdad and throughout Iraq is an essential precondition for reconciliation and political and economic progress in Iraq;

Whereas these steps must include the fulfillment of military, political, and economic commitments that the Government of Iraq has made to the United States and to the people of Iraq;

Whereas Iraqi political leaders must show visible progress toward meeting specific benchmarks, including—

(1) deploying a significant number of new Iraqi security forces to partner with United States units in securing Baghdad;

(2) assuming responsibility for security in all provinces in Iraq in a timely manner;

(3) disarming individual militias as circumstances warrant and ensuring that security forces are accountable to the central government and loyal to the constitution of Iraq;

(4) ensuring equitable distribution of the resources of the Government of Iraq without regard to the sect or ethnicity of recipients;

(5) enacting and implementing legislation to ensure that the oil resources of Iraq benefit Sunni Arabs, Shia Arabs, Kurds, and other Iraqi citizens in an equitable manner;

(6) building an effective, independent judiciary that will uphold the rule of law and ensure equal protection under the law for all citizens of Iraq;

(7) pursuing all those who engage in violence or threaten the security of the Iraqi population, regardless of sect or political affiliation;

(8) enacting and implementing legislation that reforms the de-Ba’athification process in Iraq;

(9) conducting provincial elections in Iraq;

(10) ensuring a fair process for amending the constitution of Iraq; and

(11) expending promised funds to provide basic services and employment opportunities for all Iraqis, including a \$10,000,000,000 fund for reconstruction, and ensuring that these funds reach both Sunni and Shia areas, including Sunni neighborhoods in Baghdad and largely Sunni Anbar Province;

Whereas the United States Ambassador to Iraq and the Commander of Multinational Forces-Iraq should report each month to the Senate on the progress being made by Iraqis toward achieving the benchmarks specified in the preceding clause and on their own progress in achieving their missions in Iraq;

Whereas leaders in the Administration of President George W. Bush and Congress have made it clear to the Iraqi leadership that the commitment of the United States in Iraq is not open-ended and that, if the Government of Iraq does not follow through on its promises, it will lose the support of its own people and the people of the United States;

Whereas the moderate countries of the Middle East, and other countries around the world, have an interest in a successful conclusion to the war in Iraq and should increase their constructive assistance toward the achievement of this end;

Whereas over the past year, leaders in the Administration of President George W. Bush and Congress, as well as recognized experts outside government, acknowledged that the situation in Iraq was deteriorating and required a change in strategy; and

Whereas Lieutenant General David Petraeus has been unanimously confirmed by the Senate as the new Coalition commander in Iraq and given the mission of implementing a new strategy for Iraq designed to bring security to Iraq and pave the way for political and economic progress in Iraq: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should ensure that General David Petraeus, the Commander of Multinational Forces-Iraq, and all United States personnel under his command, have the resources they consider necessary to carry out their mission on behalf of the United States in Iraq; and

(2) the Government of Iraq must make visible, concrete progress toward meeting the political, economic, and military bench-

marks enumerated in the preamble to this Resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 71—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE TRANSITIONAL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF THE SOMALI REPUBLIC

Mr. INHOFE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 71

Whereas, after the collapse of the Somali government in 1991, the main judicial system in Somalia devolved into a system of sharia-based Islamic courts, which have increased their power to include security and enforcement functions;

Whereas, in 2000, the courts consolidated to form the Islamic Courts Union (ICU), which came into conflict with secular warlords in the capitol city of Mogadishu by asserting its ever increasing power;

Whereas, the ICU is known to have links to Al-Qaeda and has provided a safe haven for members of Al-Qaeda;

Whereas, by June 2006, ICU forces controlled Mogadishu and much of southern Somalia, creating a potential haven for Islamic terrorists;

Whereas, in 2004, the Transitional Federal Government of the Somali Republic (TFG) was formed in Kenya;

Whereas, in 2006, the TFG army joined forces with the army of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia to sweep the ICU from power and, after a string of swift military victories, enter Mogadishu; and

Whereas, the current situation is still volatile, creating a short window of opportunity to positively affect Somalia’s stability and future status:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Senate expresses its support for the Transitional Federal Government of the Somali Republic;

(2) the Senate recognizes Ethiopia, particularly Prime Minister Meles, and Kenya for the noble efforts aimed toward pursuing peace in Somalia and support for the United States in the War on Terror;

(3) the United States should support and push efforts for serious multi-party talks aimed at establishing a national unity government in Somalia;

(4) the United States should take several measures, at an appropriate time, to promote stability;

(5) assistance from the United States will better equip the TFG to face the challenges of restoring peace to this war-torn country;

(6) the United States should promote foreign investment in Somalia and facilitate financial and technical assistance to the TFG; and

(7) the United States should aid the TFG to—

(A) locate and free Somali-owned financial assets throughout the world;

(B) solicit support from other friendly countries; and

(C) encourage nongovernmental organizations to commit more resources and projects to Somalia.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, recent events in Somalia have opened a unique window of opportunity. The Islamic Courts have been militarily defeated. However, the Ethiopian troops that are currently maintaining order have stated that they have no intention of remaining. There are reports of

troop withdrawals back to the Ethiopian border. Without outside support I fear that the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) and Somalia as a whole will be swept back into the cycle of violence and chaos that has defined the country for the past 15 years.

I believe that the United States can make great progress in securing the Horn of Africa by what actions we take right now. First and foremost is security. Until the government troops can offer sustainable stability, we need to assist them. This solution need not include U.S. troops; I am aware of negotiations for the deployment of 8,000 troops from other African countries, including a force of about 1,000 from Uganda. Any efforts in this direction should be greatly encouraged.

The United States has no formal representative to the Somali Republic. The Transitional Federal Government has requested creating such a position.

We need to offer assistance and aid at this most crucial juncture. At an appropriate time the U.S. should encourage public and private investment, possibly through a trade mission. Other areas where help is greatly needed include security training, basic sanitation, water purification, and tax collection.

Perhaps most importantly, we should assist in any steps that can be taken to establish a national unity government. This will require groups from all sides of the spectrum getting together and working out serious solutions.

The United States can make great progress in securing the Horn of Africa by what actions we take right now. I am submitting a resolution expressing the following: support for the Transitional Federal Government; recognize Ethiopia, particularly Prime Minister Meles, and Kenya for the noble efforts aimed toward pursuing peace in Somalia and support for the United States in the War on Terror; and the U.S. should support and push efforts for serious multi-party talks aimed at establishing a national unity government.

There are a number of measures that should be taken at an appropriate time by the United States to promote stability. With the assistance of the U.S., the TFG will be better equipped to face the challenges of restoring peace to this war-torn country.

While I understand that the situation is volatile and some forms of assistance may not be immediately appropriate, I believe it is necessary to raise awareness that there are definite ways that we can affect progress. Please join me in supporting Somalia and bringing peace to this war-torn region.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 231. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 470, to express the sense of Congress on Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 232. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 470, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 231. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 470, to express the sense of Congress on Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, strike line 24.

On page 10, and 18, strike "intervention.", and insert the following: intervention; and

(13) no United States military forces should be deployed to Iraq after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress before such deployment that such forces are adequately equipped and trained for the missions to be discharged by such forces in Iraq.

SA 232. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 470, to express the sense of Congress on Iraq; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 7, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 8, line 13, and insert the following:

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Senate disagrees with the President's plan to escalate United States military involvement in Iraq.

(2) Congress should establish an end-date for the deployment of United States military forces in Iraq;

(3) the Senate believes a failed state in Iraq would present a threat to regional and world peace, and the long-term security interests of the United States are best served by an Iraq that can sustain, govern, and defend itself, and serve as an ally in the war against extremists;

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Monday, February 12, 2007, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The dual purpose of this hearing is to receive recommendations on policies and programs to improve the energy efficiency of buildings and to expand the role of electric and gas utilities in energy efficiency programs.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Deborah Estes at (202) 224-5360 or Britni Rillera at (202) 224-1219.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law be authorized to meet on Monday, February 5, 2007 at 3 p.m. to conduct a hearing on "Genocide and the Rule of Law" in Room 226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Witness List

The Honorable Sigal Mandelker, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

Lieutenant General The Honorable Romeo A. Dallaire, Senator, Parliament of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

Don Cheadle, Actor and Activist, Los Angeles, CA.

Diane F. Orentlicher, Professor, Washington College of Law, American University, Washington, DC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress: the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD; the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD; the Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON; the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY; and the Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, appoints the Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN, as Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during 110th Congress.

REFERRAL OF S. 153 TO THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 153 and the bill be referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 26, 2007, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY,
FEBRUARY 6, 2007

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m., Tuesday, February 6; that on Tuesday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their

use later in the day; that there then be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the majority and the time allocated 10 minutes each: LEAHY, MIKULSKI, and KENNEDY; that the Republicans control the next 30 minutes, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the majority and the minority; that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 3:30 p.m., Tuesday in order to accommodate the respective conference work periods and to permit

Members to attend an intelligence briefing which begins at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. SANDERS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:11 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 6, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO JOHN A. HOOPER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent John A. Hooper who passed away on January 17, 2007, at the Sequoias Portola Valley, California, at the age of 89. He was an extraordinary Californian and a public servant who devoted much of his career to serving his country.

Mr. Hooper was born in San Francisco in 1917, graduating from Thacher School in 1934 and from Stanford University in 1938 where he earned a bachelor's degree in political science. He earned a law degree from Harvard Law School and served as a captain in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1946. He married Trish Lowrey, the great love of his life, in 1943 and they had four children during their enduring marriage of 63 years.

Mr. Hooper was a distinguished attorney with the law firm of Pillsbury, Madison and Sutro and practiced tax law for 10 years until he was asked by President Eisenhower to represent the U.S. Department of Defense in NATO. He also served under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson as Minister to the U.S. Mission to NATO. He was based in Paris with his wife and four children until 1967 and was honored with the Pentagon's Meritorious Civilian Service Award for his great work. His son, John C. Hooper, said: "All of Europe was emerging from World War II, and the United States was helping Europe to get back on its feet; that was a real high point of my parents' lives."

Upon their return to the United States, John, Trish and their family moved to the land his grandfather purchased, Mountain Home Ranch in Woodside where they lived until moving to the Sequoias. He devoted himself to working with charitable and community organizations, serving as president of Planned Parenthood of Northern California, as president of the Auxiliary of the University of California Hospital, and as president of the Board of Delegates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California. He was a member of the Woodside Planning Commission for 7 years and served as its chair from 1979 to 1980. He was a member of the Pacific Union Club and president of the Cypress Lawn Cemetery Association.

I had the privilege of knowing John Hooper. He was an elegant, intelligent gentleman who was respected by his entire community. I benefited from his wise counsel and our country is better because of his patriotism and service. John Hooper was a national treasure and that's why Madam Speaker I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our deepest sympathy to Trish Hooper and their children, John C. Hooper of Point Arena, Margo H. Blair of Chicago, Lawrence Hooper of Twisp, WA, and Helen McCloskey of Rumsey, CA.

REMEMBERING STATE SENATOR WILLIAM A. TRUBAN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring the attention of the House to the passing of Virginia State Senator William A. Truban on Saturday, February 3, 2007. Senator Truban represented Virginia's 27th district in the Virginia General Assembly for over 20 years.

A veterinarian and father of six from Shenandoah County, Senator Truban was a leader in his community and dedicated his life to helping those in Winchester and the surrounding area. Inserted for the RECORD is the obituary published in the Winchester Star which details the many accomplishments of Senator Truban.

[From the Winchester Star, Feb. 5, 2007]

FORMER STATE SEN. TRUBAN DIES

(By Suzanne E. Wilder)

WINCHESTER.—William A. Truban, a longtime Virginia state senator who represented Winchester and the surrounding region for more than two decades, died on Saturday.

The resident of Shenandoah County and retired veterinarian was 82.

Truban represented the state's 27th District—which then included Shenandoah, Frederick, Clarke, and Warren counties and the city of Winchester—from 1971 through his 1992 retirement from politics.

His family and friends are mourning the loss of a man who was well known in the Shenandoah Valley as "Senator Truban," "Doc," or—to his loved ones—"Pap," according to a statement from one of his sons, John W. Truban.

Born in 1924 in Garrett County, Md., Truban served during World War II as a member of the U.S. Army Air Force.

After his service, he attended West Virginia Wesleyan College, where he met his future wife, Mildred Hayes. He then attended the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine.

John Truban, one of Truban's six children, said his parents selected Woodstock and the Shenandoah Valley for their home after visiting Winchester, where one of William Truban's sisters lived.

Truban became the only licensed veterinarian in Shenandoah County, John Truban said.

He worked all over the Valley and cared for animals from Woodstock to Haymarket to Stephens City. His veterinary practice, Shenandoah Animal Hospital, is still in business though Truban retired several years ago. His son, Thomas, continues to run the clinic.

In 1970, Truban was elected to the Virginia State Senate. He had been urged to run by several prominent Republicans, including then-Gov. A. Linwood Holton Jr.

"I met him when he was under a cow," Holton said in a telephone interview on Sunday.

Their first phone conversation, Holton recalled, had been after someone informed him that Truban was caring for a sick cow.

Holton had heard that Truban would make "an excellent candidate for state Senate," he

said. "And he became a strong leader in the Senate."

"You need good people to represent the area. He was well known and well liked," said Warren B. French, a former chairman of the state Republican party who lives in Woodstock. "And he made a great senator."

"He'll be missed, but he made a valuable contribution in many ways to his community," said French, who is a former chairman at Shentel and knew Truban from the Woodstock United Methodist Church.

Many of the people who worked with him politically remember Truban as a person with "strong integrity," in Holton's words.

I. Clinton Miller served in the General Assembly for much of the time Truban was a state senator.

Miller represented Shenandoah County and Woodstock in the House of Delegates and was also a Republican. At the time, the GOP was in the minority in Virginia politics.

"We shared a lot of time on the road, and we shared a lot of discussions," Miller said.

Truban "was especially well-liked by both sides of the aisle," Miller said. "He was always concerned with whatever was best for Virginia."

John Truban said his father instilled the value of hard work in his children.

"He loved working," he said. "His hobby was working."

That diligent attitude likely came from growing up during the Great Depression, the son said. "His era, they had no safety net."

"I think what we all probably got from his is a sense of working hard and . . . trying to help others," John Truban said.

But that was not the only trait Truban passed to his kids. John Truban said his dad, who was Italian by blood, loved to cook and passed the same interest to his five sons and one daughter.

"My dad always would cook and help out in the kitchen," he said.

Truban had health problems in recent years, including congestive heart failure. He died as a result of those illnesses, John Truban said.

Truban is survived by his wife, six children, 25 grandchildren, seven great-grandchildren, and one brother. Truban's two sisters and a brother are deceased.

A memorial service will be at 1 p.m. Saturday at the Woodstock United Methodist Church. Dellinger Funeral Home in Woodstock is in charge of arrangements.

Memorials may be made to the Woodstock United Methodist Church, the Virginia Maryland Regional College of Veterinary Medicine at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and the Shenandoah County Animal Shelter.

IN RECOGNITION OF COACH TONY "MAC" McDONALD'S 600 CAREER VICTORIES

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Coach Tony McDonald for his tremendous achievement of 600 career

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

victories as head basketball coach at Central High School in Allentown, FL, located in my district in northwest Florida.

Coach Mac himself graduated in 1969 from Allentown School, one of three schools that would come to be known as Central High School. After graduating, he went on to honorably serve his country for 4 years in the United States Air Force at Eglin Air Force Base, not far from home. During his time in the service, Tony was able to come back to Allentown and watch the basketball games, developing a stronger desire to return and coach at the spirited school.

After the Air Force, Tony stayed in northwest Florida and attended the University of West Florida, graduating from there in 1977. It was shortly after this graduation that he returned to become the Junior Varsity Basketball coach at his alma mater of Allentown High School. A year later, he became head coach, a position he stayed with for three seasons. Tony left for rival Milton High School to serve as their head basketball coach for the following season.

Tony's heart was always with his alma mater, though, and soon enough he returned once again to Allentown School. By the time the 1985–86 basketball season kicked off with Coach at the helm, Allentown School had consolidated with Chumuckla School and Munson School, and the high school sections became Central High School, and under this name Tony would coach his students for the next 22 seasons, having a banner career in the process.

For six seasons during those early years at Central, Coach Mac was in charge of both the boys' and girls' teams, and was able to bring the girls' team their first winning season. Every day was another challenge to better his students, and many acknowledge how well he motivated them. What many rival schools noted was Coach Mac's ability to turn a small squad into a basketball powerhouse. While many other schools had teams of several more players, Central's smaller squads continued to play tireless games. While the energy that Coach Mac put into his players was a great factor, so was the energy they gave back to their dedicated coach. Coach's energy also carries into the classroom, where he teaches both geography and American history. It would be difficult to find someone more committed to helping students than Tony McDonald.

Reaching 500 career wins was a milestone in itself, so it was with even more excitement that Coach Mac reached his 600th career win on January 16, 2007. Given the devotion to his players on and off the court, it should not come as a big surprise. During his time as head coach, he has led the team to nine play-off appearances and five district championships. In fact, a sixth district championship this season is not out of the realm of possibility.

Coach McDonald has set a high standard in his dedication to his work and his devotion to his students. A benchmark has been established for many other high school coaches. Coaches serve as role models for students, and Coach Mac has without a doubt been a great role model for those that played for him. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is a great honor for me to congratulate Coach Tony "Mac" McDonald for over 20 years of dedication to his high school students and an amazing 600 career wins as head coach of Central High School.

IN MEMORY OF WALTER
SHERIDAN HARPOOL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Walter Sheridan Harpool of Denton, Texas, who passed away at 84 years of age on Sunday, January 28, 2007.

Mr. Walter Harpool, also known as "Pinky", was born in Hebron, Texas on February 14, 1922 to Josephine and R.T. Harpool. The family moved to Denton, Texas in 1928, and later started the company Harpool Seed, Inc. Created in 1962, Harpool Fertilizer Co. was the first independent bulk blending plant for fertilizer in Texas.

Mr. Harpool served in the Army Air Force during World War II. After training at Santa Ana, King City and Lancaster, CA, he received his wings at Phoenix, AZ. He became a flight instructor at Perrin Field, Sherman, TX, and then took B-18 training at Sebring, FL. Mr. Harpool was later stationed at Langley Field as a pilot for radar students.

Due to his dedication and passion for agriculture and agribusiness, he was honored as Man of the Year in Texas Agriculture in 1987, and in 1998 was name Conservation Businessman of the Year. He had a fine interest in farm production and improvement, and regularly donated materials such as seed and fertilizer for agriculture research and demonstrations across the state of Texas. Not only did he serve as Chairman of the Denton County Program Building Committee, where he worked with numerous crop and livestock committees, but he also served on the State Board of Agriculture during Governor Bill Clements administration. Mr. Walter Harpool was an avid supporter of many civic functions, such as the Denton Youth Fair, the North Texas State Fair, United Way, and the Denton Chamber of Commerce.

In 1987 Mr. Harpool bought and renovated an old train caboos, which he used as his office. He enjoyed the occasions on which his friends and customers would drop by to visit him. His outstanding and honest character continued to delight those he came into contact with. Despite his life as a strong businessman, taking care of his family held the utmost importance to Mr. Harpool. He showered them with love and devotion, and took pride in providing for them.

Mr. Walter Sheridan Harpool is survived by his wife, Rose Harpool, his son, Walter S. Harpool, Jr., and his brother, Tom Harpool. I extend my sincerest sympathies to his family and friends, and I am honored to have been able to represent such a remarkable man.

HONORING THE DEDICATION OF
THE KEISER FAMILY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the hard work and commitment of the Keiser family. Evelyn Keiser was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and

graduated from Temple University. She was one of the first women in the United States to receive a Bachelors Degree in Medical Technology.

Evelyn Keiser moved to south Florida in 1961 and co-founded Keiser College in 1977. Art & Belinda Keiser, along with Evelyn, have continued to serve our community by providing superior education through Keiser College, now known as Keiser University.

The Keiser Family continues to contribute to Broward County and the State of Florida, not only through their educational institutions, but also through philanthropy. Keiser University will celebrate their 30th Anniversary in 2007.

Madam Speaker, I proclaim January 31, 2007, as Keiser University Day in the 23rd Congressional District.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PERCY
LAVON JULIAN

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today we honor one of the most accomplished scientists of the twentieth century; a man who would not be deterred by racial bias. Today we honor the life and research of Dr. Percy Julian.

Dr. Julian worked tirelessly, and won acclaim for his work in organic chemistry. A brilliant chemist, Dr. Julian developed a treatment for glaucoma, a new process to produce cortisone, and a fire retardant used by the US Navy, which saved countless American lives during World War II. Throughout his distinguished career Dr. Julian was awarded an impressive 105 patents. His many scientific accomplishments led to his election as a member of the prestigious National Academy of Sciences in 1973.

Dr. Percy's contribution to the study of science is remarkable, yet we cannot forget the racial barriers that Dr. Julian was able to overcome. Born the grandson of Alabama slaves, Dr. Julian was a civil rights pioneer. Dr. Julian was forced to fight through racial prejudice and intimidation to establish himself as a pre-eminent chemist. Let us not forget, as the first African-American family to live in the Chicago suburb of Oak Park, the Julian house was fire-bombed in 1950. And again, on June 12, 1951, the Julian house was attacked, this time with dynamite. Yet, through it all, we should not forget the courage he displayed and his perseverance.

We, as a nation, owe much to Percy Julian and it is a privilege to honor him today.

HONORING BLACK HISTORY
MONTH

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I welcome you to join me in commemorating the the history of Africans in the Americas. Since 1926, the month of

February has been the designated time for honoring the Black contribution. It serves as a reminder that we must be ever vigilant of the Black experience in this country, and the African roots of our shared concepts of freedom, hope, and justice. This year's theme for Black History Month is fittingly, "From Slavery to Freedom: The Story of Africans in the Americas."

As Chair of the Congressional Ethiopia and Ethiopian American Caucus, I am particularly interested in the history of Africans in this country. My experience with this community has taught me that the history of the Diaspora is as complex and divergent as the communities themselves. Our challenge this month is educate ourselves about the Diaspora and to understand how African Americans embrace and explore their heritage.

This February, let us broaden our understanding of the myriad ways people of African descent arrived here—beyond the slave trade. Let us be honest and open about the impact that slavery has had on African descendant communities today, but let us also celebrate the African contribution to our culture in spite of it. The best way to honor the African American experience is to educate oneself and one's community. I urge you to use this month to expose yourselves to the ways in which the African American experience has already been made a part of your life.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.J. RES. 20, FURTHER CON-
TINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FIS-
CAL YEAR 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2007

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we consider this important legislation to highlight several matters of critical importance within the funding allocations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA.

Over past years several of my colleagues and I have worked hard to ensure that NASA fulfills its commitment to its science mission, as well as its commitment to the excellent men and women who daily carry out NASA's cutting-edge missions. In particular, I want to acknowledge and pay tribute to my constituents at NASA Ames Research Center, one of the world's premier research facilities located in my district in California's Silicon Valley.

As we pass this continuing resolution, which we are forced to do by the inaction of the previous majority leadership, it is important that NASA recognize and adhere to the clear intent expressed by both the House and Senate under H.R. 5672, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007, and the accompanying committee reports—House Report 109–520 and Senate Report 109–280. I would like to highlight some important points from these bills.

Within the House-passed version of H.R. 5672, Congress included the following points:

Recognizing the disproportionate reduction proposed by NASA to its research and analysis budget, a recommended \$50 million increase was included.

Following NASA's misguided attempt to discontinue funding the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy, SOFIA project, the House concluded that should NASA's internal review of the program result in a recommended continuation of the program, NASA should accordingly reallocate funds to SOFIA.

Building on the priorities expressed by the House, the Senate Appropriations Committee subsequently included the following high-priority points:

In addressing NASA's management of the SOFIA project, Senate Appropriators stated:

"The budget request eliminates funding for the SOFIA mission in fiscal year 2007. Since the budget was released, NASA has completed a review of its decision and has concluded that there are no scientific or technical reasons for canceling the mission . . . This calls into question the credibility of the science directorate in making budget decisions and determining scientific priorities.

"The Committee expects NASA to come up with a plan to fund the SOFIA mission in 2007 from within available funds through a re-programming request subject to section 505 of this act. In determining the funding strategy for this program, the Committee directs NASA to follow the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences Decadal survey in Astronomy and Astrophysics when setting mission and budget priorities. Missions that are ranked higher in the surveys should be given priority over missions that are ranked lower in priority with launch dates."

To ensure the protection of NASA's critical workforce, the current moratorium on involuntary reductions in force, RIF, was extended from its current expiration date of March 2007 until the end of fiscal year 2008.

These provisions are unequivocal and must be honored by NASA as such. In particular, given Congress's stated and clear questioning of NASA's guidance of the SOFIA project to date, NASA should refrain from making significant changes to SOFIA without Congress first having the opportunity to review their proposals.

Additionally, it is critical that the existing prohibition on the transfer of funds between major accounts is observed consistent with the NASA Authorization Act of 2005. The re-programming of funds across accounts has in the past been used to change funding allocations within NASA in ways that counter the legislative intent of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, NASA and its institutional capabilities are a critical component of our Nation's high-technology research and development infrastructure and must be protected for the sake of our future innovative capability. Ensuring these provisions passed by the Congress are honored as part of this fiscal year 2007 funding process will ensure NASA's continued excellence.

MATH AND SCIENCE INCENTIVE
ACT OF 2007

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, today I introduced with Congressmen EHLERS the Math and Science Incentive Act of 2005. This legis-

lation would pay—over the life of the loan up to \$10,000—the interest on the undergraduate student loans of math, science or engineering majors who agree to work 5 years in their respective fields. The idea for this legislation came from the book *Winning the Future*, by my friend and our former colleague Newt Gingrich. America's dominance in science and innovation is slipping, but this legislation can help combat this trend.

We are facing today a critical shortage of science and engineering students in the United States. Unfortunately, there is little public awareness of this trend or its implications for jobs, industry or national security in America's future. We need to make sure we have people who can fill these science and engineering positions. In an era in which students are graduating college with record levels of debt, I am hopeful that this incentive will be a significant motivator in attracting or retaining math, science and engineering students.

How do we know that our Nation is slipping in the areas of math, science, engineering and technology? Americans, for decades, led the world in patents. But we can no longer claim that lead. The percentage of U.S. patents has been steadily declining as foreigners, especially Asians, have become more active and in some fields have seized the innovation lead. The United States share of its own industrial patents now stands at only 52 percent. Foreign advances in basic science now often rival or even exceed America's. Published research by Americans is lagging.

Physical Review, a series of top physics journals, last year tracked a reversal in which American scientific papers, in two decades, dropped from the most published to minority status. In 2003—the most recent year statistics are available—the total number of American papers published was just 29 percent, down from 61 percent in 1983.

Another measuring stick: Nobel prizes. From the 1960s through the 1990s, American scientists dominated. Now the rest of the world has caught up. Our scientists win now about half of the Nobel prizes, the rest go to Britain, Japan, Russia, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland and New Zealand. According to the National Science Foundation, the United States has a smaller share of the worldwide total of science and engineering doctoral degrees awarded than both Asia and Europe.

This is a real problem. In 2000, Asian universities accounted for almost 1.2 million of the world's science and engineering degrees. European universities—including Russia and eastern Europe accounted for 850,000.

North American universities accounted for only about 500,000. Since 1980, science and engineering positions in the U.S. have grown at five times the rate of positions in the civilian workforce as a whole.

The Math and Science Incentive Act augments the recently approved National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent grants—National SMART grants. National SMART grants provide grants of up to \$4,000 to Pell Grant-eligible students in their third and fourth academic year of undergraduate education at a 4-year, degree-granting institution of higher education. The student must be pursuing a major in the physical, life, or computer sciences, math, technology, or engineering or a foreign language. The student must also have a grade-point average of at least 3.0.

SMART grants are an important tool for attracting and retaining lower-income students in

the critical areas of math, science and engineering. The Math and Science Incentive Act will build on the SMART grants by providing a direct incentive to middle class students who may not meet Pell grant eligibility. We critically need to attract and retain the best and brightest to study these challenging fields and this loan forgiveness may just make the difference for some.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation to help America continue to be the innovation leader of the world.

RECOGNIZING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUT TROOP 10

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the 80th Anniversary of Boy Scout Troop 10.

In 1927, Boy Scout Troop 10 was founded and chartered to First Baptist Church Pensacola in Pensacola, Florida. Today, eighty years later, it is recognized as the oldest active Boy Scout troop in the Boy Scout Gulf Coast Council, which serves the Florida panhandle and lower Alabama.

Over the course of its history, thousands of young men have made the trek with Troop 10 under the leadership of twenty-nine Scoutmasters, and eighty-six have achieved the Eagle Scout rank, The Boy Scouts of America's highest honor.

As trustworthy, loyal, courteous, brave, and reverent young men, Troop 10 exemplifies everything which scouts stand for, and the very ideals that all Americans should strive to attain as our duty to God and this great Nation. From the beginning, Troop 10 has won the hearts and high respect of the communities of Northwest Florida and their presence will continue to do so.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize the 80th Anniversary of Boy Scout Troop 10 and its service to God and Country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PERCY LAVON JULIAN

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 34, to honor Percy Julian, an American research chemist of international renown, and a pioneer in the chemical synthesis of medicinal drugs. During his lifetime, Percy Julian received more than 100 chemical patents.

Percy Julian attended elementary school in Birmingham and later moved to Montgomery, Alabama where he attended high school. After high school, Julian applied to and was accepted into DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana. At DePauw, he began as a probationary student, having to take higher level high school classes along with his freshman

and sophomore course load. He was named a member of the Sigma Xi honorary society as well as a Phi Beta Kappa member.

Upon graduation from DePauw in 1920, he was selected as the class valedictorian. Julian was awarded the Austin Fellowship in Chemistry and moved to the distinguished Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where he achieved straight A's, finished at the top of his class and received a Masters Degree in 1923.

Percy Julian proved himself to be a brilliant chemist. Among his many patents, most notable are—a foam fire retardant, a treatment for glaucoma and a low-cost process to produce cortisone. His innovative approach to chemistry helped to make important medicines more accessible to millions.

Please join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 34, honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences.

IN MEMORY OF DR. DAVID RAY REDDEN

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. David Ray Redden who passed away at 85 years of age on Sunday, January 21, 2007.

Dr. David Ray Redden lived a long, beautiful life. He was born on December 22, 1921 in McKinney, Texas. He served in World War II from 1944–1946 as a Technical Sergeant (4th Corps-5th Army), and earned the Bronze Star for his bravery while serving as a Forward Sound Ranging Observer in Italy's Po Valley Campaign. Once the war ended, Mr. Redden completed his Bachelor of Science degree in Biology at the University of North Texas, which is where he met his wife, Ruth Hillin, who attended Texas Women's University at the time. The couple was married three months after their first date, and they were married for 58 years.

Mr. David Redden obtained his M.S. degree from the University of North Texas, and then received a Ph.D. from Baylor University Medical School and Graduate Research Institute. Due to his passion for research and teaching, Dr. Redden joined the UNT faculty after teaching Physiology at Baylor University College of Dentistry, where he remained for 30 years. As the Chair of the Pre-Professional Advisory Committee, he was involved in the placement of students into medical, dental, and veterinary schools. He was also a member of the adjunct faculty at the UNT Health Science Center in Fort Worth, Texas. Dr. Redden achieved many honors while at UNT, which include: Outstanding Professor, Outstanding Service Award, Distinguished Teaching Award, Outstanding Educator, and Outstanding Alumni for Excellence in Biological Sciences. After his retirement, he was named Professor Emeritus.

Not only was Dr. Redden an intelligent and meritorious professor, but he was also a talented duck carver, skilled hunter, and loyal church member. Most importantly, however, was his love and devotion to his wife, children, and grandchildren.

Dr. David Redden is survived by his wife, Ruth Hillin Redden; five children: Pam Drenner, Mike Redden, Ken Redden, Ron Redden, Chris Redden; eleven grandchildren: Bryan and Matt Drenner, Corbett Redden, Collin, Sean, Jennifer, Matthew Ryan, Tracy, Shannon, Kevin and Derek Redden; and two great-grandchildren Riley and Price Webb.

As a professor of mine, Dr. Redden was not only a mentor, but also an inspiration to me, and I was honored to represent him in Congress. I extend my sincerest sympathies to his family and friends; he will truly be missed by all.

COMMENDING THE CHAMBER OF SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA AND MEMBERS OF THE ZETA PSI LAMBDA CHAPTER OF ALPHA PHI ALPHA FRATERNITY

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend some of my constituents in Lake Charles, Louisiana for their efforts to help complete the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial. As a result of the hard work of the Chamber of Southwest Louisiana and members of the Zeta Psi Lambda Chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, a model of the historic Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial will make Lake Charles its first stop on a national tour. The goal of the tour is to raise additional funding for the memorial, which is set to be erected on the National Mall in Washington, DC in 2008.

Because of Dr. King's courage, words, and actions, America is stronger and stands as a beacon of hope for people around the world. The monuments on our National Mall tell the story of our achievements as a country, but they also tell the story of our struggles. It is only fitting that Dr. King be honored with a memorial to provide a living history of his role in the civil rights movement.

Dr. King did not just talk about character, he lived it everyday. His leadership changed American life, and his legacy will continue to endure. Today, I commend the leadership of the Chamber of Southwest Louisiana and members of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity for doing their part to ensure that Dr. King's legacy endures.

IN HONOR OF LITTLETON AND JANE MITCHELL

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Littleton P. Mitchell and Jane E. Mitchell, two of the leading civil rights advocates from my home state of Delaware. On February 6th, Howard High School of Technology will kick off a fundraising drive to establish a chair in honor of the Mitchells at the University of Delaware. I cannot think of two more worthy recipients.

Littleton was born in Milford, Delaware and attended Howard High School. He served as a lieutenant in the United States Army Reserve and spent time at Fort Bragg in North Carolina, as well as the Tuskegee Air Base in Alabama. In addition to his Army service, Lit, as he was known to his friends, worked at the Governor Bacon Residential Treatment Center for Social and Emotional Disturbed Youth for 36 years. Most noteworthy though, were his contributions as State President of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).

During his 31 years as President of Delaware's NAACP, Littleton played an important role in several civil rights advancements. He helped integrate all of Delaware's hospitals and worked to eliminate Delaware's Inn Keepers Law that allowed restaurants to refuse service to Black citizens. During the same period, Lit oversaw the integration of local movie theaters and Delaware's volunteer fire companies. I could continue but his accomplishments are too vast to cover in a single document.

Jane Mitchell was not only Littleton's loving wife, but an accomplished registered nurse and community activist. Also a graduate of Howard High School, Jane's nursing career led her to many different hospitals around the United States, including the Tuskegee Institute Hospital in Alabama, the Jewish Hospital of Philadelphia and several hospitals throughout Delaware. She held the distinguished titles of Head Nurse at the Governor Bacon Health Center, and Director of Nursing at Delaware State Hospital.

Jane's impressive career achievements and numerous volunteer activities have earned her a great deal of recognition. Most notably, she was recognized by the National Association of College Women as the Woman of the Year and the Alpha Nu Sigma Chapter of the Rho Sorority awarded her the Outstanding Negro Woman Award.

This couple has achieved so much in their lives, it is truly impossible to do them justice at this time. I am grateful for all they have given to the State of Delaware and I cannot think of two better people to name a chair after. I wish Howard High School luck in their endeavor and I know they will work diligently to honor their distinguished alumni.

TRIBUTE TO THE MOUNT ZION
AME CHURCH OF MILLBURN,
NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Mount Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church in the Township of Millburn, Essex County, New Jersey, a vibrant community I am proud to represent. On February 18, 2007, its good parishioners will celebrate the Mount Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church's 105th Anniversary.

The Mount Zion AME Church was organized in the Spring of 1888 by former members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Springfield, New Jersey, in order to give African American domestic workers a place of their own to gather and worship on Sunday mornings. Mr. Henry Chambers, Mrs. Willhelmina Veals and

Ms. Ella Taylor began the church with a Sunday School in a florist shop on Taylor Street in Millburn. A short while later the church moved to the Old Mountain House on Church Street, where it remained until 1902.

In 1889, Reverend Chase was appointed as pastor of the Mount Zion AME Church and served for 4 years. The Reverend John Roberts succeeded Reverend Chase in 1893 and served until 1895. Reverend Pendleton served as pastor in 1895, followed by Reverend Johnson in 1896.

The Reverend Adolus Willis became pastor in 1897 and served until 1909. On August 20, 1902, Reverend Willis was instrumental in the church's purchase of the building located at 56 Church Street. The Mount Zion AME Church remains at this location today.

A total of twenty pastors led the church from between 1909 and 2003, when the Reverend Cecil Bonds was appointed pastor. Reverend Bonds continues as pastor of the Mount Zion AME Church today.

Madam Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Mount Zion AME Church of Millburn, New Jersey on the celebration of its 105th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO W.R. "REG" GOMES

HON. DENNIS A. CARDOZA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to W.R. "Reg" Gomes, who is retiring with distinction as Vice President, Agriculture and Natural Resources, for the University of California.

Over the past four decades, Reg has dedicated his life to the land-grant university missions of teaching, research and public service. He has mentored hundreds of current agricultural leaders from his early career as a professor at The Ohio State University, then as the Dean of Agriculture at the University of Illinois and finally in his home state to which he returned 11 years ago to lead the vast and varied agricultural education, science and Cooperative Extension programs of the University of California.

The grandson of immigrants from the Azores of Portugal, Reg was raised in the hard working dairy farming culture of California's Central Valley. This early appreciation for farming life led Reg to California Polytechnic State University (San Luis Obispo) to study animal science. Reg and his brother became the first in their family to graduate from college. Reg went on to earn a master's degree from Washington State University and a Ph.D. from Purdue University. This is an impressive collection of degrees for a young man from a small dairy farm in the small town of Hanford, California and it was the beginning of a remarkable academic career.

As an internationally recognized scientist and educator, Reg has been a leading voice on several prominent State and national boards, including the Farm Foundation Agricultural Round Table, the California State Board of Food and Agriculture, the California Farm Bureau Federation Board and the Board on Agriculture and Natural Resources of the National Research Council, which he currently chairs.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am particularly proud that California is the Nation's leading agricultural state with nearly \$30 billion in sales coming from over 88,000 farms which produce 350 different commodities. These impressive statistics are due in large part to the innovative spirit of California farmers who are usually the first to use new technologies and science-based farming practices, and it is our state's great land-grant university—the University of California—and leaders like Reg Gomes whom we have to thank for much of our farming successes.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to offer these words in tribute to my friend Reg Gomes and to wish him and his wife Anne a wonderful next phase of their lives.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOSEPH
"DUKE" CARTER FOR OVER 40
YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
PAINTERS AND ALLIED TRADES

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of a man whose professional life has been dedicated to improving the lives of working men and women in Massachusetts and our Nation. Joseph "Duke" Carter is a remarkable labor leader with a long and illustrious career with the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades.

Duke joined the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades in 1965 and over the next 21 years worked on numerous jobs throughout Boston and the State of Massachusetts. In this capacity Duke developed complete comprehension of the trade and was known for his expertise and attention to detail.

In 1986, Duke became a Business Representative for the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades District Council #35 until 2005 when he was appointed to the position of Assistant Director of Servicing. Duke has also contributed to the improvement of workers' rights as a Delegate to the International Painters and Allied Trades at their National Convention as well as being a Trustee to the Pension, Annuity, Health and Apprenticeship funds program.

Despite his various accomplishments, the title that Duke has always been most proud of and which he cherishes most, is the title of a proud and loving husband. Duke has had the enormous pleasure and tremendous good fortune to be married to his wife Patti for over 43 years.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to take the floor of the House today to join with Joseph "Duke" Carter's family, friends and brothers and sisters of labor to thank him for over 40 years of remarkable service to the American Labor Movement. I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating Duke's distinguished career and wishing him good health and God's blessing in all his future endeavors.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 20, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2007

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend your work on the Continuing Resolution. Republicans set up a colossal budget failure and created the worst budget mess since the government shut down in 1996. I know you had no choice but to attempt to make lemonade out of the lemons that were left for us.

With this behind us, we will be able to work together to really meet America's needs. While I am happy that this legislation included increases in the maximum Pell grant, veterans' health care, funding for Community Health Centers, and the NIH, there are some areas that remain in critical need of additional funding. Much has been neglected over the last few years by the Republicans and will require further attention this Congress. In fact, I could stand here all night discussing the specifics. Don't worry, Mr. Speaker, instead I will focus on one area in particular, teacher incentive grants.

Chicago Public Schools, in collaboration with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET), were awarded a 5-year grant under the Teacher Incentive Fund in FY 2006. Chicago Public Schools were one of 16 grantees awarded funding under the new TIF program to develop a program for performance-based teacher pay, specifically targeting high-need schools. This particular grant award totals \$27,336,693 over 5 years.

The first year of funding for the Chicago award totals \$131,273. The second year continuation grant is proposed at \$4,055,600. This funding is scheduled to be awarded in the fall of 2007 and I would like to make certain that Chicago's schools receive this funding. I am sure that we will be able to work together in the coming months to ensure that this is the case.

TRIBUTE TO DENVER EAST HIGH SCHOOL

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Ms. DeGETTE. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Denver's East High School for winning the "We the People" state competition on December 13, 2006. These students will represent Colorado in the national finals, held in Washington, DC on April 28–30, 2007.

This fantastic program seeks to develop the civic understanding of our nation's elementary, middle, and high school students. Each year competitions are held across the country, with students demonstrating their knowledge of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights.

After months of preparation, the students of East will represent the State of Colorado at the national competition, "testify" before a panel of judges, and display their knowledge of American government and history.

I am so proud to have these students representing the First Congressional District and the entire state of Colorado. I wish them luck in the national finals, and look forward to welcoming them to Washington.

I want to personally recognize the participating students, including Caitlin Bell, Tucker Larson, Tessa Caudle, Sean McCarthy, Mats Engdahl, Manon Scales, Dan Aschkinasi, Matt Valeta, Catie Gliwa, Brian McQuinn, Katrina Sondermann, Tyler Castle, Davis Wert, Kaitlyn Randol, Mackenzie Gilchrist, Carlo Davis, Morgan Hall, Tim Hambidge, Emery Donovan, Rachel Banks, Rye Finegan, Charlie Fine, Michelle Murphy, Taylor Jones, Alexa Morrill, Max Viski-Hanka, Sam Keene, and Marissa Latta. Additionally, I would like to congratulate Kathy Callum, the principal of East, teacher Susan McHugh, and Loyal Darr, who coordinates the "We the People" program in Denver and is a tireless advocate for civic education.

HIRE A VETERAN WEEK

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 5, expressing Congressional support for "Hire-A-Veteran Week," and encouraging the President to issue a proclamation calling upon employers to increase employment of men and women who have served honorably in the U.S. Armed Services.

As a U.S. Army veteran and a longtime member of the House Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees, I know of the challenges awaiting our service members when transitioning from military service to the civilian workforce. While this resolution will not solve the problems of unemployment within the veterans community, it is a strong message that we as members of Congress should send to anyone in a position to hire qualified veterans.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, younger veterans have a significantly higher unemployment rate than those of the general population in the same age range. Madam Speaker, I find this situation unacceptable and I believe most Americans would agree that our country should do more to assist these veterans in transitioning from active duty to the civilian workforce.

Furthermore, as a strong advocate of hiring qualified veterans, I practice what I preach. Having hired military veterans in both my El Paso, Texas and Washington, D.C. offices, I know of the exceptional training the Armed Forces provides our service members, and wholeheartedly encourage any employer to consider hiring those veterans who have served our country.

Madam Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in supporting our Nation's veterans by voting in favor of H. Con. Res. 5.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 58, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 59, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 60, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 61, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 62, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 63, I would have voted "no." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 64, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 65, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 66, I would have voted "no." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 67, I would have voted "no." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 68, I would have voted "no." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 69, I would have voted "no." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 70, I would have voted "no." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 71, I would have voted "yes." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 72, I would have voted "no." Had I been present on Rollcall Vote No. 73, I would have voted "yes."

NATIONAL INTEREST ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR CLARIFICATION ACT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to clarify provisions in Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 regarding the designation of National Interest Energy Transmission Corridors (NIETC).

As the Department of Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) begin implementation of Section 1221, concerns have arisen in my state and in other states about this section of the new law. Specifically, those concerns include how the designation of these corridors could work to usurp the state decisionmaking process, override merit-based decisions by state siting authorities, destroy protected lands, ignore alternative energy solutions, and fail to provide compensation for landowners adjacent to new transmission lines. My legislation attempts to clarify Section 1221 to ensure that the necessity of building interstate energy transmission lines is balanced with other important national interests.

Building transmission lines that use 200-foot rights-of-way and rise up to 270 feet into the air have a tremendous and permanent impact on the surrounding landscape and property values. Patterning the electric transmission line process after current gas line siting regulations does not take into consideration the far reaching visual impact of power lines. Above ground facilities for gas lines are generally a maximum of eight feet high, therefore the viewshed affected is minimal. But power lines

towering over 100 feet can be seen for miles around. It is traditionally understood that local and state governments are best equipped to properly consider and evaluate land use needs for local communities. Federal siting processes for transmission lines must be carefully tailored to allow greater protections to both local landowners and to the state decisionmaking process.

Currently, Section 1221 provides that state regulatory authorities can have their jurisdiction to approve or disapprove an application for new transmission lines in the state usurped by the federal government after one year in the application process. Additionally, the FERC can simply override disapproval by the state regardless of how sound the rationale for disapproval might have been. This is unacceptable.

Under my legislation, if the state entity denies an application, any subsequent application to FERC would first have to prove that the state decision was arbitrary and capricious. Furthermore, if the state goes beyond a year to act, the applicant must show that the state had no valid reason for delaying action.

Additionally, in order to ensure that lands that have been protected by the federal or state governments through conservation easements, ownership and similar preservation initiatives will not be impacted, the legislation prohibits these lands from being included in a NIETC and requires that the Department of Energy consider the national interests in protecting these resources.

I fully support investment in alternative energy sources and conservation, yet current law requires no assessment of alternative energy solutions before action is taken to designate a NIETC. My legislation would require the Department of Energy to consider all energy use alternatives to building new transmission lines before designating a NIETC. Furthermore, the Department of Energy will be required to solicit public comments on the analysis.

Finally, under current law landowners are compensated only for the portion of their property actually taken for a NIETC right-of-way. There is no compensation for any reduction in the value of the remainder of a landowner's property or for adjacent landowners whose property is devalued. This legislation would allow all landowners who are able to prove a 10 percent diminution in property value because of the construction of the transmission lines a cause of action to recover those damages from the energy company. The fact is that transmission lines that tower 270 feet into the air have an impact far beyond the footprint required for construction and maintenance and this must be acknowledged.

Madam Speaker, I invite our colleagues to join with me in support of this legislation.

REHABILITATED, NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS NEED A SECOND CHANCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention the devastating impact of imprisonment on the lives of rehabilitated ex-offenders and to enter into the

RECORD an opinion editorial in the New York Times entitled, "Closing the Revolving Door."

Last week I introduced the Second Chance Act which would provide for the expungement of criminal records of certain non-violent offenders who have paid their debts to society. This "second chance" would only apply to individuals who have clearly demonstrated their commitment to turning themselves into industrious members of our communities.

It is preposterous that many states have often been forced to choose between building new prisons or new schools, because of the federal mandatory minimum sentencing laws. Worse still, the country has created a growing felon caste, now more than 16 million strong and growing, of felons and ex-felons, who are often driven back to prison by policies that make it impossible for them to find jobs, housing or education.

The U.S. Sentencing Commission and the Department of Justice have both concluded that mandatory sentencing fails to deter crime. Furthermore, mandatory minimums have worsened racial and gender disparities and have contributed greatly toward prison overcrowding. Mandatory minimum sentencing is costly and unjust. Mandatory sentencing does not eliminate sentencing disparities; instead it shifts decision-making authority from judges to prosecutors, who operate without accountability. Mandatory minimums fail to punish high-level dealers. Finally, mandatory sentences are responsible for sending record numbers of women and people of color to prison.

I urge your support for H.R. 623, the "Second Chance for Ex-Offenders Act of 2007," which would provide for the expungement of criminal records of certain non-violent offenders who have paid their debts to society.

[From the New York Times]

CLOSING THE REVOLVING DOOR

The United States is paying a heavy price for the mandatory sentencing fad that swept the country 30 years ago. After a tenfold increase in the nation's prison population—and a corrections price tag that exceeds \$60 billion a year—the states have often been forced to choose between building new prisons or new schools. Worse still, the country has created a growing felon caste, now more than 16 million strong, of felons and ex-felons, who are often driven back to prison by policies that make it impossible for them to find jobs, housing or education.

Congress could begin to address this problem by passing the Second Chance Act, which would offer support services for people who are leaving prison. But it would take more than one new law to undo 30 years of damage:

Researchers have shown that inmates who earn college degrees tend to find jobs and stay out of jail once released. Congress needs to revoke laws that bar inmates from receiving Pell grants and that bar some students with drug convictions from getting other support. Following Washington's lead, the states have destroyed prison education programs that had long since proved their worth.

People who leave prison without jobs or places to live are unlikely to stay out of jail. Congress should repeal the lifetime ban on providing temporary welfare benefits to people with felony drug convictions. The federal government should strengthen tax credit and bonding programs that encourage employers to hire people with criminal records. States need to stop barring ex-offenders from jobs because of unrelated crimes—or arrests in

the distant past that never led to convictions.

Congress should deny a request from the F.B.I. to begin including juvenile arrests that never led to convictions (and offenses like drunkenness or vagrancy) in the millions of rap sheets sent to employers. That would transform single indiscretions into lifetime stigmas.

Curbing recidivism will also require doing a lot more to provide help and medication for the one out of every six inmates who suffer mental illness.

The only real way to reduce the inmate population—and the felon class—is to ensure that imprisonment is a method of last resort. That means abandoning the mandatory sentencing laws that have filled prisons to bursting with nonviolent offenders who are doomed to remain trapped at the very margins of society.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family I was unable to travel to Washington, DC, and missed votes in the House of Representatives on January 29, 30, and 31. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on:

1. H.R. 521, 2. H.R. 49, 3. H.R. 335, 4. H. Res. 70, 5. H. Res. 82, 6. H. Res. 24, 7. H. Con. Res. 20, 8. H. Res. 59, 9. H. Con. Res. 34, 10. H. Con. Res. 5, 11. H. Res. 90, 12. H. Res. 24, 13. H. Res. 116, and 14. H.J. Res. 20.

MARITIME POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT OF 2007

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today, together with the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Mr. CUMMINGS, to introduce the "Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2007".

For many years, the International Maritime Organization, an entity of the United Nations, has been developing international standards to prevent pollution from ships that ply the world's oceans. The international convention they developed is called the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, The United States has implemented these environmental laws by enacting and amending the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (APPS).

On May 19, 2005, Annex VI of that Convention came into force internationally. Annex VI limits the discharge of nitrogen oxides from large marine diesel engines, governs the sulfur content of marine diesel fuel, prohibits the emission of ozone-depleting substances, regulates the emission of volatile organic compounds during the transfer of cargoes between tankers and terminals, sets standards for shipboard incinerators and fuel oil quality, and establishes requirements for platforms and drilling rigs at sea.

This bill is the necessary implementing legislation for Annex VI of that Convention. This legislation will provide the Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency the authority that they need to develop U.S. standards and enforce these requirements on the thousands of U.S.- and foreign-flag vessels that enter the United States each year from overseas.

Everyone here recognizes the challenge that the world faces in combating global climate change. We must pursue all avenues in the effort to turn around the rising temperatures on this planet. I am pleased that the International Maritime Organization stepped up to the plate and developed amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships to regulate air pollution from ships.

Last year, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure favorably reported H.R. 5811, the MARPOL Annex VI Implementation Act of 2006. This bill was subsequently added as an amendment to H.R. 5681, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2006, and passed the House on October 28, 2006.

The bill that Mr. CUMMINGS and I introduce today is very similar to H.R. 5811. Pursuant to requests by the Administration, the bill allows the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") and the Coast Guard to enforce the standards. The Coast Guard acknowledges that the EPA has far more experience than it does on air quality emission standards. However, it is important for the EPA to develop the standards jointly with Coast Guard because of the Coast Guard's expertise regarding vessel safety issues.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will report this bill to the House very quickly and that the House will have an opportunity to consider the bill in the coming weeks.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank our new Chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Mr. CUMMINGS, for his contributions in developing this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2007.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained on Wednesday, January 24, 2007, and missed rollcall no. 56. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY PROCUREMENT REFORM ACT OF 2007

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. CARNEY. Madam Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security purchases \$10 billion worth of goods and services per year. Un-

fortunately, the Department's procurement process is rife with problems that need to be addressed. Whether buying ice to aid disaster victims or cameras and sensors to secure our borders, the Department has struggled. The bill I am introducing today is a first step toward addressing some of the Department's most pressing needs in this area. It is an outgrowth of the excellent bi-partisan work spearheaded during the last Congress by then-Chairman MIKE ROGERS of Alabama and then-Ranking Member KENDRICK MEEK in the Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Specifically, this bill requires regular procurement training for the Department's acquisition employees and the development of courses for both new and experienced employees. To assist the Chief Procurement Officer in developing policies and curriculum for the training, it establishes a "Council on Procurement Training" made up of eight component-level chief procurement officers in the Department. In order to ensure that training occurs as required, the Chief Procurement Officer is required annually to submit a report on training activities to the Secretary.

Selection of able and responsible contractors is, of course, crucial to any procurement success. To that end, this bill puts new requirements on the Department to review the past performance of all offerors seeking contracts. And to ensure that all contractors are on an equal playing field, it requires offerors to provide information concerning any role the offeror or its employees played in developing a contract solicitation or similar document. Further, if an offeror is delinquent or in default on any payment of tax, the bill requires offerors to disclose this information.

The bill also directly addresses one area that requires particular attention, the use of purchase cards. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) review released this past July revealed a disturbing lack of guidance and controls over their use. It highlighted potential incidents of fraud, waste, and abuse that could run into the millions of dollars. To address this problem, the bill directs the Department to develop and quickly disseminate Department-wide guidance concerning the use of such cards. Finally, the bill directs the GAO to issue a report on the contracting processes of the Department within six months of enactment.

This bill will not solve all of the problems of the Department's procurement operations. It will, however, start the process of reform that is badly needed.

MEASURE Y: IRAQ WAR ADVISORY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in agreement with the wishes of 19,290 voters in Mendocino County, California concerning the United States military engagement in Iraq.

On November 8, 2006, Measure Y: Iraq War Advisory was on the ballot in Mendocino County. The measure asked the following: Should the United States end the military occupation of Iraq and bring the troops home now? It passed by 67.17 percent of the vote.

Madam Speaker, the voters who approved Measure Y know what has been evident for some time—we need to begin redeployment of the United States military forces out of Iraq. As of today, 3,056 brave American servicemen and women have been killed in Iraq and over 23,000 have been wounded. We must redeploy our troops as quickly and safely as possible while putting an emphasis on diplomacy and shifting security responsibilities to the Iraqi people.

The President has already spent close to half a trillion dollars on war spending and he has called for more troops and more money, but the results of our efforts have been to endanger American lives, and worsen living conditions for Iraqis. It is time to bring our troops home. The will of the American people is indisputable. They want a swift end to the U.S. involvement in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, in accordance with the wish of my constituents, I submit this advisory into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SUPPORT FOR THE EDUCATE ACT

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Ms. HOOLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the EDUCATE Act that Congressman VAN HOLLEN introduced today on behalf of myself and Congressman MIKE FERGUSON. I believe that this bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation that will be introduced in this chamber this year because it speaks to the Federal Government keeping a promise to children.

When Congress passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1975, we made a commitment to our country's special education students. By providing only half of the promised funding in recent years, the Federal Government has passed on another unfunded mandate to States and local school districts and failed to honor our promise that students with special education needs deserve the best education possible.

Despite the fact that current law requires the Federal Government to match State IDEA costs at 40 percent, the President's budget in recent years has included funding for less than half of the Federal Government's IDEA obligation. Budgeting shortfalls at the federal level and the rising cost of special education have forced local school districts to assume a larger percentage of the funding burden. As a result, they have had to seek out alternative funding sources such as higher taxes or diverting monies from other educational initiatives in order to comply with IDEA requirements.

Now I know that many of my colleagues have been angered with the funding that IDEA has received in the past few years, and a few of them have introduced their own legislation to correct this funding shortfall. But I believe that the EDUCATE Act is the most fiscally responsible funding solution that has been offered. In the current fiscal climate and with the PAYGO requirements that have been put in place, this legislation offers the most responsible means of achieving our goals. It will do no good if we succeed in providing these children with a quality education and then leave them a country in financial ruin.

I am proud to have been involved in the crafting of this legislation and I hope that my colleagues will support it.

TRIBUTE TO ISRAEL "IZZIE"
BARLAS

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Israel "Izzie" Barlas who passed away on January 23, 2007. Izzie led a long and full life, married for 59 years to Helene, raising his son Lance, and cherishing his two grandsons.

The youngest of six children born to Russian immigrants Max and Esther Barlas, Izzie was raised in Petaluma, California and attended Santa Rosa Junior College. He was a world traveler, but always came home to Petaluma the "best place to live, work and raise a family".

Izzie and his two brothers co-owned Barlas Feeds, founded by their father. The feed and livestock store began by supplying to local farmers, but the business grew to include shipments as far away as the South Pacific. Those business interests developed from Izzie's tour of duty as a U.S. Marine stationed in the South Pacific during World War II.

The years spent with the Marine Corp held a sense of pride for Izzie. He took part in four major battles: Guam, Bougainville, Guadalcanal, and Iwo Jima. He was present at the flag raising on Iwo Jima, a defining moment of the Pacific battles, captured on film and made into a Marine Corps War Memorial in Washington, DC.

Izzie became active in politics in the 1950s when the state legislature considered a bill requiring all chickens be sold with the head and feet off and eviscerated. The Jewish farmers in Petaluma, many of whom were customers of Barlas Feeds, were selling their chickens "New York dressed" (with the head and feet on and not eviscerated). To oppose the bill, Izzie drove carloads of farmers to meet with committee members. Each member was given a roaster and asked to cook and eat it before deciding it was not healthy. An amendment passed to allow "New York Dressed" chickens. Thus began his career as a poultry industry lobbyist.

Not satisfied with only meeting with elected officials, Izzie decided to make change from within. He ran and was successfully elected to the local Democratic Central Committee, founded the Petaluma Democratic Club, and became a delegate to the California Democratic Council. In 2004, the Sonoma County Democratic Central Committee honored him as the Democrat of the Year. He also became active with the Congress of Democratic Farmers, which led to his relationship with President John Kennedy and an appointment to the National Agricultural Advisory Committee. He fondly recalled visits to the White House pressroom denying reporters his identity, leaving them wondering who he was and his importance.

Madam Speaker, it is with sadness that I honor Israel "Izzie" Barlas, who fought and worked for his country. He touched many lives in his 84 years as a role model and inspiration as a mover and shaker.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION HONORING THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which recognizes the contributions of the architectural profession during National Architecture Week. The architectural profession has made unique contributions to the history, texture, and quality of life in the United States. Through advances in building technology and design innovation, architects are vital to the creation of communities which are safe, livable and sustainable.

This year is the 150th Anniversary of the founding of the American Institute of Architects, which signifies the founding of the organized architectural profession. This bill will honor and celebrate the work of the approximately 281,000 individuals in the United States who create the structures we cherish and towns we treasure. The bill additionally requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to recognize and celebrate National Architecture Week beginning April 8th.

THE PREVENTION FIRST ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, today, I am again proud to introduce the Prevention First Act. By emphasizing prevention first, my bill will help protect women's reproductive health, reduce unintended pregnancies, decrease the spread of STDs, and give women the tools they need to make the best decisions possible for themselves. The Prevention First Act will help to achieve these goals by providing comprehensive access to all forms of contraception and sex education.

Throughout the years, conservative leaders have sought to limit women's rights and freedoms by imposing stricter penalties on doctors who help women faced with an unintended pregnancy. At the same time, these leaders have done very little to ensure that millions of unintended pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) are prevented in the first place. If they are opposed to abortion, if they support women's health, and if they believe that the right to choose when to start a family should apply to all women, no matter their economic or social situation, then they should be in favor of this bill.

It has been more than 40 years since the Supreme Court said women had the right to access contraception. This decision was revolutionary, for the first time allowing women to choose when to become pregnant and how many children to have. Access to contraception greatly enhanced women's equality in American Society.

It also helps to ameliorate economic disparities among women. The social and economic realities surrounding contraception could not be starker. Many poor and low-income women cannot afford to purchase contraceptive serv-

ices and supplies on their own. About 1 in 5 women of reproductive age were uninsured in 2003, and that proportion has increased by 10% since 2001. Half of all women who are sexually active, but do not want to get pregnant, need publicly funded services to help them access public health programs like Medicaid and Title X, the national family planning program. These programs provide high-quality family planning services and other preventive health care, such as pap smears, to underinsured or uninsured individuals who may otherwise lack access to health care and alternative options for birth control. What's more, each year, publicly funded family planning services help women to prevent an estimated one million unplanned pregnancies and 630,000 abortions. Despite the obvious benefits they bring, these programs are currently struggling to meet the growing demand for subsidized family planning services without corresponding increases in funding. The Prevention First Act authorizes funding for Title X clinics and strengthens states' coverage of Medicaid family planning services.

Contraception is, of course, more than a means of fighting economic inequalities. It also provides a way to save scarce public health dollars. For every \$1 spent on providing family planning services, an estimated \$3.80 is saved in Medicaid expenditures for pregnancy-related and newborn care.

And what's more, improved access to emergency contraception (EC) has been proven to significantly reduce the staggering rates of unintended pregnancy and, as a result, abortion. EC prevents pregnancy after unprotected sex or a contraceptive failure. The Alan Guttmacher Institute estimates that increased use of EC accounted for up to 43 percent of the total decline in abortion rates between 1994 and 2000. In addition, EC is often the only contraceptive option for the 300,000 women who are reported to be raped each year. Unfortunately, even with the recent FDA decision to allow EC to be sold over-the-counter to women 18 years of age and over, many women do not know about EC and many still face insurmountable barriers in accessing this important product. The Prevention First Act mandates that the Secretary of Health and Human Services implement an education campaign about EC and requires that hospitals receiving federal funds provide victims of sexual assault with information and access to EC.

Despite the fact that contraceptives have a proven track record of enhancing the health of women and children, preventing unintended pregnancy, and reducing the need for abortion, far too many insurance policies do not cover them. While most employment-related insurance policies in the United States cover prescription drugs in general, many do not include equitable coverage for prescription contraceptive drugs and devices. Although 21 states now have laws in place requiring insurers to provide contraceptive coverage if they cover other prescription drugs, 29 states still have no corresponding law on the books. Out of pocket expenses for contraception can be costly. Women of reproductive age currently spend 68 percent more in out-of-pocket health care costs than men, much of which is due to reproductive health-related supplies and services.

The Prevention First Act requires that private health plans to cover FDA-approved prescription contraceptives and related medical services.

Madam Speaker, it is critical in any discussion of reproductive rights to devote time to teenagers, who face the consequences of so many of these issues more acutely than other age groups. Teens face additional barriers regarding access to services and information. Sixty percent of teens have sex before graduating high school. Those who receive comprehensive sexuality education that includes discussion of contraception as well as abstinence are more likely than those who receive abstinence-only messages to delay sex, to have fewer partners, and to use contraceptives when they do become sexually active. Efforts by conservatives to restrict access to family planning services and promote abstinence-only education programs—which are prohibited from discussing the benefits of contraception—actually jeopardize adolescent health and run counter to the views of many mainstream medical groups.

Nearly 50 percent of new cases of STDs occur among people ages 15 to 24, even though this age bracket makes up just a quarter of the sexually active population. Clearly, teens have the most to lose when faced with an unintended pregnancy or an STD infection.

Moreover, 1 in 3 girls becomes pregnant before the age of 20, and 80 percent of these pregnancies are unintended. Teen mothers are less likely to complete high school. Children of teenage mothers have lower birth weights, are more likely to perform poorly in school, and are at greater risk of abuse and neglect. Improving access to contraceptive services and information does not cause non-sexually active teens to start having sex. Instead, teens need information to help them both postpone sexual activity and to protect themselves if they do become sexually active. A November 2006 study of declining pregnancy rates among teens concluded that the reduction in teen pregnancy between 1995 and 2002 is primarily the result of increased use of contraceptives.

The Prevention First Act provides funding to public and private entities to establish or expand their teenage pregnancy prevention programs. This bill also provides for comprehensive, medically accurate sex education programs that teach young people about abstinence, health, and contraceptives. Moreover, this bill requires federally funded programs that provide information on the use of contraceptives to ensure that the information is medically accurate and includes health benefits and failure rates.

Madam Speaker, virtually everyone can agree that reducing unintended pregnancies, lowering STD infection rates, and promoting the health of all women and their children, regardless of their economic or social situation, are important public health goals. It should come as no surprise that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention included family planning in their published list of the "Ten Great Public Health Achievements in the 20th Century." My bill, the Prevention First Act, will improve access to family planning services for women in need throughout America, and will go a long way toward fulfilling the promise of this important public health achievement.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member to stand with the women of our country and to support this important bill.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 800, THE
EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, today, I am pleased to be joining 230 of my colleagues in introducing H.R. 800, the Employee Free Choice Act. The Employee Free Choice Act is a bipartisan bill designed to provide workers with a fair opportunity to bargain with employers for better wages, benefits and working conditions.

In recent years, despite a growing economy, the middle class has been squeezed. Corporate profits and executive compensation have skyrocketed, but the middle class has seen their wages stagnate, while the costs for basic needs like healthcare, education, food, energy and housing continue to increase. Globalization and misguided government policies have contributed to a growing income disparity and less economic security for middle class families.

One way to help the middle class is to provide them with a fair opportunity to organize and join unions, so they can have a say in what goes on in the workplace. Workers who belong to unions earn 30 percent more than nonunion workers. In addition, they are 62 percent more likely to have employer-provided health coverage and four times more likely to have pensions.

The current process for forming unions is badly broken and so skewed in favor of those who oppose unions, that workers must literally risk their jobs in order form a union. Although it is illegal, one quarter of employers facing an organizing drive have been found to fire at least one worker who supports a union. In fact, employees who are active union supporters have a one-in-five chance of being fired for legal union activities. Sadly, many employers resort to spying, threats, intimidation, harassment and other illegal activity in their campaigns to oppose unions. The penalty for illegal activity, including firing workers for engaging in protected activity, is so weak that it does little to deter law breakers.

Even when employers don't break the law, the process itself stacks the deck against union supporters. The employer has all the power; they control the information workers can receive, can force workers to attend anti-union meetings during work hours, can force workers to meet with supervisors who deliver anti-union messages, and can even imply that the business will close if the union wins. Union supporters' access to employees, on the other hand, is heavily restricted.

The Employee Free Choice Act would add some fairness to the system by: (1) allowing a majority of employees the opportunity to select to be represented by a union by expressing their decision through the signing of authorization cards; (2) provide for mediation and arbitration when workers and employers cannot agree on a first contract; and (3) increase penalties against employers who threaten, intimidate or fire workers for engaging in protected activity.

I urge all my colleagues to join in this effort to provide working people with a real opportunity to bargain for better wages and benefits.

TO REQUIRE THAT ALL SHIPS WITH BALLAST WATER TANKS, INCLUDING VESSELS THAT ARE NOT CARRYING BALLAST WATER, TO CARRY OUT THE EXCHANGE OF BALLAST WATER OR ALTERNATIVE BALLAST WATER MANAGEMENT METHODS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO ANY PORT WITHIN THE GREAT LAKES

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, today I introduced a bill to require all vessels, including those with no ballast water on board, NOBOBs, to undergo ballast water exchange before entering the Great Lakes.

Invasive species pose a dangerous threat to the Great Lakes. These creatures can cause irreparable ecological and economic damage to a variety of locations and industries. In 2005, economic losses were estimated at an annual \$5 billion to the region. More than 160 non-native species have already invaded the Great Lakes ecosystem. As the largest source of our Nation's fresh water, the Great Lakes must be protected from further introduction of invasives.

One method by which these species enter the Great Lakes is through ballast water tanks. Current law requires ships carrying ballast water to undergo ballast water exchange to flush out invasive species before entering the Great Lakes from another port. However, 90 percent of all ships entering the Great Lakes have no ballast water on board. These NOBOBs are not subject to the same ballast water exchange laws, even though they still have ballast tanks. Invasive species often survive in the sediment at the bottom of these tanks. When these ships operate in the Great Lakes, they may add and then pump out new ballast water before leaving. This mixes with residual ballast water and sediments, and provides an unregulated pathway for the introduction of new invasive species when the ballast water is released.

In other words, the contamination begins.

We must not leave 90 percent of ships entering the Great Lakes untreated. This bipartisan legislation requires all ships with ballast tanks, including NOBOBs, to undergo ballast water exchange. In addition, the bill commissions a study of the effectiveness and environmental soundness of other ballast treatment options. The language fixes a current problem and works towards an even stronger solution for the future.

Madam Speaker, this legislation, while small, has enormous consequences for the health and safety of one of our national treasures. I am proud to introduce this ballast water legislation to significantly reduce the infiltration of invasive species into the Great Lakes.

STAFF SERGEANT RICHWELL
ARZADON DORIA—A TRUE HERO

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, United States Army Staff Sergeant Richwell Arzadon Doria

was killed by small-arms fire during the battle with the insurgents in Iraq on November 7, 2006.

He was born on December 6, 1980 in Dagupan City, Philippines. He immigrated to the United States of America in 1991 and graduated from Samuel Morse High School in San Diego, California in 2000. He enlisted in the United States Army and completed the Basic and Advanced Individual Training at Fort Benning, Georgia in 2001. He was naturalized as an American citizen in 2004.

Staff Sergeant Doria was assigned to the 25th Infantry Division at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii. He reported to the 2nd Battalion, 35th Infantry Regiment and was assigned to Alpha Company. He participated in training exercises at the National Training Center, Pohakuloa Training Area, and Operation North Wind in Japan. In 2004, he deployed with the Cacti Battalion in support of the Operation Enduring Freedom V in Afghanistan and also served with the Cacti Battalion in Operation Iraqi Freedom V. While in Alpha Company, he served as a rifleman, M203 gunner, machine gun operator, team leader, and as a squad leader.

SSG Doria was posthumously awarded the Army Commendation Medal with "V" device for valor. On November 1, 2006, his action saved the lives of his fellow soldiers following an insurgents attack. He was also posthumously awarded the Bronze Star, the fourth highest U.S. military award for gallantry in action and the Purple Heart for his courageous actions on November 7, 2006, when he made the ultimate sacrifice while covering for his fellow soldiers during an air assault and rescue mission in Iraq.

He is survived by his wife, Jasmine; daughter, Jada; parents, Fred and Rose; sister, Rowena; aunts, Zenaida and Minda, and grandfather/adopted father, Benito Doria. His last wish to be buried at the Eternal Gardens Memorial Park in Dagupan City, Philippines was fulfilled, complete with full military honors, 21-gun salute, and the American flag was presented to the grieving Doria family by BG Simeon G. Trombitas, who is the Commander of the U.S. Army's Special Operations Command in South Korea.

U.S. Army SSG Richwell Arzadon Doria is a true hero and will forever remain in our hearts and memories for his bravery, dedication to duty, and service to the United States of America.

HONORING ROSEANNA WABEL
MCDERMOTT (1909–2007)

HON. JIM MCDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, on behalf of loving family and friends, I enter into the RECORD our memory of Roseanna Wabel McDermott, born in Streator, Illinois, who died peacefully on January 29, 2007, at Columbia Lutheran Home in Seattle. We will miss her gentle spirit and twinkling eye.

Roseanna and her husband, Mac, came to the great Northwest in 1971. Early in their marriage, they had founded a church in their garage in the Chicago suburbs. Throughout her life, Roseanna continued to live her Chris-

tian faith of love, charity and compassion. She fundamentally rejected racism and unjust war.

A true mid-Westerner and a bride of the Depression, Roseanna had sizeable grit and an entrepreneur's resourcefulness. She could make something out of nothing, and for her everything had at least one more use before it went into the trash. She re-wired lamps, rejuvenated Charlie Brown Christmas trees with a bit of careful grafting, and mended furniture. She was a saver—of string, rubber bands, and plastic twist ties. And, she showed us there was always hope for a dying plant, a broken chair, or a difficult personality.

As a consummate gardener, Roseanna fed her family from her backyard and taught her offspring the wonders of composting, the satisfaction of baking and the skill of darning. She was a crack gin rummy player (despite her misgivings about the danger of cards), and she loved the interaction and challenge of a good game of Scrabble. She enjoyed all things northwest—Dungeness crab, Pacific oysters and the Seattle Mariners.

Roseanna possessed a wide curiosity and believed in the power of education. A Streator High School graduate, yet financially unable to go to college herself, she sacrificed for the education of her children and served as their constant reminder of the benefits of hard work and life-long learning.

Roseanna's loving presence and beautiful smile were dwarfed only by her huge heart and unwavering belief in the goodness of all. She is preceded in death by her husband of 68 years, William Morrell (Mac), and survived by her children Jim, John, Lois, Mark; her grandchildren Katherine, Jim and Nicholas; and, her great grandchildren Kendall and Lachlan.

In tribute to their loving care of Roseanna, donations may be sent to Columbia Lutheran Home (columbialutheranhome.com) 4700 Phinney Ave. N., Seattle, WA 98103. Please join in celebration of this beloved woman on February 10th at University Congregational United Church of Christ at 2 p.m. (4515 16th Ave NE, Seattle).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained on Wednesday, January 31, 2007, and missed rollcall No. 68. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

H.R. 798, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
HEADQUARTERS SUN WALL PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEM

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, today I introduce a bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to install a sun wall photovoltaic system, known as the "Solar Net" on the headquarters building of the Department of

Energy. There is no more appropriate or symbolic federal building with which to demonstrate the power and promise of photovoltaics than the Department of Energy headquarters building, known as the Forrestal Building, located in Washington, DC.

Our energy needs continue to increase, but as a nation we have not done enough to try to meet these needs with new technologies and alternative fuels. As a result, our dependence on fossil fuels—and foreign oil in particular—continues unabated.

As the nation's largest single energy consumer, the Federal Government is in a unique position to promote energy conservation and efficiency, particularly in the operation of Federal buildings. By applying the principles of sustainable, green design, agencies have the ability to reduce energy usage, reduce life-cycle costs, and reduce environmental impacts in the construction and operation of federal facilities.

A photovoltaic system turns light energy into electricity. Photovoltaics reduce the consumption of fossil fuels and offer distinct advantages over diesel generators and primary batteries. These systems are highly efficient panels and have no moving parts, so the need for maintenance is virtually non-existent. Photovoltaics have tremendous potential. As an example, estimates have shown that the electricity needs of the entire U.S. could be met by installing photovoltaic panels in a 100-mile by 100-mile area in the Southwest.

The Federal Government owns or leases approximately 500,000 buildings. According to U.S. Department of Energy estimates, in FY 2005, the cost of energy consumption by Federal agencies totaled \$14.5 billion—more than \$5.5 billion of which was spent on buildings and facilities. The General Services Administration, through its Public Building Service, manages 218.9 million square feet of owned office space and 168.8 million square feet of leased space. Imagine the benefits if this space utilized photovoltaics and solar power.

More than 25 Federal buildings nationwide already utilize photovoltaics in some capacity. These projects have demonstrated that we have the technology and ability to provide electricity for the Federal Government office buildings with photovoltaic rays. We have the ability to keep our public buildings running on clean and quiet sources of energy, and still produce extra electricity to put back into the power grid.

The bill I introduce today addresses only one project, but it is a necessary and important step in the overall effort to increase energy efficiency in public buildings. Located in our Nation's capital, the Solar Net project will serve as a model for the entire country, as the largest building-integrated solar energy system on any federal building in the country. The design for the sun wall project was selected in 2000 after an open competition. It is an attractive and energy-efficient design that can generate a maximum of 200 kW of electricity and includes a solar thermal installation for hot water and hot air.

A similar provision to this bill was enacted as part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109–58). While the Energy Policy Act authorized funding for fiscal year 2006, no funding was appropriated for that year. Today, this bill specifically sets aside federal building repair and alteration funding for construction of the sun wall project in fiscal year 2007.

The time is long overdue for the Federal Government to lead in the development and promotion of energy-efficient technologies and alternative and renewable fuels. The plans are ready to go. The needs and the potential impacts on our nation's energy use are great. All that is left is to do is to provide the funding needed to purchase and install the proper equipment. This bill does just that.

I thank Mr. MICA, Ranking Member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ms. NORTON, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, for joining me on this critical, bipartisan initiative. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 798.

RECOGNIZING THE CELEBRATION OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF REV. ZAIDAN'S PRIESTHOOD AND THE LIFE OF JOHN MILAD NISSER

HON. RAY LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, as a Lebanese American, I rise here today to recognize the celebration of St. Maron Feast Day on February 11, 2007, by The Parish of Our Lady of Mount Lebanon in Los Angeles. They are planning a grand banquet at the Biltmore Hotel for this occasion and are honoring the 20th anniversary of the priesthood of Father Abdallah Zaidan, their pastor, and John Milad Nisser, who is receiving a Lifetime Achievement Award.

Born in Kseibe, Lebanon, Rev. Zaidan joined the Congregation of Maronite Lebanese Missionaries and earned his Master's degrees at St. John's University in New York. He entered Novitiate in September 1980 and was ordained in July 1986. Father Abdallah E. Zaidan received his Master's in Theology in 1986, his Master's in Philosophy in 1987, and his Master's in Education in 1990.

Beginning his service in Lebanon as a Chaplain and teacher, Rev. Zaidan immigrated to the United States in 1988. He became Assistant Rector at Our Lady of Lebanon Cathedral in Brooklyn, and in January 1990, became Pastor of St. George Maronite Catholic Church in San Antonio. Beginning in August 1992, Father Zaidan became Regional Superior of Maronite Lebanese Missionaries in the United States and is currently the Rector of Our Lady of Mt. Lebanon-St. Peter Cathedral in Los Angeles, and Protospyter for the Southwest and Northwest Regions of the Eparchy of Our Lady of Lebanon of Los Angeles, as well as several other important positions within the church and the community. I join the parishioners of Our Lady of Mount Lebanon to congratulate Rev. Zaidan for his 20 years of wonderful service.

Furthermore, I would also like to honor John Milad Nisser who will be presented the Lifetime Achievement Award. John Nisser was born in Batroun, a small town north of Beirut, in Lebanon. His father died when he was just 15, so John took it upon himself to provide for his family by taking odd jobs and tutoring the children of wealthy families. By doing so, he was able to provide for the other five children

while becoming fluent in French, Arabic, English, and later Spanish. In 1947, John left Lebanon and journeyed first to South America and eventually to California. In California, he turned to the place of his faith for comfort and joined the church of Our Lady of Mt. Lebanon. Here he married Rosalie Barhouse in 1949. Dreaming of owning his own business, he purchased and operated a small market. Still, he wanted to do more. After finally securing the necessary loans, he and Rosalie built and managed several apartment buildings, and later constructed three senior citizen homes. Through all this, he has never stopped giving thanks to God and his country for what life has given him. Due to his generosity, the church of St. Stephens in Batroun has been given new windows, an organ, pews, and a hearse. He has sponsored the building of the St. Vincent DePaul nursing home and set up an Endowment Fund through Our Lady of Mount Lebanon to provide for the poor in Lebanon. Here in the United States, many Lebanese transfer students were offered free rent in his apartments during the duration of their education. Our Lady of Mt. Lebanon has consistently been a recipient of his generosity.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these two men who have contributed greatly to their communities and touched the lives of many.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF FINDLAY ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JIM JORDAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate a crown jewel of Northwestern Ohio on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

The University of Findlay was founded as Findlay College in 1882 by the Churches of God, General Conference. Back then, the City of Findlay's total population was less than 5,000; today, total enrollment at the University is approaching that milestone. The 1989 renaming of the College better reflects the size of the student population and the wide variety of academic programs offered: degrees are now awarded in more than 60 undergraduate areas.

Throughout its history, the University has earned accolades for its hands' on learning environment and its excellent faculty' student ratios. Named a 2007 Best Midwestern College by the Princeton Review, Findlay excels in distance learning programs through cutting-edge technologies; all of the required coursework to earn a Master of Business Administration degree may be taken online.

I am especially proud of the University's innovative work on terrorism response initiatives. Following the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, Ken Zirkle, who was then serving as President of the University, came to Congress to discuss how communities could better prepare to respond to terrorist attacks. Since then, Congress has helped the University form the Center for Terrorism Preparedness, a nationally recognized program that is helping first responders deal with emerging threats to our homeland.

Madam Speaker, ceremonies marking the 125th anniversary of the University's founding will take place on campus later this week. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio, I congratulate the administration, faculty, staff, and students of the University of Findlay on this historic occasion. The people of Hancock County and throughout Ohio can take great pride in the work done at the University to prepare students to meet the challenges of the future.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EVERYONE DESERVES UNCONDITIONAL ACCESS TO EDUCATION (EDUCATE) ACT MANDATORY FULL FUNDING FOR IDEA BIPARTISAN COMPROMISE BILL

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Everyone Deserves Unconditional Access to Education Act, a bill to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I thank my colleagues, Representatives FERGUSON and HOOLEY, for their work on this bill.

Madam Speaker, it was more than 30 years ago that Congress passed IDEA, requiring states to provide an appropriate education to students with special needs. At that time, Congress promised states that it would cover 40 percent of the costs to meet this goal. However, Congress has yet to fulfill its promise to states. In fact, Congress has never met even half of its commitment. This is unacceptable.

The bill I introduce today with Representatives FERGUSON and HOOLEY will fulfill our promise to states with guaranteed funding increases for IDEA every year. It will relieve the burden on states and ensure a quality education for all special needs students. And it will restore the integrity of this Congress by ensuring that a promise made is a promise kept.

Madam Speaker, states and students have waited more than 30 years for Congress to fulfill its pledge. I encourage members from both sides of the aisle to join with Representatives FERGUSON, HOOLEY, and me to support our schools and provide our students with the resources they need.

HONORING DOUGLAS D. HAWTHORNE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, it has been my distinct honor over the years to take note of the extraordinary valuable work done by Douglas D. Hawthorne for the 30th Congressional District of Texas, the State of Texas and this Nation.

Mr. Hawthorne, president and chief executive of Texas Health Resources was recognized this fall, when he received the Greer Garson-E.E. Fogelson Humanitarian Award at the Greer Garson Gala. Mr. Hawthorne serves

as a national role model through his leadership and unwavering commitment to helping people and furthering the awareness of Parkinson's disease in our community.

For more than a decade, Mr. Hawthorne has conducted a "quite revolution" in the treatment of Alzheimer. He helped establish the APDA's Parkinson's Information and Referral Center at Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas in 1990 and developed a relationship with the local chapter.

Hawthorne served as president and chief executive officer of Presbyterian Healthcare Resources from 1983 until the formation of Texas Health Resources in 1997. He is past chairman of Dallas/Fort Worth Hospital Council and the Texas Hospital Association (THA). In 1996, he received the Boone Powell Sr. Award of Excellence for distinguished hospital administration by the Dallas/Fort Worth Hospital Council. In 1994, he received THA's highest award, The Earl M. Collier Award for Distinguished Hospital Administration. He has chaired several American Hospital Association (AHA) committees and is a former at-large member of AHA's Board of Trustees. A Fellow of the American College of Healthcare Executives (ACHE), he received the Gold Medal Award in 2002, ACHE Regent Senior Level Health Care Executive Award in 1991 and served as Regent for Texas Greater Dallas/Fort Worth area of the ACHE. In 2003, Modern Healthcare magazine named Hawthorne number 30 on its list of the "100 Most Powerful People in Health Care."

Madam Speaker, as one who has worked closely with Alzheimer patients, I know that his efforts for battling this disease are unequaled and he is certainly one of our community's great leaders. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I rise with great pleasure to honor Douglas Hawthorne, on the occasion of his receiving the Greer Garson-E.E. Fogelson Humanitarian Award.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 20, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2007

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 20, the Joint Funding Resolution that will complete action on the remainder of the fiscal year 2007 appropriations bills. This measure is not perfect, but it addresses the most urgent funding needs of federal programs while remaining within the tight budget constraints imposed by the previous Congress.

We are fixing this funding problem today because the former Republican leadership in the House and Senate failed to complete nine of the 11 appropriations bills for fiscal year 2007 before the 109th Congress adjourned in December 2006. The funding resolution we are voting on today will finally give federal programs a blueprint for their spending until September 30, 2007; however, it is not an ideal solution. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have rightly talked about challenges faced by certain programs that will see no in-

crease over fiscal year 2006 levels. I cannot help but wonder where their concerns were when they controlled the fate of those programs last year?

The Democratic leadership faced many hard decisions in funding the remainder of the appropriations bills, and my colleagues rose to the occasion. This endeavor required a careful analysis of many important programs, as well as a great deal of compromise. To start, this measure does not contain any earmarks or a cost-of-living pay increase for Members of Congress. I wholeheartedly agree that any congressional pay increase should not be passed until the minimum wage increase passes Congress. We all must move forward together. That is also why I am pleased that this measure will increase Section 8 funding, which will help renew vouchers for individuals and families that cannot afford exorbitant housing prices on their own.

I am proud that my colleagues were able to increase funds for other high priority needs as well, such as veterans and military health care. We must make sure that service members wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan have the services they require, as well as anticipate the increasing number of returning veterans who have earned their promised benefits. This measure will also fund an increase in programs for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as well as local law enforcement programs, such as the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program, which are critical to keeping our communities safe. At both the state and federal level, our work on intelligence and security must not be threatened by a lack of resources.

The funding resolution will also increase the maximum amount of a Pell grant so that more than 5.3 million students can help pay rising college expenses. I am especially pleased that this increase, the first in 4 years, will strengthen a program first introduced by an esteemed Rhode Islander, Senator Claiborne Pell. This measure also helps the youngest and most vulnerable group of students in our country by increasing Head Start funding to prevent a drop in enrollments.

Finally, this resolution also highlights areas where we need to move our country forward like health care and energy security. We are providing increased funding for community health centers, as well as scientific research; both the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation will be funded over last year's level. The Department of Energy will also receive additional resources for research and development activities for renewable energy and energy efficiency programs.

After completion of H.J. Res 20, I look forward to working toward timely passage of a Fiscal Year 2008 budget that provides the necessary funding for some of our nation's most critical programs. The Democratic leadership has reinstated the pay-as-you-go budget rule, so that new spending has to be offset by a decrease in spending elsewhere in the budget. This promise was made last year, when we told the voters that we would bring this Congress in a new direction and demand fiscal responsibility. The measure we pass today, as well as the work we will do in the coming months, will show Americans that this Congress can be responsive to the public, enhance support for federal programs vital to our working families, and be careful stewards of taxpayer dollars.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ENTERPRISE RENT-A-CAR

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements and contributions of Enterprise Rent-A-Car, the largest car-rental company in North America and an integral part of the local Saint Louis community.

Enterprise has annual revenues of more than 9 billion and is currently number 21 on the Forbes "500 Largest Private Companies in America" list.

Operating on the principle that good business derives from a well-trained and well-treated staff, the company has been cited by Business Week as one of the Best Places to Launch a Career. In 2005, Enterprise received the Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award for efforts on behalf of its employees serving in the National Guard and Reserve.

Enterprise is as dedicated to the public, as they are to their own employees.

In 1982, the Enterprise Rent-A-Car Foundation was created, and has, over the past 25 years, given more than \$87 million to non-profit entities, has donated \$30 million to schools and scholarships to support minorities and economically-challenged students, and has contributed \$1 million each to both the Red Cross relief effort for the Gulf Coast, as well as the victims of 9-11.

With its charitable works, avid support of its employees, and economic success, Economic Rent-A-Car is a truly dynamic corporation.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to this organization, who has made great contributions to the local Saint Louis community and the larger national community, and is a model for effective and charismatic business.

HONORING OPERATION HELMET

HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it is with great honor and personal gratitude that I recognize the remarkable work of Mike and Marie Farley who, along with Rodney Van Pelt and other members of the Quakertown Moose Lodge No. 1622, took bold initiative to provide our soldiers with life-saving equipment.

Marie Farley of Nockamixon, Pennsylvania was shocked to learn that antiquated gear was being issued to U.S. soldiers—including to her 23-year-old son Michael, a Marine stationed in Anbar Province, Iraq. She learned that with an upgrade kit, her son's helmet could do more to protect him. If Michael was knocked down by an explosion, the shock-absorbing pad and new strap system could save his life. But Mrs. Farley and her husband Mike discovered that if they wanted their son and his unit to have this simple safety feature, they would have to raise the money themselves.

The Farleys were not alone in their desire to provide U.S. soldiers with proper equipment. A national initiative—Operation Helmet—was underway and the Farleys quickly sought to localize the effort. Mrs. Farley made up signs asking for donations and put one of those signs at the Quakertown Moose Lodge. That is where the project took off. After learning about the need for the protective pads, Rodney Van Pelt of the Moose Club joined the Farleys to aggressively pursue the goal of equipping Michael's entire unit with the upgrade. The Moose Club and the rest of the community rallied around the family and raised enough to take care of Michael's entire company, not just his unit.

As of today, the Farleys and the Quakertown Moose Club have raised \$35,000, enough for almost 500 upgrade kits. The kits have been shipped out and came as early Christmas presents for soldiers overseas. This accomplishment is inspiring and is a telling example of true patriotism and respect.

Having led convoys in a Humvee without doors while serving with the 82nd Airborne Division in Baghdad, I understand what it means to fight a war without proper equipment. So I speak from experience when I say that this kind of support from home is wholeheartedly appreciated and serves as a tremendous morale boost. But Madam Speaker, family members should not be forced to pay for their loved ones' military equipment. The Farleys were able to gather tremendous community support but despite their best efforts they couldn't supply all U.S. forces, and many families are paying out-of-pocket. This is unfair and I urge you all to support the Helmet Pad Reimbursement Act of 2007. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill because at the very least, these families should have the opportunity to request a reimbursement.

This is an issue of critical importance to our troops and I commend all who have brought it to light. On behalf of the men and women with whom I served, Mr. and Mrs. Farley, Mr. Van Pelt, the Quakertown Moose Lodge and most importantly, Michael and all the soldiers who continue to risk their lives for this country, I urge Congress to support this bill.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD REYNDERS
FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE
CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF ST. PETERSBURG

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Harold Reynders as the recent recipient of the St. Jude Medal from the Catholic Diocese of St. Petersburg. A dedicated volunteer at the St. Frances Cabrini Catholic Church for nearly two decades, Harold has given his time and energy to help his fellow parishioners.

Born in Lancaster, NY, Harold ran his own construction company in Buffalo for 37 years. Moving with his wife Corinne to Spring Hill, FL in 1988 in search of warmer weather, Harold began attending St. Frances Cabrini Catholic Church in 1989.

Each day Harold would go to church, work throughout the sanctuary and help keep the

church neat and clean. His efforts were eventually brought to the attention of Monsignor John Cippel, who gave Harold Keys to the church and an official position as a sacristan.

For the next 10 years, Harold prepared the altar for the Mass and cleaned up following the sermon. He also was given the responsibility of opening the church doors each morning, and served as a lector and minister at the Sunday Masses.

This past November, Harold was presented with the St. Jude Medal that "honors individuals who have consistently given of themselves to living the gospel of Jesus Christ by their generosity and service." Presented on the Feast of Christ the King Day at the Cathedral of St. Jude in St. Petersburg, Harold was truly humbled to receive the honor.

Madam Speaker, Harold Reynders has spent a lifetime as a devout Catholic, working to make his parish and his church a better place to worship. He should be commended for his years of service and for being honored with the St. Jude Medal.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2007

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, today I, together with Ranking Member MICA, Economic Development Subcommittee Chairwoman NORTON, Subcommittee Ranking Member GRAVES, and many Members who represent communities of the Appalachian region, introduce the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 2007. This bipartisan bill improves the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and reauthorizes the Appalachian Regional Commission for five years through FY 2011.

I am proud to sponsor this bill, which builds on more than four decades of economic development successes through job creation in some of the Nation's most disadvantaged yet deserving communities. I have witnessed firsthand the triumph that is possible when the Federal Government joins in partnership with states, localities, economic development districts, and private businesses to break the cycle of crippling and pervasive poverty. It is an economic certainty that job deficiencies reduce the tax base, which reduces the ability of governments to provide public infrastructure, which further reduces the ability to create and attract new industries. Generating jobs must therefore continue to be our top priority in communities suffering economic distress, particularly in Appalachia.

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) was created by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-4) to address economic issues and social problems of the Appalachian region as a part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society program. Congress created the ARC in 1965 to assist the Appalachian region "in providing the infrastructure necessary for economic and human resource development, in developing the regions' industry, in building entrepreneurial communities, in generating a diversi-

fied regional economy and in making the region's industrial and commercial resources more competitive in the national and world markets."

As a regional economic development agency, ARC's primary function is to support development of Appalachia's economy and critical infrastructure to provide a climate for industry growth and job creation. ARC includes all or part of 13 States: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Historically, the Appalachian region has faced high levels of poverty and economic distress resulting from geographic isolation and inadequate infrastructure. Since its creation in 1965, ARC has administered a variety of programs to aid in the development and advancement of the region, including the creation of a highway system, enhancements in education and job training, and the development of water and sewer systems.

ARC's funding and projects have contributed significantly to employment, health, public works, and general economic development improvements in the region. The regional poverty rate has been reduced by almost one-half. High school graduation rates have doubled, and the percentage of Appalachian students now completing high school is slightly above the national average. The infant mortality rate has been cut by two-thirds, and ARC funds have helped build more than 400 health facilities serving four million people in Appalachia.

ARC projects have also helped to construct 2,496 miles of new Federal-aid highways. In the last five years alone, ARC-funded infrastructure projects have resulted in the creation or retention of 136,000 jobs, and over 183,000 households have reaped the benefits of clean water and sanitation facilities.

Yet, our work to ensure the economic viability and vitality of the communities that are part of the ARC is far from finished. Approximately one-fifth of ARC's counties remain in a state of economic distress. One-fourth of Appalachia's counties have a poverty rate that is more than 150 percent of the national average. Additional Federal investments are necessary to build upon the progress made to date.

Specifically, this bill directs ARC to designate as "at-risk counties," which are counties in the Appalachian region that are most at risk of becoming economically distressed; establishes the maximum Federal share for Appalachian Regional Commission non-highway grant amounts for designated at-risk counties as 70 percent; authorizes additional appropriations to the Commission through FY 2011 to carry out Appalachian regional development; and extends, for five years, the termination date of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (with exceptions for the Appalachian development highway system and certain definitions).

During the 107th Congress, the House passed the Appalachian Regional Development Reauthorization Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-149), which built upon past successes of the Appalachian Regional Commission, made several amendments to existing law, and extended the authorization for an additional five years.

ARC's authorization expired at the end of FY 2006. During the 109th Congress, the Committee's bipartisan leadership introduced

H.R. 5812, a bill reauthorizing ARC through FY 2011. Although the Senate passed S. 2832 to reauthorize the ARC, the Senate-passed bill did not include the anti-earmarking provision of H.R. 5812. The House did not pass S. 2832 and no further action was taken on H.R. 5812. This bill includes the anti-earmarking provision that I insisted upon in the 109th Congress.

The ARC, and the critical investments that it provides, are far too important for further delay. Congress should show its commitment to the people of Appalachia by getting this bill to the President's desk early in the 110th Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bipartisan bill to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Commission.

HONORING KRISTIN WILLETT

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 2007

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kristin Willett, an exemplary citizen from my district who was recently named recipient of the Elizabethtown Independent Schools' 2006-07 Excellence in the Classroom and Educational Leadership (ExCEL) Award.

An art teacher at the Morningside Elementary School in Elizabethtown, KY, Mrs. Willett has made a personal commitment to education, creating an environment in her classroom where students of varying ages and abilities can comfortably learn and demonstrate their creative talents. For more than 4 years, she has captured the attention of her students through her innovative and interactive approach, using a wide variety of visual resources to promote connections to art.

Mrs. Willett chose to pursue a career in teaching as a way to make a tangible difference in the most important foundation of our society—children. In her interaction with students, she personifies honesty, trust, organization, creativity, and knowledge; qualities that consistently make her a favorite teacher and role-model. Her best reward, she explains, is seeing children excited by their own creativity.

I applaud Mrs. Willett for her accomplishments in public education, a profession of great responsibility and even greater reward. On behalf of many others in the Elizabethtown area, I would like to express my profound appreciation for her service.

It is my great privilege to recognize Kristin Willett today, before the entire U.S. House of Representatives, for her special achievement. Her unique dedication to the development of young people and the communities they will someday serve make her an outstanding citizen worthy of our collective honor and respect.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 6, 2007 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 7

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of Energy. SD-366

9:45 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the United States Department of Agriculture farm bill proposal. SD-106

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled "Public Transportation Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007"; to be followed by hearings to examine predatory lending practices and home foreclosures. SH-216

Budget
To hold hearings to examine the President's Fiscal Year 2008 budget proposal. SD-608

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine climate change research and scientific integrity. SR-253

Finance
To hold hearings to examine the President's Fiscal Year 2008 budget proposal. SD-215

Environment and Public Works
Private Sector and Consumer Solutions to Global Warming and Wildlife Protection Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine global warming and wildlife, focusing on informing the Committee and the United States Senate on issues related to global warming and wildlife. SD-406

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings to examine the hazards of electronic voting, focusing on the machinery of democracy. SR-301

2:30 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters. SH-219

FEBRUARY 8

9:15 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the President's foreign affairs budget; there is a possibility of a business meeting to consider the nomination of John D.

Negroponte, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State. SD-106

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine issues relating to labor, immigration, law enforcement, and economic conditions in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. SD-366

Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by an oversight hearing on diabetes in Indian Country, focusing on the Special Diabetes Program for Indians. SR-485

Appropriations
Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the President's budget request for Fiscal Year 2008 for the Department of Transportation. SD-138

10 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings to examine the President's Fiscal Year 2008 budget and revenue proposals. SD-608

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the present and future of public safety communications. SR-253

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine No Child Left Behind reauthorization, focusing on strategies that promote school improvement. SH-216

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider S. 188, to revise the short title of the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006, S. 214, to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys, S. 316, to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, S. 236, to require reports to Congress on Federal agency use of data mining, S. Res. 36, honoring women's health advocate Cynthia Boles Dailard, S. Res. 37, designating March 26, 2007 as "National Support the Troops Day" and encouraging the people of the United States to participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the Armed Forces both at home and abroad, and the nominations of Marcia Morales Howard, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, Nora Barry Fischer, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Norman Randy Smith, of Idaho, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, John Alfred Jarvey, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa, and Sara Elizabeth Lioi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio. SD-226

2:30 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters. SH-219

<p>FEBRUARY 9</p> <p>9:30 a.m. Armed Services To receive a briefing on the Department of Defense Inspector General's report on the activities of the Office of Special Plans prior to the war in Iraq; to be followed by a closed session in SR-232A. SR-222</p>	<p>pacts of climate change and stabilizing greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. SD-106</p> <p>Appropriations Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee To hold oversight hearings to examine the Outer Continental Shelf oil and natural gas royalty management by the Department of the Interior. SD-124</p>	<p>closed session in SR-222 following the open session. SH-216</p> <p>Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee To hold hearings to examine the Administration's proposal to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration (Part 1). SR-253</p> <p>Energy and Natural Resources To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of the Interior. SD-366</p>
<p>FEBRUARY 12</p> <p>2:30 p.m. Energy and Natural Resources Energy Subcommittee To hold hearings to examine recommendations on policies and programs to improve the energy efficiency of buildings and to expand the role of electric and gas utilities in energy efficiency programs. SD-366</p>	<p>FEBRUARY 14</p> <p>10 a.m. Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs To hold hearings to examine the semi-annual monetary policy report to the Congress. SD-106</p> <p>Judiciary To hold hearings to examine judicial security and independence. SD-226</p>	<p>10 a.m. Finance To hold hearings to examine the Administration trade agenda for 2007. SD-215</p>
<p>FEBRUARY 13</p> <p>10 a.m. Energy and Natural Resources To hold hearings to examine the "Stern Review of the Economics of Climate Change" examining the economic im-</p>	<p>FEBRUARY 15</p> <p>9:30 a.m. Armed Services To hold hearings to examine the current and future readiness of the Army and Marine Corps; there is a possibility of a</p>	<p>FEBRUARY 28</p> <p>2:30 p.m. Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science and Space Subcommittee To hold hearings to examine the President's budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). SR-253</p>

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1545–S1581

Measures Introduced: Three bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 488–490, and S. Res. 69–71. **Page S1576**

Iraq Sense of Congress Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 470, to express the sense of Congress on Iraq. **Pages S1555–67**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 49 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 44), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S1555–66**

Senator Reid entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill failed (listed above). **Pages S1566–67**

Bill Referral—Agreement: Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. 153, to provide for the monitoring of the long-term medical health of firefighters who responded to emergencies in certain disaster areas and for the treatment of such firefighters, and the bill was then referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. **Pages S1576, S1580**

Reading of Washington's Farewell Address: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the Resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 26, 2007, at 2 p.m. **Pages S1580–81**

Appointments:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) dur-

ing the 110th Congress: Senators Dodd, Feingold, Clinton, Kerry, and Cardin. **Page S1580**

Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed Senator Cardin, as Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress. **Page S1580**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting a report relative to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM–3) **Page S1575**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Cote d'Ivoire; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–4) **Page S1575**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, the Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2008; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; which was referred to the Committees on the Budget; and Appropriations. (PM–5) **Pages S1575–76**

Executive Communications: **Page S1576**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1576–77**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1577–80**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1574–75**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1580**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S1580**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1580**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—44) **Page S1566**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m., and adjourned at 7:11 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Tuesday, February 6, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1581.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

GENOCIDE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law concluded a hearing to examine genocide and the rule of law, focusing on ongoing

efforts against the perpetrators of genocide and other human rights violators, after receiving testimony from Sigal P. Mandelker, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Lieutenant General Romeo A. Dallaire, Parliament of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario; Diane F. Orentlicher, American University Washington College of Law, Washington, D.C.; and Don Cheadle, Los Angeles, California.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 36 public bills, H.R. 797–832; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 53–55; and H. Res. 124–127 were introduced.

Pages H1208–11

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H1211–12

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 547, to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–7).

Page H1208

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Lampson to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today.

Page H1155

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 577, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas, as the “Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building”;

Pages H1156–58

Sergeant Lea Robert Mills Brooksville Aviation Branch Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 514, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16150 Aviation Loop Drive in Brooksville, Florida, as the “Sergeant Lea Robert Mills Brooksville Aviation Branch Post Office”;

Page H1158

Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 433, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1700 Main Street in Little Rock, Arkansas, as the “Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building”;

Pages H1158–59

Supporting the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week: H. Res. 94, to support

the goals and ideals of National Consumer Protection Week, by a 2/3 Yea-and-Nay vote of 398 yeas with none voting “nay,” Roll No. 74; and

Pages H1159–62, H1169

Supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day: H. Con. Res. 35, to support the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, by a 2/3 Yea-and-Nay vote of 396 yeas with none voting “nay,” Roll No. 75.

Pages H1162–67, H1169–70

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress of the continuation of the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d’Ivoire—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 110–11);

Pages H1167–68

Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted a report relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 110–12); and

Page H1168

Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted to Congress the Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2008—referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 110–3).

Page H1168

Recess: The House recessed at 3:24 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

Page H1168

House of Representatives Page Board—Appointment: Read a letter from the Minority Leader wherein he appointed Representative Brown-Waite to the House of Representatives Page Board.

Page H1169

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1155.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two Yea-and-Nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear

on pages H1169, H1169–70. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2:00 p.m. and adjourned at midnight.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see *Daily Digest*, p. D 65)

H.R. 475, to revise the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board to equalize the number of members representing the majority and minority parties and to include a member representing the parents of pages and a member representing former pages. Signed on February 2, 2007 (Public Law 110–2).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the President's budget request for fiscal year 2008 and the fiscal years 2007 and 2008 war supplemental requests in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2008 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine war costs, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold an oversight hearing to examine recent Environmental Protection Agency decisions, focusing on EPA actions and documents, including monitoring regulations related to perchlorate, the process for setting National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), the lead NAAQS process, air toxics control (the "once in always in" policy), the Toxic Release Inventory, and EPA library closures, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the President's Fiscal Year 2008 budget proposal, 2:45 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine a comprehensive stabilization, reconstruction and counter-terrorism strategy for Somalia, 10 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine if the Department of Justice is politicizing the hiring and firing of U.S. attorneys relating to preserving prosecutorial independence, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Preston Bailey, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia, and Otis D. Wright II, and George H. Wu, each

to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Major Management Challenges Facing the Department of Homeland Security in Implementing Legislated and Other Security Improvements, 10 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, hearing on the President's Fiscal Year 2008 Budget, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, hearing entitled "A Review of the Department of Health and Human Services' Fiscal Year 2008 Budget," 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to consider authorizing the issuance of subpoenas in connection with a planned hearing on adequacy of the Food and Drug Administration to assure the safety of the drug supply, 9:30 a.m., 2218 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, hearing entitled "Federal Housing Response to Hurricane Katrina," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, hearing entitled "Update on Federal Rail and Public Transportation Security Efforts," 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing and mark up of the following bills: H.R. 545, Native American Methamphetamine Enforcement and Treatment Act of 2007; H.R. 137, Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007; and H.R. 740, To amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent caller ID spoofing, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing entitled "The Lasting Impact of CPA Decision-Making on Iraq Reconstruction," 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, to mark up the following: a measure to direct the Administrator of General Services to install a photovoltaic system for the headquarters building of the Department of Energy; the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 2007; H.R. 187, To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse located at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, as the "Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse;" H.R. 342, To designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independent Street, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr., United States Courthouse;" H.R. 399, To designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse;" H.R. 429, To designate the United States courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the "Hugh L. Carey United States Courthouse;" H.R. 430, To designate the United States bankruptcy courthouse located at 271 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn,

New York as the “Conrad Duberstein United States Bankruptcy Courthouse;” H.R. 478, To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the “Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse;” H.R. 544, To designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Sante Fe, New Mexico, as the “Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse;” and

H.R. 584, To designate the headquarters building of the Department of Education in Washington, D.C., as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, hearing on the President’s FY 2008 budget proposals, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, February 6

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, February 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: The Senate will be in a period of morning business.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of the following suspensions: (1) H.R. 161—Bainbridge Island Japanese American Monument Act of 2007; (2) H.R. 235—Allowing for the renegotiation of the payment schedule of contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the Redwood Valley County Water District; (3) H.R. 356—Removing certain restrictions on the Mammoth Community Water District's ability to use certain property acquired by that District from the United States; (4) H.R. 386—Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District Conveyance Act of 2007; (5) H.R. 482—American River Pump Station Project Transfer Act of 2007; and (6) H.R. 512—Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino Act of 2007.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abercrombie, Neil, Hawaii, E258, E261
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E259
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E254
Brown-Waite, Ginny, Fla., E264
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E252, E254
Cardoza, Dennis A., Calif., E255
Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E263
Carney, Christopher P., Pa., E258
Castle, Michael N., Del., E254
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E256
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E256
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E251, E253

Filner, Bob, Calif., E260
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E255
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E252
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E252
Hooley, Darlene, Ore., E258
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E262
Jordan, Jim, Ohio, E262
Kirk, Mark Steven, Ill., E260
LaHood, Ray, Ill., E262
Langevin, James R., R.I., E263
Lewis, John, Ga., E252
Lewis, Ron, Ky., E265
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E255
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E257, E261

Miller, George, Calif., E260
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E251, E254
Murphy, Patrick J., Pa., E263
Norwood, Charlie, Ga., E256
Oberstar, James L., Minn., E257, E261, E264
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E254, E257
Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E256
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E259
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E258
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E262
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E251, E253, E256
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E259



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.